



# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 138

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Tuesday, December 6, 1994**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, December 6, 1994

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

[*English*]

## POINTS OF ORDER

### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe you would find unanimous consent, when the House gets to Government Orders today, for the Secretary of State for Multiculturalism and the Status of Women to put the following motion:

That this House take note of the anniversary of the murder of 14 young women at l'École polytechnique on December 6, 1989 and the continuing urgent need for action to eliminate the threat of violence in society, including the threat of violence to women.

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

## GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 23 petitions.

\* \* \*

## COMMUNITY STORIES

**Hon. Sheila Finestone (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table in the House, in both official languages, a document entitled "Community Stories: Taking Action on Violence Against Women". The document contains the personal stories and history of the women applying for safety in their communities.

Today I will be moving: "That this House take note of the anniversary of the murder of 14 young women at l'École polytechnique on December 6, 1989 and the continuing urgent

need for action to eliminate the threat of violence in society, including the threat of violence to women".

**The Speaker:** I understand that this will be the first order of the day when we get through the routine business, and it is taken as such.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Hon. Sheila Finestone (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today, December 6, is the day that all parties in the House have unanimously proclaimed national day of remembrance and action on violence against women.

[*English*]

These young women were smart, ambitious and hardworking. They had much to contribute to their families and to their country. All this was stolen from them in a burst of gunfire.

Today, 14 red roses have been placed at the entrance of the Chamber. Each rose represents the life of a young woman, a life full of promise, a life full of dreams, a life cut short by a horrifying act of violence by a man who voiced the old hidden belief that women do not have the right to equal status in a man's world.

The tragedy was a catalyst for action and the rose has become a symbol in memory of the women who died. It appears on the YWCA buttons sold each year as part of its campaign to address violence against women. It appears on the Canadian Labour Congress lapel pin as part of its new campaign.

[*Translation*]

Every year, since 1989, increasing numbers of individuals and organizations have joined forces with women's groups and other community organizations in order to bring about social change. The Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the Canadian Union of Public Employees, the Quebec women's federation—many people are trying to make a difference in their community.

[*English*]

Our government is also a partner for change. Last week the Minister of Justice announced the government's intention to ban the type of gun that was used in Montreal. Firearms control is a life and death issue for women. In the new proposals anyone

*Points of Order*

charged with criminal harassment such as stalking will temporarily be prohibited from owning a firearm.

[*Translation*]

A national firearms registry would have enormous advantages. When responding to a domestic violence call, police would know if there was a registered firearm at the address in question.

(1010)

Last year, Statistics Canada reported that, based on the definition of violence in the Criminal Code, half of Canadian women have been victims of violence in their adult life, often more than once. Men they know pose more of a danger to them than strangers.

[*English*]

The foundation of the federal government's multifaceted approach to violence against women in Canadian society is legislation, giving protection under the law. We have made this a priority. It is part of the solution, clearly our part. We are also working in new ways to facilitate community action.

I am pleased to have tabled today the publication entitled "Community Stories: Taking Action on Violence Against Women". It chronicles the experience of 10 communities that took part in a demonstration project of a community kit on violence against women. Both community stories and the community kit are tremendous resources for grassroots action in our own neighbourhoods. They are a source of inspiration on what is possible.

There are many other excellent resources available today for increased safety and security for all women in the workplace, in municipalities and in relationships. Violence against women is simply unacceptable. We must work together to change attitudes and behaviour that give rise to these acts, to these terrible tragedies.

Gender violence does not just threaten women; it threatens their families, their loved ones and all of us. It tears at the very fabric of our society. We need to act not just for ourselves but for our daughters and our granddaughters. It is for their right to walk safely and earn fairly anywhere in our Canada.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of emotion that we are reminded today of a cold and snowy day, five years ago, when 14 female students of l'École polytechnique de Montréal were shot and killed by a young man who had a visceral hatred of women, and feminists in particular. These women, like many others, had families, friends, hopes. Such senseless acts have sounded a call, a heart-rending call, in Quebec and Canada, and even had an echo in the United States.

Violence against women must stop. The word was out before this tragic incident, but the atrocity of these murders created a new awareness of a reality experienced by a great number of women.

From then on, all forms of violence against women were to be seen under a much harsher light. For instance, a harder and more serious look was taken at one of the most revolting aspects of our society. Conjugal violence must stop and we must take all the necessary steps to stop it. Spousal violence is widespread in Quebec and Canada. The figures are alarming. Let me just quote a few here. This fall, Statistics Canada reported that 29 per cent of women who had been married or in a common law relationship were physically or sexually assaulted by their spouse at one time or another in their life together.

It is reported that 21 per cent of spousal assaults occur when women are pregnant. Physical abuse may or may not be accompanied by psychological abuse. The blows, injuries, death threats, and humiliations leave permanent psychological scars in women, as well as in the children who often witness and are themselves victims of the abuse.

Since the second half of the 1970s, homes for battered women have mushroomed. The care and services they provide unquestionably meet a fundamental need in our communities. However, the issue of funding is much thornier and the financial support they receive from the federal government is far from adequate. Funding programs for housing that used to help these shelters open up new places for battered women now have no budget. This government decided instead to offer public funds to private owners.

(1015)

Last February's budget did not provide any financing for a campaign to address violence against women, despite the formal promise contained in the red book. Nevertheless, all provincial governments as well as the federal government must do even more to promote awareness and spread information in order to eliminate violence against women.

Another statistic involving women has to do with firearms. Firearms are the weapon of choice used in spousal homicides. Between 1974 and 1992, 42 per cent of women killed by their spouses were shot dead.

In this context, Bloc members, like most Quebecers and Canadians, eagerly awaited the bill on how the federal government would effectively control firearms. Unfortunately, the Minister of Justice was rather timid in announcing a policy statement on gun control. Surprisingly enough, despite the urgent need for gun control, this bill will be implemented over the next seven years until 2002.

We also fail to understand why all 4,000 AK-47 and 6,000 FN-FAL owners will be allowed to keep these weapons for the rest of their lives. All 555,000 Canadians who own .25 or .32

*Points of Order*

caliber handguns or 105-mm guns will also be able to keep them until they die.

Heidi Rathjen is to be commended for her determination and her work in the Coalition for Gun Control, which helped highlight the importance of controlling guns in Canada and Quebec. Her crusade will not be in vain.

The victims and survivors of the massacre at the École Polytechnique will live in our collective conscience for many years to come. We must not, however, forget that this violence still goes on on a different scale, often far from the spotlights and the cameras.

In 1993, 63 women were killed by their spouses, 49 by their legal or common law husbands and 14 by separated or divorced spouses. Another 63 roses could have been laid at the entrance to the House of Commons and in front of all provincial legislatures.

Every time an injured woman seeks refuge in a shelter for battered women, every time a woman decides to sue her abusing spouse, every time a woman leaves her home to start a new life, it is another step forward in the campaign to eliminate violence.

On December 6, 1989, 14 students at the École Polytechnique were silenced forever, but we cannot remain silent.

[*English*]

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute today as well to the 14 women who five years ago were brutally murdered at l'École polytechnique. We deplore such violence in our society and must make every effort to reform the criminal justice system so that tragedies like this are avoided.

On December 6, 1989 one of the worst nightmares in this society came to pass when one sick individual went into our schools and gunned down 14 young women. Crime is a terrible fact in our society that we must do our best to eradicate. It affects us all.

Not only was that murder deplorable but there have been several since, maybe not on that large scale, but certainly the fact is when anyone is murdered in this country it is too many.

It is reported that violent crime is on the rise. Since 1988 in the nation's capital alone, here in Ottawa total violent crime is up 75 per cent. Considering this alarming statistic, let us look together at a solution to the situation, not always look back in time but forward as to how we can avoid these things in the future.

We must be cautious not to give the impression that the problems of violence in our society only affect women. We need to be very careful that is not the only thing we talk about. They are not simply women's issues. All men must not be branded.

Most Canadian men abhor violence. They do not condone it, nor do they want to be put on a guilt trip for one maniac who went crazy and committed such a deplorable act.

These issues affect all members of our society. Violence is perpetrated on many areas of our society, certainly violence against women but also men, seniors and children. The largest category of violent crime is male violence against other males. We have grandparents and seniors who are verbally and physically abused, and let us not forget the children. Our vulnerable children are being preyed on more and more.

(1020)

The government pays lip service and expresses a sincere intent to address the issue of violence against women. The minister just said we need to act. However, on looking back at the legislative agenda of this government for the last year it seems that there has been very little action taken that will remedy the situation.

There needs to be fairness in the system. Sentencing for violent crimes needs to be fair. Recently in Surrey—White Rock—South Langley a father of two murdered his wife, put her back into bed, and after the crime he admitted to a friend what he had done. He was not convicted of murder one or murder two but simply of manslaughter. His defence was that his wife had threatened to spread a rumour that he was molesting his children. He was sentenced to five years in jail, but he served only two of them for killing his wife. This is intolerable.

I would hope that the minister would hear me when I say that we must have punishment in place for criminals that fits the crime. Unfortunately the government aims at the wrong people in society and at the wrong sector for getting tough with criminals such as someone who could kill his wife and simply serve two years of his sentence. That is intolerable.

If we want to truly stop the tide of violence in society we must start one small step at a time. We are willing to take that step. We are willing to make the commitment. We are willing to make the tough decisions that will protect our women, our children and our men. If we really want to make a difference and show Canada that we are truly sick and tired of senseless crimes the government should take action now to keep people from beating, raping or killing people, and then using the excuse that we have seen recently that they were simply too drunk to know what they were doing and so they get away with the crime.

If the Secretary of State for the Status of Women wants to safeguard women, children and men in Canada, surely she will use her influence around the cabinet table to get rid of the drunkenness defence. I urge the secretary of state to listen to Canadians and to push the Minister of Justice to introduce an amendment to the Criminal Code now. We have given our consent that we would let this be passed within 24 hours.

*Points of Order*

**Mrs. Finestone:** On what?

**Miss Grey:** “On what”, the minister asks of me. Unfortunately she did not hear what I said. Let me reiterate it because it is that important.

Our party said that we would give unanimous consent to an amendment to the Criminal Code to get rid of the drunkenness defence immediately. If the minister is sincere, if she is serious about making sure that violence is not perpetrated on other people in our society, especially people whom they know and ultimately care about, surely we could pass that amendment now. That would be true action. I think nothing would speak louder than an amendment to the Criminal Code.

I urge the secretary of state to listen to Canadians and to push the Minister of Justice to introduce an amendment to the Criminal Code.

My colleagues across are saying “What about gun control?”. Yes, gun control for the people who are abusing guns and making sure that those people pay the price. This needs to be done now.

**An hon. member:** What does this have to do with it?

**Miss Grey:** That was my question exactly: What does this have to do with it?

Since the Supreme Court ruled on the Daviault case, the drunkenness defence has been used successfully three times in a matter of weeks. If this government were serious about it we could have this passed by the Christmas break and I look forward to working with the government on bringing that in.

We look forward to making sure that justice not be put on hold. Our women, our children and our men expect nothing less from the government, from the secretary of state and from the Minister of Justice. They expect action now.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the House for unanimous consent to reply to the ministerial statement.

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, five years ago we rose in this House to commemorate the 14 young women who were killed in Montreal and today we must remember these 14 women, their families and friends, and also propose actions for a policy of zero tolerance of violence against women.

[*English*]

Five years ago when we stood in this House and sadly recognized and commemorated the tragedy of the Montreal massacre we all committed ourselves to action.

(1025)

It is true that awareness of the issue has increased since that time. While there is never any positive aspect to the loss of such young lives, I think we can say that following that massacre there has been much more attention to the issue.

While there has been much condemnation there is still much to do. Far too little has been done. Sadly few steps have been taken which would actually end the violence; some have, but too few. I would say for example that the current social security review that is being undertaken does not address the question of violence but indeed does address the possibility of less funding under the Canada assistance plan for the provinces and territories which fund transition homes and those organizations which help who are under threat of violence.

As well we have seen several recent court judgments which excuse assault and sexual assault on the grounds of intoxication or the use of drugs. This is totally unacceptable. If we are to be committed to zero tolerance in our society, I join with others in this House to demand that government take action on this issue now. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this party will support such immediate action.

As we remember those who lost their lives five years ago, we again recommit ourselves to real action. I call on the government to start today with that real action.

\* \* \*

#### REGULATORY EFFICIENCY ACT

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-62, an act to provide for the achievement of regulatory goals through alternatives to designated regulations and through administrative agreements.

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

**Mr. Eggleton:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wish to inform the House that it is my intention to propose that this bill be referred to committee before second reading, pursuant to Standing Order 73(1).

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

#### PETITIONS

##### SENIOR CITIZENS

**Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to table 586 signatures from all ridings in the province, including Saint-Maurice, the riding of the Right Hon. Prime Minister.

These petitions come from women's social action associations, better known by the acronym AFEAS, and from seniors'

groups. The petitioners ask Parliament to ask the government to give up the plan for voice mail systems for seniors. I support this petition.

[English]

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

**Mr. Paul Steckle (Huron—Bruce, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour this morning to present three petitions. The first is that the petitioners pray 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.

(1030)

HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Paul Steckle (Huron—Bruce, Lib.):** In the second petition the petitioners pray that Parliament ensure that the present provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide be enforced vigorously. They request that Parliament make no changes in the law which would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide, or active or passive euthanasia.

The petitioners also pray that Parliament not amend the Human Rights Act or 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 Canadian Human Rights Act to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase of sexual orientation.

It is my privilege to present these petitions this morning.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 36 I would like to present two petitions signed by residents of the town of Westlock and the city of Fort McMurray in my riding of Athabasca.

The petitioners request that Parliament ensure the present provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide be vigorously enforced and that Parliament make no change in the law which would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

**Mr. Raymond Bonin (Nickel Belt, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I have two petitions from the ridings of Nickel Belt and Sudbury with over 600 signatures.

The first requires 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.

*Points of Order*

ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. Raymond Bonin (Nickel Belt, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition from the same ridings with the same numbers asks that Parliament 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 which would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

I support both petitions.

TOBACCO

**Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I am pleased to deposit a petition today from residents of virtually every province from coast to coast in Canada.

The petitioners suggest that research conducted by Health Canada shows that the number of people, particularly teenagers, who smoke increases as the cost of cigarettes goes down. Tobacco products are clearly linked to forms of cancer, heart disease, stroke, emphysema, chronic bronchitis and many other illnesses. Given the fact that tobacco products contain over 4,000 chemicals of which at least 43 cause cancer in humans and that the use of tobacco products is directly responsible for the premature death of some 38,000 Canadians annually tobacco can rightly be termed a hazardous product.

Therefore the petitioners call upon Parliament to remove the exemption for tobacco under the Hazardous Products Act.

HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Cliff Breitkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I rise to present several petitions.

On behalf of Darcy Siggelkow I present three petitions. The first petition asks Parliament not to amend the human rights code or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way which would indicate societal approval of same sex relationships.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

**Mr. Cliff Breitkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition prays that Parliament extend the same protection to the unborn child as that enjoyed by born human beings.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. Cliff Breitkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the third petition asks that Parliament make no changes in the law which would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Cliff Breitkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have two additional petitions to present on these issues on behalf of Anne Pinkoski and Norma Wood. I present two petitions asking that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Charter of Rights and

*Government Orders*

Freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships.

## TELEVISION PROGRAMMING

**Mr. Cliff Breitkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I also have a petition regarding enacting legislation to provide specific standards for acceptable content for CBC television programming.

\* \* \*

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

**The Speaker:** Shall the questions be allowed to stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

## REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY DEBATE

## VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring before the House an important matter requiring the urgent attention of the House of Commons.

(1035)

Five years have passed since the murder of the 14 women at l'École polytechnique in Montreal yet violence does continue at alarming rates. More than half of all Canadian women will experience in their lifetime at least one incident of violence. Therefore I have put forward the request today for an emergency debate on this issue.

We have to date and this morning certainly acknowledged and given our condolences to the families of the 14 young women who were so sadly and tragically murdered five years ago. However it is incumbent upon this House to show its seriousness in this matter and have a true debate on this issue. The government should hear proposals of members of this House from all parties.

I urge that this motion for an emergency debate be accepted.

**The Speaker:** This topic indeed is a very serious one and I would make these points. This is a chronic matter for our society to deal with. As the motion stands now it is not in the strictest sense a matter for an emergency debate. However all this might be moot in view of the fact it is my understanding that in just a short while I will be reading a motion in orders of the day. All hon. members will be able to join in to make their views known on this very important topic.

I wish to inform the House that pursuant to Standing Order 33(2) because of the ministerial statement Government Orders will be extended by 20 minutes.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

*[English]*

## VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Hon. Sheila Finestone (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women), Lib.)** moved:

That this House take note of the anniversary of the murder of 14 young women at l'École polytechnique on December 6, 1989 and the continuing urgent need for action to eliminate the threat of violence in society, including the threat of violence to women.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased that the House has unanimously agreed to address this issue of violence against women in our society. This issue has become pervasive and has created concern for the men and women in this House and of course many organizations, associations and groups outside of this House.

The House has accepted the resolution unanimously to acknowledge the issue of the women who were murdered unconscionably five years ago. That unfortunate circumstance has given us the excellent opportunity for us to look at this issue not from a partisan political perspective but more in the interests of the well-being of the women and children and the responsibility that women have for the future of our society, for the well-being of the children, for the education and for the community work that is needed and is often the role of women.

Women have many roles in our society. Not only are they the progenitors of the future, they also educate and train our children. They do a great amount of community based work and care for the elderly. As well women are in the workforce. Women bear tremendous amounts of stress and strain. The last thing they need is a lack of respect, understanding and appreciation of the multiplicity and the importance of their role for all of us in our society.

I am pleased to rise to speak on this topic. I am pleased there was unanimous approval in this House to proceed in this way. This morning in commemoration of the national day of remembrance and action on violence against women, I talked about statistics and the magnitude of the problem in Canada. I would like to put forward a fact sheet to which women and men can refer and which organizations and institutions can look at to take proper concerted action together so we can win the fight against violence against women.

(1040)

In 1993 Statistics Canada conducted a national survey on violence against women. Approximately 12,300 women were interviewed. Only behaviours considered an offence under the

Criminal Code of Canada were addressed in this survey. In fact, they were quite specific about what they were prepared to look at and include in the survey.

The survey included a wide range of behaviours such as the threat of imminent attack, attack with serious injury, unwanted sexual touching up to and including violent sexual attacks with severe injury. The findings are chilling and should advise us here in the House about our responsibility to represent, to speak for and to speak out in the interests of our constituents, half of whom are women.

In Canada 51 per cent of all women have experienced at least one incident of violence since the age of 16. Women are at greater risk from men they know than they are from strangers. Twenty-five per cent of all women have experienced violence at the hand of a current or past marital partner. In those cases weapons were used by 44 per cent of violent spouses. Twenty-one per cent of women abused by current or previous partners were assaulted during pregnancy; this is absolutely the most repugnant of the statements as far as I am concerned. One in six currently married women reported violence by their spouses and 39 per cent of those women said it happened more than once.

For sources of support that most women need and use, 51 per cent of women who ask for help turn to friends and neighbours and 42 per cent turn to family. Those figures come from the violence against women surveys in the Statistics Canada daily of November 18, 1993.

We also know how important are the homes for battered women, the transition houses and the groups that work right at the community base on these issues of violence. They enable women to leave their homes, take their children and protect themselves. They enable the women to get legal aid and some advice and counselling.

I sincerely hope that more work will be done with the batterers. If we leave them out there it will mean that some other woman is put at risk. We need to do work in that regard.

[Translation]

The other important aspect illustrated by this information on violence against women in Canada is that of women and firearms. On average, one woman is killed by a firearm every six days in Canada, often in a private residence and by someone she knows.

Firearms are the weapon of choice in spousal homicides. Between 1974 and 1992, 42 per cent of women murdered by their spouses were killed by bullets, 21 per cent were stabbed and another 21 per cent died from blows received.

### *Government Orders*

During that same period, a married woman was nine times more likely to be killed by her spouse than by a stranger, and there were a total of 1,886 spousal homicides. Women were the victims in 76 per cent of cases. According to a study on domestic homicides conducted by the Department of Justice in 1992, only 18 per cent of firearms used by husbands who killed their wives were acquired illegally.

These are important facts to consider on a day like today and during a debate such as this one.

[English]

I would like to talk about this whole issue in terms of the human toll. The following testimonial is from a woman living in Canada today: "My husband struck me on our honeymoon. He killed our first child by kicking the four month old child in my uterus. My doctor asked me what I did and what I do to make him so mad. Our Anglican minister reminded me that I had married for better or worse. The lawyer wanted to know where I would get money to pay the fees. My mother told my husband where I was hiding".

(1045)

The voice is a chilling one. It is an incisive call for change in the attitudes throughout Canadian society.

[Translation]

I want to point out two important realities for Canadian women. The first one is that we are more likely to be abused by an acquaintance, that is a spouse or a friend, as the hon. member from the opposition and I mentioned earlier. I feel it is very important for women to know that this is the reality and that they should take it into consideration before talking or making arrangements with anyone.

[English]

I just finished outlining some of the highlights of a Statistics Canada survey from last year. I did not outline the impact on the children who witness this violence and then become repeaters, carrying on this behaviour pattern into their own relationships with women. We find that half of the women reporting violence by men are known to them: dates, boyfriends, marital partners, friends, family and neighbours. It is very disquieting.

The second reality that I want to impress on the House is that violence and women's inequality are inextricably linked. Violence is a manifestation of women's inequality. In the words of another women: "When my husband stole a pizza he got a \$100 fine. He beats me and sometimes he gets a \$50 fine. I think this is awful. I am worth less than a pizza".

What messages do these words send to all women about our worth? How deeply entrenched are the old views that it is a



*Government Orders*

man's right to control his wife and his daughters, that, as in past centuries, women are possessions?

Admitting that these attitudes exist is an important step in finding solutions. As I said earlier today, I am encouraged by the level of community action taking place across Canada. As a nation we are beginning to hear what women's groups have been saying for years, that violence against women is pervasive in Canada, that it is tolerated and that violence is the most deplorable symptom of women's inequality.

On behalf of the people of Canada I would like to extend our thanks to the women and to the grassroots groups that started the shelter movement, staffed the assault crisis centres and started self-healing circles. They were determined to get the public's attention. We must ensure that their voices continue to be heard and support the work and the undertakings they have made.

The government understands that violence against women results from complex inter-related factors. That is why we favour a comprehensive approach to this issue. I was asked by one of the members of the opposition to explain the question of drunkenness and the Supreme Court of Canada ruling which cited extreme drunkenness as a defence in a case of sexual assault. This defence has since been successfully used in several other lower court cases. I find this to be totally unacceptable. The women of our caucus and I have spoken to the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice is equally outraged. However, the charter and the Constitution speak before the courts.

The question is how to amend the laws of this land so they will not be found wanting when we go to the courts. This kind of abysmal, unacceptable behaviour can no longer take place and be accepted and certainly that unenlightened judges do not use proper defence mechanisms from my perspective.

I would like the House to know that the Minister of Justice intends to propose amendments which he has pointed out several times. He will present an amendment to the Criminal Code to deal with self-intoxication as a defence when the House resumes in February. This Friday, on December 9, he is holding discussions with groups that have a tremendous interest in seeing the reduction of violence and enabling us to move forward in our agenda against violence against women.

(1050)

[*Translation*]

Some members of this House claimed that we did not take important measures. As I said before, our responsibility lies primarily in passing appropriate legislation, and I believe that, in this respect, we truly made critical choices on a series of actions which will ultimately be complemented by other measures later on this year.

I also think that it must be recognized that we have taken important measures. Let us take a look at the firearms control

program. On November 30, the Minister of Justice announced a gun control program, an important step towards eliminating violence against women. The development of a national firearms registry, the ban on some firearms and the relaxation of prohibition orders are all measures that can be beneficial to women and used to save lives.

The National Crime Prevention Council was set up in July 1994. Among other issues, this Council will study how women are vulnerable to crime. The Council is made up of 25 members, 14 of whom are women, who come from all walks of life. As for keeping the peace, in June, the Minister of Justice tabled Bill C-42, which contains more than 100 changes to the Criminal Code, including various provisions to improve our efforts to keep the peace. For example, the police and other stakeholders will be able to ask for a peace bond in order to protect women in danger.

The national screening system to identify individuals who have sexually assaulted children is the fourth part of our approach. Announced in November, this database will enable organizations and employers to check if a job applicant has a criminal record for sexual offences before allowing the applicant to work with children. I think that this is the fifth bill on sentencing reform.

[*English*]

I would say to members that the sentencing reform is an important piece of legislation.

[*Translation*]

Bill C-41 gives the courts the means to make a distinction between serious violent crimes and less serious non-violent crimes. This sends a clear message to society: violence against women and children will not be tolerated. The bill stipulates that evidence that a crime, including a sexual offence, was motivated by hate or that the offender abused a position of trust or authority will be deemed by the judge to be an aggravating factor for the purpose of sentencing.

I must say that the opposition's complaints are unfounded because we have made progress. We also looked at the issue of equality before the law. Take the court challenges program, for example. In October 1994, the government reinstated that program in order to provide funding for cases of national interest regarding equality rights or language rights under the Canadian constitution.

[*English*]

In giving this list I do not think there can be complaints by the opposition as to the undertakings of the government with respect to violence against women. The facts should speak for themselves. Certainly there are other issues to which I can point. These include the question of legal equality, which is the court challenges program I just talked about, and public education.

*Government Orders*

(1055)

In April Canadian heritage, in collaboration with other federal departments and the Canadian Association of Broadcasters, launched a series of radio and television programs and ads in the first of a three-year campaign on violence in society. I want to thank the Canadian Association of Broadcasters for the undertaking. That is \$10 million worth of publicity which we have enabled to happen. It will ensure that violence against women and children, violence in society and violence based on race, prejudice, hatred and bigotry no longer find a home in this country.

I just deposited in the House today a community kit on violence against women. It is to promote community action so that people in their own backyards, leur petit patelins, will take responsibility for auditing what is dangerous in their society and for undertaking collective community action to prevent violence and promote safety.

The community kit on violence against women was tested in 10 locations across the country. The stories tell us what took place, what was helpful, what was not helpful, and how the audit was a positive factor in small towns and regions and in larger cities.

We have published those stories and I think members would find them interesting reading. I advise members of the House to take a good look at this kit, take it back to their towns and villages and enable their constituents to take control of their own lives. We must control the violence that is inherent in our society and make sure that our women and children can walk the streets of our cities safely and can live in safe homes.

Over 2,000 projects have been funded across the country by Health Canada on child abuse, on violence against women and on senior abuse. The family violence initiative is now in its fourth year. It also funds the building of shelters for abused women and their children.

In June I met with my colleagues, the ministers of the status of women across Canada, in Regina. We discussed the whole question of violence against women. We discussed it from the provincial perspective and we discussed it from the federal perspective. We discussed what initiatives we each could take, collectively and collaboratively, to ensure that the lives of women and children were safe. We issued a Regina declaration on the rights of women subjected to violence. It calls on justice systems across this land to ensure the equal protection of women subjected to violence.

In November 1993 we received the Statistics Canada research which was very important. In April of this year Statistics Canada released data from a transition home survey. It revealed there was a 2 per cent increase in the occupancy rate from 1992 to 1993 by women fleeing from abusive situations.

Most women using shelters are aged 25 to 34. These women are in their child bearing years and are subjected to violence by aggressive men even when pregnant. They have children in their homes who are visibly upset and mentally disturbed by what they see, action taken against women as something acceptable within their society. Less than 10 per cent of shelters primarily served ethnocultural and visible minority women, although 41 per cent offered culturally sensitive services.

The Minister of Justice, the Minister of Health and I have conducted public consultations. We held consultations with women's groups on violence as well as on the budget and social security reform. This is a very important and effective means of understanding what is going on in our society.

*[Translation]*

During the first year of our mandate, I think we have given top priority to legislation aimed at better protecting women and children. The protection provided by law is the very foundation of personal and public security.

(1100)

*[English]*

As we move to support the program that has been presented by my colleague, the Minister of Justice, on firearms control, I would suggest that we have an obligation to the women of the country. Women do not like guns. That is a pretty obvious understatement. Women are fearful of guns.

I do not have to argue that the issue of firearms control is one of crucial importance to women. Nationally women have already spoken out. Numerous women's organizations from across the country and from a wide variety of social and cultural backgrounds have come forward to support tougher firearms control laws.

If people want to own firearms then let them own them with responsibility. You have to get a licence and do various other things to own a car. For goodness sake, what is so terrible about doing the same thing to own a gun? We are not taking them away from people. Those people who object to firearms control should not object to having us know that they own a gun. It does not make any sense to have it any other way. Tighter restrictions on firearms are what we want and that is what we are responding to.

I would like to answer the Reform Party which is not very pleased with this. A poll conducted recently by Angus Reid revealed that as many as 70 per cent of all Canadians interviewed favoured tighter restrictions on firearms. Firearm control is also supported by Canadian teachers. In a joint statement two weeks ago the Canadian Teachers Federation and the Centrale de l'enseignement du Québec agreed that a series of measures, including the Minister of Justice's package on firearms control, was necessary to reduce violence in our society.

*Government Orders*

The Minister of Justice has consulted across the land from big cities to small cities to the towns and villages. He has met with all kinds of organizations. He has listened and he has adjusted, understanding the needs and the sport recreational aspects. He also understands what women have to say. Every one of us ought to support his measures.

We have also taken other legal measures. I think of how important the peace bond was in the amendments to the Criminal Code and the sentencing on abuse of trust. How many of us know about incestual relationships that have taken place? How many of us know of friends and children and particularly relatives whom we call on to babysit for us, who do not have a code of ethics and abuse that trust, teachers who have abused the trust, priests who have abused the trust? Abuse of trust and sexual abuse are not acceptable in Canadian society. We are moving on that bill.

We have established the national information system, the court challenges program. Other initiatives to improve the status of women, although not necessarily dealing with violence and abuse against women are equally important. There is the creation of the national breast cancer information exchange program, the establishment of the prenatal nutrition program and our work to help women achieve economic equality.

Economic equality gives women the freedom to move away from an abusive situation. If a woman is trapped with no money she fears leaving. Economic equality in our society tells women that their work is valued, that their contributions to society are honoured and respected. Therefore economic equality will help women care for themselves and their children, give them a sense of worth and a sense of independence, not merely out of the generosity of the heart of her husband, but because she contributes to his growth and development, to his success. She is deserving of a fair share of those earnings if she stays at home and raises children. Raising children in today's society is a value in and of itself.

I was very pleased to chair the task group on the treatment of child support. The government will be coming in shortly with a comprehensive package of guidelines for the courts. It will have an enforcement component and will look at tax treatment. This more comprehensive policy is long overdue.

We must find a way so that not so many children in our country are poor. Children are poor when their mothers are poor. That too is a violence against women. It is a violence against people in our society.

(1105)

I would like to close my remarks by talking for a few moments about the Beijing conference which is coming up. In the international arena Canada is seen as very important and effective in addressing the concerns of women.

The machinery of government that we have set up to advise and counsel ministers on any kind of project, policy or legislation is seen as a very positive factor. The input our staff has made, because staff really equals service, and what we have been able to render in the international arena has been very important. We are not the only nation in the world seeking solutions to these issues. We can be proud of what we have done at the international level. We have played a leadership role in two key areas that I want to point out.

First was the adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of the declaration of the elimination of violence against women last December.

The second was the appointment of a United Nations special rapporteur on violence against women. That was an initiative of Canada as well. The rapporteur will report to the United Nations commission on human rights every year starting in March.

I had the pleasure of meeting the young woman who is filling that responsibility. We can have a sense of confidence that we are going to move forward on the international stage in this area.

In less than a year we will be meeting in Beijing for the fourth United Nations world conference on women. It has an enormous potential to act as a catalyst for change and progress on women's equality worldwide and particularly women's equality in China.

The role of the NGOs, the non-government organizations, has been very key, very different from Mexico and Nairobi. They have had a significant input into the preliminary documents we will be examining at that time. Ten key areas and key issues are of concern. It will look at women's struggles with poverty, with violence, with access to education and health, with access to power and decision making, to name but a few.

We want solutions to those problems right here for all Canadians. We do not have to wait until the UN world conference.

I encourage the women in the House to renew their commitment to women's equality today. I encourage them to speak out. The government intends to fulfil all its red book commitments with respect to the increase in funding for services for battered women. Public education campaigns will be ongoing and will enable behaviour modification with the goodwill and support of the men as partners in society. The options for removal of abusers from the home shall certainly be part and parcel of what we look at.

*[Translation]*

I am very happy to have had the opportunity here today to mention some of the things that make life more difficult for women. I look forward to working with our colleagues from the opposition and indeed with all Canadians, both men and women, who want to improve the lot of women, to prevent the increase in

*Government Orders*

violence against women and to try to educate the public in order to eliminate this problem in our society.

The roses that all the members of the House placed in the hall on behalf of the 14 women indicate that the moment has come to rethink the society in which we live.

[*English*]

Let us remember. I thank all members of the House for the roses which were deposited outside in the hall.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I have several things to say to this government, in response to the motion tabled in the House this morning. I have no doubts about the hon. member's sincerity, and I am sure that, as a woman, she is more than aware of the problem of violence against women.

(1110)

There is no need to repeat the latest statistics ad nauseam. Everyone knows them. Statistics can shock and move us, and for a few moments we are upset. We have a spontaneous urge to say: Something has to be done. What are governments doing about this? It does not happen quite that way in real life. So many times we are filled with anger and sadness as we read in the papers that another woman was slain by her spouse or former spouse.

Most people feel helpless to do anything about this phenomenon, and most people, unfortunately, do not feel directly concerned, and I will get back to this.

The fact remains that violence against women is a social problem and that society elects governments to give leadership and ensure its collective well-being. Politicians are very much aware of their role in this respect. That is why during every election campaign, politicians reflect and analyse and make promises. Of course, no politician would dare promise to deal with violence, once and for all. However, since they are very aware of the public's expectations, they promise action and funding to renew the hopes and obtain the trust of the voters.

As I said at the beginning of my speech, politicians are usually sincere. What happens after election day? Consider the present situation as an example. Since the situation exists here and now, people cannot accuse us of distorting the truth or letting the passage of time colour our perceptions.

The present government was very well intentioned. Like everyone else, it analysed the situation and made promises. It promised to make eliminating violence one of its big priorities. It found ways to do this. It would launch a massive public awareness campaign against violence. It would promote a community-based approach. It would introduce strict gun con-

trols. It would tighten the provisions of the Criminal Code in order to eliminate spousal violence.

All this has a very direct and very specific connection with violence against women. Some progress has been made. The government will say it did not make any direct cuts in funding for shelters for female victims of violence, while other budget items were cut by 5 per cent.

The government will also say it experimented with the use of community kits. On the whole, it will say it is aware of the problems experienced by women who are victims of violence.

However, it has overlooked a number of things. It forgot about all the recommendations of the committees which examined this problem, and met thousands of women and hundreds of agencies that worked with victims of violence. It forgot that they all reached the same conclusion: violence will continue as long as women are not treated as men's equals. That is the real problem. Women are unanimous in this.

This government could take a step towards equality and recognize that women, who are directly concerned after all, are perfectly capable of identifying the source of their problems, the symptoms and the solutions. If this elusive equality is ever to be achieved, the government will have to start by trusting our abilities, at least in this area. Women are adults. To stop being victims, they must be recognized as equal to men and treated as such in every respect and by everyone, governments included. This sounds so simple and so obvious that I am sure many of my male colleagues are thinking: Equality is already a fact, so what are they complaining about? What else do they want?

The answer is just as simple: Women want equality, and the government must help them, which it promised to do but did not.

Equality means equal rights. It means equal social, human and economic rights. Equal social rights means that unemployed women are treated the same as their spouses and not like economic stopgaps who work just to be able to afford a few luxuries like a fur coat every five years. It means a woman has the right to work, study and participate fully in the labour market.

(1115)

Equality will not happen with this government which is preparing to treat working women as second-class citizens who depend on their husbands for a living and for whom the country should not invest its precious resources.

Equality means studying without accumulating a debt for a lifetime, if and when you can get a loan, because it is not so easy for women to borrow. How does this government expect women to be equal if they have to rely on men financially and on their husbands' bank account in order to get a diploma? It seems absurd! But that is exactly what this government is suggesting

*Government Orders*

with its social reform. How on earth does the government intend to promote equality for women.

It is also hard to understand how this government can resort so much to rhetoric on equality and at the same time do so little to make it easier for mothers to have access to the workplace. Adequate day care services often are essential for women entering the labour market or taking occupational training. But what have they done in that area? They promised they would create thousands of new places in day care centres and even included this in the budget.

However, they robbed Peter to pay Paul. They made the creation of day care services conditional on the economic recovery. What a nice way to encourage job creation. What a perfect way to make sure women would stay home or rely on lower quality services for their children. This way, women can be accused of being bad mothers besides.

This government prefers to keep matters pending before the courts and pay their lawyers handsomely instead of paying their employees adequately and enabling them to improve their financial situation and become more self-sufficient.

Despite what women suggested, this government chose not to apply the Employment Equity Act to employees of Parliament, civil servants and employees of its many agencies and commissions and this same government talks about equality.

It is the same government which did not see the need to re-establish a committee which would thoroughly analyze problems experienced by women. How serious is the government about improving the living conditions of women, Madam Speaker? We have committees for everything, but not for promoting the cause of women. Fine proof of the real concerns of this government.

Equality also comes from fiscal justice, an area where the government does not really shine. How can it justify taking Mrs. Thibaudeau's case to the Supreme Court, when the decision brought some to parents, generally women, who receive support payments for their children. While the court was trying to restore some financial equity between the paying parent and the custodial parent, the Minister of Justice rushed to appeal, for fear of upsetting the Department of National Revenue. What a noble concern on the part of this government.

So women are left to fend for themselves. You will tell me that a committee is looking into the matter. Sure, and maybe in the same breath you will tell me that the committee will find solutions. The solutions are obvious to all, but the government spends its time and energy consulting. It is probably easier than taking action. Equality suffers, but who cares. The government's money is being saved and God knows that is the real priority.

Violence can take several forms.

(1120)

It can be physical, and this is the most commonly recognized. It can be psychological, and its consequences are just as severe, sometimes even more so. It could be financial and it could be emotional.

Whatever its form, violence is the result of inequality, whether physical or economical. It is the concrete expression of the perception that one person is worth less than the other, is not as important as the other one, in the eyes of society and the spouse.

To eliminate that perception, a tremendous amount of work must be done, first at the individual level, because that is where concrete results will be measured. However, as I said at the beginning, on the level of society as a whole, we need a government truly concerned about the problem, its consequences and root causes. All this government can do is make nice promises and hold public consultations. I urge it to take concrete action to help women achieve equality with men.

When I say equality, I mean equality across the board—social, personal, legal and financial equality. I mean a government which will take the concrete action needed to make equality between men and women possible and to impose it. Then we will see violence against women diminish some day.

I would like to tell you about an initiative taken in Quebec to mark the terrible tragedy that happened at the École Polytechnique. This initiative is co-sponsored by various communities: the business community, labour, the government, politicians, and associations.

I would like to read the message these Quebec partners signed. It is entitled "Never again".

December 6, 1989 will remain forever engraved in our collective memory. On that day, 14 young women lost their lives at the École Polytechnique in Montreal, gunned down by a murderer who hated women. Five years later, we must turn our minds to the devastated families and their pain, to the sadness and the anger that overcame all of us, men and women alike.

This tragic event shook our entire society. It revealed the truth that women are targets of violence on a daily basis, at work and in the street, in daylight hours as well as at night, in times of peace or war, regardless of the region or country in which they live.

Through the efforts of individuals, groups, and public or government organizations, various measures have been taken to identify and oppose violence against women. But we all know that it persists.

Each of us must be vigilant and condemn all forms of violence against women. We must commit ourselves collectively to building a non-violent world. December 6, 1989 must never return. NEVER AGAIN.

Today we remember— in order to change.

This message appeared in several Quebec dailies; 76 associations and agencies, including the council on the status of women got together to commemorate, in a very special way, that tragic day when 14 young women lost their lives.

*Government Orders*

I would like to list the names of all the signatories to this beautiful message: Assembly of Quebec bishops; Association des collaboratrices et partenaires en affaires; association of Quebec native women; Quebec psychiatric association; Association des ressources intervenant auprès des hommes violents; Association des sexologues du Québec; women's association for education and social action; Association québécoise Plaidoyer-victimes; Avon Canada; Quebec bar association; Quebec teaching congress; congress of democratic unions; centre for interdisciplinary research on family violence and violence against women; Chambre des notaires du Québec; college of Quebec physicians; human rights commission; confederation of national trade unions; Quebec conference of regional health and social services boards.

Madam Speaker, the list goes on: Montreal council of women; council on the status of women; Développement québécois de la sécurité des femmes; Fédération des ressources d'hébergement pour les femmes violentées et en difficulté; Quebec federation of CLSCs; Quebec federation of catholic school commissions; Quebec women's federation; federation of Quebec nurses; Quebec federation of labour; Quebec family planning federation; Groupe d'aide et d'information sur le harcèlement sexuel au travail dans la province du Québec; *Le Devoir*; *Le Journal de Montréal*; *Le Protecteur du citoyen*.

(1125)

And there are others: Quebec says no to violence against women: Les cercles de fermières du Québec; Institut de recherche des centres de femmes du Québec; order of nurses of Quebec; Ordre des psychologues du Québec; Ordre professionnel des travailleurs sociaux du Québec; Regroupement des centres de santé des femmes du Québec; Regroupement des équipes régionales Espace; Regroupement des maisons de jeunes du Québec; Regroupement provincial des maisons d'hébergement et de transition pour femmes victimes de violence conjugale; Regroupement québécois des centres d'aides et de lutte contre les agressions à caractère sexuel; Relais-femmes; Réseau des répondants à la condition des femmes, ODM, diocese of Quebec; Service d'orientation et de consultation psychologique de l'Université de Montréal; Sûreté du Québec; Quebec government employees union.

And the list goes on: the union of professional employees of the Quebec government; *The Gazette*; the University of Montreal; the University of Sherbrooke; the University of Quebec in Montreal; Laval University; McGill University; Jacques Parizeau, Premier of Quebec; Lucien Bouchard and all members of the Bloc Québécois; Louise Beaudoin, Minister responsible for

Canadian Intergovernmental Affairs; Paul Bégin, Minister of Justice; Jeanne Blackburn, Minister of Income Security and Minister responsible for the Status of Women; Jacques Brassard, Minister of the Environment and Wildlife; Jean Campeau, Minister of Finance and Minister of Revenue; Guy Chevrette, Minister of Municipal Affairs; Rita Dionne-Marsolais, Minister of Culture and Communications and Minister responsible for Tourism; Jean Garon, Minister of Education.

And also: François Gendron, Minister of Natural Resources; Louise Harel, Minister of Employment; Bernard Landry, Minister of International Affairs, Immigration and Cultural Communities; Marcel Landry, Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food; Richard Le Hir, Minister responsible for Restructuring; Jacques Léonard, Minister of Transport; Pauline Marois, Minister responsible for Administration and Public Service, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for the Family; Serge Ménard, Minister of Public Security; Daniel Paillé, Minister of Industry, Trade, Science and Technology; and Jean Rochon, Minister of Health and Social Services.

That, Madam Speaker, is the list of all the people who endorsed the statement marking this sad anniversary.

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** We are now into 20-minute speeches with 10 minutes for questions and comments at the end.

**Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, as I enter the discussion regarding violence against members of society, particularly women, I begin by pointing out how human life seems to have been devalued in our society. When I look at the changes of attitude that have occurred in this regard, I look at such things as abortion, euthanasia and mercy killings. I see a greater and greater acceptance of these measures which suggests an insensitivity toward human life that has led to a devaluation of human life.

Today marks an anniversary I am sure most Canadians wish did not exist. However, not to remember invalidates the lives that were lost as a result of a violent and vicious attack perpetrated because one male took out his fear, hate and frustration on a group of innocent young defenceless women.

The cause of this crime is at the heart of the debate on violence against women and other members of our society. Why are men attacking women? Why are husbands beating wives? Why is violence against women occurring at such a high rate, certainly a higher rate than before.

These are the questions we must attempt to answer if we are ever to eradicate or at least reduce violence.

*Government Orders*

(1130)

Until we can answer these questions and until we can determine the causes of violence, we will continue to have a problem in this country which defies logic and a problem which threatens to destroy the strongest foundation we have, the family.

From 1981 to 1990 almost one half, or 48 per cent, of the women killed were killed by spouses or ex-spouses. A further 27 per cent were killed by acquaintances. Over the past 10 years 67 per cent of the homicides involving women occurred in the victims' homes. Spousal homicides amount to one out of every six solved homicides. According to statistics, over the period 1974 to 1992 a married woman was nine times as likely to be killed by her spouse as by a stranger. The rates of spousal homicide have remained fairly constant over a 19-year period.

These statistics reveal a shocking situation. Repeatedly governments in this country have neglected to address the issue which is the cause of crime. They have failed to determine, understand and do something about the causes of domestic violence. Harsher penalties, stricter gun controls and statistics gathering have done nothing to eliminate the rate of spousal homicide in this country, nothing to decrease the growing violence on Canadian streets and nothing to eradicate violence against women.

Fifty-two per cent of the spousal homicides in 1991-92 were attributed by the police to an argument or quarrel and a further 24 per cent to jealousy. What the statistics and police failed to reveal is what the argument or quarrel was about, why it occurred in the first place. I believe that finances and financial stress are at the heart of most domestic difficulties and arguments. Canadian families are under tremendous stress these days, stresses that are directly imposed on them by the economic state of this country and indirectly imposed on them by the fiscal and monetary mismanagement of this and previous governments.

With an unemployment rate of 10.8 per cent, which I understand has dropped recently to below 10 per cent, many Canadians are without a job and for those who do have a job, the volatility and uncertainty of the current job market means that no one has job security.

Years ago men and women could count on their job always being there. Job security is a thing of the past. We have not helped Canadians adapt to that situation. We have not helped Canadians adapt to many of the economic and social situations that have been rapidly destroying their way of life.

While banks reveal record profits, many Canadians are declaring personal and business bankruptcy because their debt load has become unmanageable given the relatively high interest and tax rates in this country.

We witness every day the impact financial stress is having on Canadian families. In 1991-92 statistics show that alcohol was involved in 37 per cent of slain wives and 82 per cent of slain husbands. Among perpetrators, 55 per cent of men and 79 per cent of women were noted to have consumed alcohol and 18 per cent of men and 13 per cent of women had used drugs.

I pause here to emphasize that we do not address the cause of the problems. So often we are told not only in ads in newspapers but on television to ensure that when you are drinking that you have a designated driver so that you can get plastered if you want. The only concern those ad makers and those who are paying for them have is simply to ensure that a person is not impaired as he drives home. No care or concern is given to the family situation when that drunk is dropped off at his home where he may go in and abuse his wife or his children. There is no indication that there is any interest in reducing the consumption of alcohol in this country which police and statistics indicate clearly is a direct contributing factor to crime and violence in this country.

According to statistics, alcohol was consumed by both parties in 41 per cent of wife victim cases and in 78 per cent of husband victim cases.

(1135)

Alcohol abuse is induced by stress. We do nothing to help the alcoholic or solve his problem if we do not determine the cause of that stress.

Why are Canadians assaulting and killing one another? That is the question which must be answered if we ever hope to reduce violence in our society. This is true whether we are dealing with young offenders, wife beaters, child molesters or murderers.

Governments in co-operation with community and service organizations, churches, schools and Canadian families must find the answer to these questions. It is a monumental task but it is a task we must undertake because our traditional response to the problem of violence is not working.

In response to public appeals for preventive action the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General unanimously agreed on May 6, 1992, exactly five months after the Tories' gun legislation, Bill C-17, received royal assent, to commence a national study of crime prevention. The committee concluded:

Traditional criminal justice responses while necessary are insufficient deterrents to acts that threaten public safety and security and the conventional crime control model fails to address the underlying factors associated with crime and criminality.

In other words the committee found that the gun control legislation, sentencing, additional police officers and law enforcement agencies, more prisons and an increasingly negative bureaucratic answer do not and will not solve the growing problem of crime within this country.

*Government Orders*

Presented to the committee were studies conducted in England, Canada and the United States. In relation to young offenders, these studies revealed that a minority of male offenders are responsible for the majority of all crimes committed.

The president of the Quebec Association of Police and the director of the Hull police force described to the committee research findings showing that 80 per cent of crimes are committed by approximately 20 per cent of the offenders.

Self reports and arrest records of offenders who have long criminal histories revealed to the committee that offending began when they were very young, that their offending became progressively more violent and that a significant proportion of persistent young offenders become the adult offenders of the future.

A criminology professor with the University of Ottawa told the committee that about 75 per cent to 80 per cent of incarcerated adults were persistent offenders in their youth. The committee heard that the level of crime in a society cannot be separated from the social, economic and political milieu in which it occurs. Social science research has identified many interrelated factors in the social environment of persistent offenders that contribute to crime.

Although the committee made a number of recommendations regarding crime prevention to the previous government based on its findings, the previous government did not introduce or even propose measures that demonstrated it was taking a leadership role in crime prevention.

We have a new government but the same approach to crime. We seem to be satisfied to deal with the symptoms of crime rather than to get at the cause of crime. Until the government of the day can identify the cause of crime, until it can identify the reasons for domestic violence and violence against women, we will continue to have this problem.

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I congratulate the secretary of state for her excellent presentation on a very important matter to all members who are going to speak on this very important subject.

I have one quick example to share with members about domestic violence. I spent about five years serving as a board member of the shelter for battered women in my riding of Mississauga South. It is called Interim Place. I am very pleased that Interim Place was able to arrange for additional funding and arrange for a second shelter to be built.

Members would be interested to know that in one month alone while I was on the board 80 women were turned away from our shelter because there were no beds left. There was no place for them to go with their children. That gives some idea of the magnitude of the problem we have in Canada. As the minister

has stated, one half of all women will experience domestic violence in their lives.

(1140)

I ask the member whether he would agree that because of the seriousness of the issue of domestic violence and the fact that there is presently a bill before this House, Bill C-41, which tries to identify aggravating circumstances of bias, prejudice or hate, that the matter of domestic violence or spousal abuse be included as a matter which would demonstrate bias, prejudice and hate and warrant a more serious sentence than the simple offence that was committed.

**Mr. Ramsay:** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. I think it is important. When we deal with penalties for offences committed, I think that if the state wishes to stiffen penalties we can do that, but we all ought to stand equal before the law. The courts and judges ought to be left with the discretion based upon the circumstances to decide whether a more severe penalty should be imposed upon the culprit who through motivation of hatred or bias commits an offence against another.

I enforced the law for 14 years and I never saw an assault upon another person motivated by anything but anger, hatred or bias. I have never seen an assault conducted by a positive emotion of love or compassion. I have never experienced that. I have never taken anyone into court on that basis, and I have taken hundreds of people into courts for other types of offences during my service.

When I consider the hon. member's question and I look at Bill C-41, I ask myself why is it that we cannot leave this matter to the courts. Yes, enhance the penalties, make them stiffer. Surely when the court feels that mitigating circumstances indicate a more serious penalty ought to be levied, the court should have the discretion to do so.

**Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (Secretary of State (Training and Youth), Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased and honoured to join in the debate this morning that this House take note of the anniversary of the murder of 14 women at l'École polytechnique on December 6, 1989, and the continuing urgent need for action to eliminate the threat of violence in society, including the threat of violence against women.

I find this debate particularly important because a year ago today I went to a memorial in Montreal. I spoke at the memorial for the 14 women. It is an experience that has left me with a commitment to society, a personal commitment to see that human beings show respect and dignity to one another that is deserved, a love, caring and commitment to work hard with all people in society.

We must work with men, women, families and communities, different levels of government, all the institutions in our country and with our children, toward a violence free society. It is a very



*Government Orders*

difficult thing to do in this day and age when the world is seized with wars.

(1145)

We have mass media with pervasive influence that shows violence and there is desensitization about the effect of it. We have an onerous task not just to make laws but to make it a state of mind. We have a commitment to deal with it in a very human way. It is not just an issue on one day of the year; it is a state of mind. It is the way we live. It is the way we relate to each other. It is the state of mind with which we approach the work we do as lawmakers, as legislators.

Recently I was unable to attend a conference in Vancouver and one of my female colleagues from the area replaced me as there were things that needed to be said that I felt very strongly about. These are some of the things that were said: "Our voices need to be added to the urgent debate about the challenges facing Canada's families. Violence is not an issue of one person or of one gender. It is an issue of humanity and it is an issue of all peoples".

I am especially pleased to speak to the vision of Canadian families living violence free. I am proud to be a member of a team that dares to dream, one that has faith in our capacity as individuals and as a nation. Our dream for the country was clearly described in our document "Creating Opportunity". It is based on the belief that each of us can be part of the solution.

I am particularly proud of my colleagues, the Minister of Justice and the Secretary of State for the Status of Women. It is not easy to seize particular issues that would help free society of those who would perpetrate violent acts and those who would take the opportunity not to do good. To roll that into a legislative agenda, to roll that into something that is accessible, fair and universal in approach, is very difficult.

I look at the different attempts by the minister to change the Criminal Code and to deal with a number of very contentious issues, controversial issues, such as gun control legislation. A very difficult agenda is set for these individuals. I appreciate the work they have done.

We are committed to changing the future and recreating Canada in a way that works better for all of us. We believe we can build a better country through stronger children and stronger families. People tend to focus on one issue or one aspect. Segmentation or compartmentalization of issues makes it easier, more manageable, but is not realistic.

We cannot separate the child and say the child is unaffected. We cannot say the spouse, the family, the grandmother or the community is unaffected when there is violence in a family or in a community. It does not work that way. It is pervasive. The power of things that go wrong, the negative things, is very

influential on people, many of whom are young children in their formative years.

We are committed. Our vision stems from the simple but profound philosophy that everyone has the right to safe homes, safe streets, and a life free of violence. No one deserves to be abused physically, sexually, emotionally or financially. No one has the right to control another person by threat, coercion, physical intimidation or any other abuse of power and control. Child abuse and neglect, child sexual abuse, wife assault, spousal assault, other forms of violence against women and other people, and the mistreatment of seniors and persons with disabilities are serious abuses of power within families and relationships of trust and dependency with detrimental consequences for all of us. They shame us as individuals and as a society. Those are the people who depend on us the most. They have greater need and less capacity to care for themselves. They are the disabled, children and seniors. Those people do not deserve to be mistreated. They do not deserve to be treated with anything but kindness and generosity.

(1150)

The costs of violence and personal suffering, social breakdown and direct government expenditure are incalculable. The hundreds of millions of dollars in social spending do not begin to pay the price of broken spirits and damaged lives, in some cases irretrievably damaged. Sometimes it starts a cycle that continues from one generation to another. It takes an enormous amount of effort to break that cycle or the silence. To correct those wrongs costs a lot more money and takes a lot more effort than if we are proactive and able to take preventive measures. We are paid back enormously for taking those steps.

The complexity of family violence requires a long term, co-ordinated approach to address the root causes. We must eradicate the conditions that contribute to family violence and provide the proper environment for young people to escape the vicious cycle associated with abuse.

Only when each and every Canadian lives without fear can we say we live in a violence free society. An important part of the solution is to influence the conditions of socioeconomic inequality that reduce vulnerability to family violence. It is not an excuse; it is a condition. Violence is inexcusable but there are mitigating factors. There are things beyond control, beyond the emotional, financial and social capacities of individuals who fall victim to becoming perpetrators.

We need to address sexism, ageism, ableism, racism and other isms. We need to assure adequate access for all to appropriate services before we can hope to make Canada a safer place. The federal government recognizes the need to treat these issues as fundamental social problems with widespread ramifications for our families, indeed our entire society.

*Government Orders*

I am particularly worried about young people as the Secretary of State for Training and Youth. We give our children an enormous gift when we teach them to care and to nurture properly, when we teach them to respect the dignity of other persons, when we teach them to treasure having children, having grandchildren and belonging to a family. They are not to be neglected or abused. They are to be cared for and to be taught. Good values and principles that presumably guide what we do, even in the House, should be passed on.

Each year the federal government directs millions of dollars to Canadian children and their families to ensure they have access to the necessary conditions required for optimal health and personal growth and development.

We have introduced a variety of preventive measures including the child development initiative, the child sexual abuse and family violence prevention initiatives, and building healthy aboriginal communities aimed specifically at providing protection for children and creating safer communities through social development and social investment.

A central consideration in these reforms is the security of children and their families. We are asking what people need in the form of rehabilitation and family support services, education, skills upgrading and training to take control of their lives. How can we help families succeed?

If we empower people with adequate means and opportunity, we are convinced that we will enable them to access education and employment opportunities that lead to healthy, rewarding, self-sufficient lives. As a result it will allow people to provide a better quality of life for their families.

In a perfect world that would be enough but life is more complicated than that. There are things beyond the control of lawmakers. There are things beyond the control of governments at all levels. There are things beyond the control of people of goodwill. These are the things we expect. However they do not stop us from working, continuing to push and believing there is a better tomorrow. We have to try harder for our families, for our children, and essentially for our community and our country.

(1155)

When children thrive our society is renewed. By nurturing healthy youth, ensuring they are physically, mentally and emotionally well, educated and employed, we run the best chance of creating healthy families.

I guess we are successful in many people's eyes. We have jobs we are proud of and have managed to earn a living. We are honoured to represent the people. In the end society will not judge us on how well we do but on how well our children and our grandchildren do and what we contribute to our communities. How well our children and grandchildren do will be the signifi-

cant judgment of us in terms of what we have contributed to society.

These efforts reflect a growing movement not only in favour of prevention but in support of fundamental, social, economic and cultural change. It is a movement toward investing in people. We have a lot to do but we have each other to do it. Canadians working together, dedicated to building healthier communities, are making a dramatic difference. Not only are we proving that families matter. We are demonstrating we can make improvements in people's lives by refusing to tolerate societal violence.

Let us talk about various forms of violence. Let us take a look at a 10-year old or 14-year old child. I have raised three children. I know what children of those ages are like. We wonder where the children are and whether we have hugged them today. All that comes to mind.

Let us take one city in our country which I will not name because it would not be fair. There is a problem in that city; it has 400 juvenile prostitutes between the ages of 10 and 14. That is not prostitution, that is juvenile or child sex abuse. It is a real problem. It is a form of violence that has been perpetrated upon our most helpless, our most treasured, our young people.

We have a responsibility. It is not only in one city. There is a problem in every city one could name. I make it my business to go to the source to see young people. We cannot do everything but we are doing some things right when we help those young people.

It cannot be done alone. It is not a woman's problem or a child's problem. It is everybody's problem and everybody's responsibility. As a caring and just society we have no option but to make families our priority. We owe it to our children and to ourselves. If the challenges are great, the promise of progress has never been better.

In 1994, the International Year of the Family, families have assumed their place on international and national agendas. Throughout the International Year of the Family the Government of Canada, in partnership with all sectors of society, has worked for the betterment of Canadian families. These partnerships have contributed to sensitizing Canadians to numerous and complex issues facing today's families such as family violence.

Most important, we must reinforce the principle that strong and healthy families create strong, healthy and productive societies. By building on this momentum we will recreate Canada together in a way that mirrors our dreams and hopes for ourselves and will achieve our visions for our children and our future.

It is interesting to note that in my riding of the Northwest Territories there are four women's shelters.

*Government Orders*

(1200)

This coming weekend one of my tours of going to the source as I put it will be to Sutherland House which is a shelter for women. Oddly enough it is communities that care that establish these shelters. They try to help themselves by helping the victims, by helping the families and the children. Whether or not we like to admit it most of them are women and children. They are the primary victims who take refuge. They are the ones who have to leave their homes, their living rooms, their beds to seek shelter elsewhere.

Shelters have a 24-hour crisis line and apparently that is not enough. I have visited other shelters in communities such as Hay River. All these people have their own stories to tell but the big one is that we need to continue to work. We need to continue not to isolate people nor to blame or to point fingers. We need to join hands and work together. If we cannot stop these people who perpetrate violence, we can take measures that will help the people caught in those unhealthy relationships take the steps to get out, to make the commitment for a better life for a better tomorrow.

Thirty-nine per cent of all women in violent marriages have reported that their children witnessed the violence against them. This is interesting because shelter workers in my riding believe that at least one in four NWT women have been abused by their partners. The NWT rate of reported sexual assault is the highest in the country. Girls 7 to 18 years old were the complainants in 54 per cent of sexual assault cases in the Northwest Territories for 1988 and 1989.

In Canada women are assaulted an average of 35 times before the police are called to assist. In Canada one in three women will be sexually assaulted by a man at home at some time in her life. Twenty-nine per cent of all women in Canada who have been married or who have lived in a common-law relationship have experienced physical or sexual violence at the hands of their partner. In Canada 90 per cent of sexual assault crimes are not reported to the police.

According to the 1991 census there were 27,595 women in the Northwest Territories and 47.4 per cent of the population was over 15 years old. Forty per cent of all aboriginal peoples identified family violence as an important problem in their community. People on reserve and Inuit identify these forms of violence more than those who live off reserve and Métis. That is from the Canadian Institute of Child Health. It goes without saying that we definitely have a real problem but more than that we have to work on our commitment.

We have to remember that we have a commitment to our children, to societies and to ourselves. Each and every one of us whether we are men or women have a commitment to the kind of work we want to see out there. We want to see results. We have a commitment to our communities and to our country. In remembering those 14 women we can build something positive from this.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest to my colleague, the Secretary of State for Training and Youth, and my friend, the member for Chambly, who is sitting behind me, said that sometimes the governing party's right hand does not know what its left hand is doing.

Violence against women will never stop unless and until we have complete and total equality. The Canadian government must start by setting an example. Complete and total equality begins in the cradle, of course, at school, in day care, in college, in university and finally reaches the work place.

(1205)

When the government here can say that it pays its staff the same regardless of sex, we will say thanks. It will be a step in the right direction when our children will be completely safe everywhere.

For example, in Sherbrooke, in my region, there were three rapes in six weeks. My daughter, who is studying police science in college, was walking in the vulnerable area with a female friend. They were stopped by the police, who told them not to walk there. They asked why. He said that as good-looking girls, they were in danger of being raped.

You see, because they were girls, they were not allowed to walk on the sidewalk in a part of the city. That is equality.

Another girl told me that she was also walking, alone, it is true, and was harassed by two people in a car. She had time to take down the licence number. A few seconds later, a policeman passed. She signaled him and gave him the message. He told her: "You should not be walking here. It is a bad area. You are in the red-light district. Go and walk somewhere else." That is the kind of freedom we offer our women and girls.

The Secretary of State for Training and Youth said that she had raised three children. I too have three children, including two girls. I would not be proud if my two daughters were not able to find as good a job as my son, because of unequal treatment. I would not be proud of the government of my country, be it Quebec or Canada, where my children would not have access to equality.

Earlier, when the hon. member for Chambly alluded to double talk, I was reminded of the famous but tragic Thibaudeau case. Who is appealing Ms. Thibaudeau's case to the Supreme Court? The government opposite.

The social program reform will primarily hit spouses, because from now on the family income, that is the salaries of both spouses, will be taken into account. Double talk indeed. I cannot

*Government Orders*

wait to see a government which will not resort to this double talk, a government which will act and act swiftly.

Here is the best example. Today marks the fifth anniversary of the tragedy at the École polytechnique, where 14 young women were killed in cold blood. The government started talking about firearms control. Some statement was made last week in the House, but things will drag on until 2002 or 2003 before the issue is settled. Tragedies such as the one which occurred at the École polytechnique could be repeated several times before tight and strict legislation is in place.

I was told last week that in some Montreal clubs, bars or taverns, it is easy to get very dangerous offensive weapons for a few thousand dollars. It is as easy to buy a firearm as a good used car.

(1210)

I would like to hear the Secretary of State for Training and Youth, because she sounded really sincere earlier. I want to ask her if she is ready to stick her neck out by asking her government and cabinet to stop using this double talk once and for all and to do everything it can to ensure that women of all ages can truly enjoy gender equality.

[*English*]

**Ms. Blondin—Andrew:** Madam Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for my hon. colleague across the way to make the unreasonable demand of asking me to put my seat in the House on the line. There are other ways to deal with some of the serious issues he has brought forward.

Gender equality is not one that escapes me. I have been a working woman all of my life. I know the trials and tribulations of essentially what used to be working in a man's world. In a sense we are graced with the presence of many good working women in this House at many different levels and in many capacities.

Let me deal with some of the issues my hon. colleague has addressed. He talked about putting my seat in this House on the line for the equality of women and to bridge the pay gap between men and women and that sort of thing. It should be noted that we have taken great steps to have a more inclusive employment equity legislation put forward. We are working on it at this very time. He will be happy to know that it is mostly women who do a lot of the work on this legislation. It is not just for women, but for the disabled, visible minorities as well as aboriginal peoples who are also equally challenged.

The member talks about the full security of children being able to live above the poverty line. With social security reform it is becoming very evident that child poverty is one issue we are very seized with, but we cannot just wave the wand and expect all the problems to go away. It will become evident as will all of

these proposals as the responses come back that child poverty is one of the concerns we share with my hon. colleague.

The other case he cited was a typical one. There is a process in place but I will not speak to it because it has already been advanced to a higher level. The member talks about the issue of income testing. The hon. member knows there is a process in place with regard to social security reform. The proposals are with the committee which is going across the country listening to people. People have expressed very loudly and clearly similar concerns about income testing. All those things will be ultimately considered.

A man sitting across the way should not ask a women to put her seat in this House on the line if he really believes in gender equality.

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I would like to say it gives me great pleasure to stand and speak before the House on this issue, however I feel that the fifth anniversary of a tragic event is not really a time for celebration but one for reflection. It is the fifth anniversary of the massacre at l'École polytechnique in Montreal. I think all Canadians feel a sense of horror that anything such as that should ever happen in our country.

It was a tragedy when 14 young women were slain simply because they were female. I do not think there is anybody who does not feel the sense of outrage that gender should have been a factor in why anyone, male or female, would decide to end the lives of 14 young women.

In my one year as a member of Parliament I have met with dozens of parents whose children were slain. Children were slain because their murderers did not like the way they were wearing their hats. Children were slain because the murderer was intoxicated. Children were slain because they were walking down a busy street in the middle of the afternoon and just happened to run into the wrong person.

(1215)

Parents are unanimous that the justice system must be changed. They want to know how it can be called a justice system when it calls for Robert Latimer to receive a life sentence with no hope of parole for at least 10 years for killing his disabled daughter in what some perceive to be an act of mercy.

Compare that with a man named Glenn Williams from my constituency who murdered his wife, the mother of four young children, the youngest six months old and still nursing. This man not only murdered his wife, but proceeded to clean up the house, clean up the murder scene, clean up the body of his wife, put her back into bed and call attention to the fact six hours later.

The murder scene gave no indication of what really took place. All that we have is the version given by the murderer, by Mr. Glenn Williams. While he was originally charged with

*Government Orders*

second degree murder, he was instead convicted of manslaughter. He received a five-year sentence.

The law says that Robert Latimer will serve a minimum of 10 years for his crime. The same law says that Glenn Williams will only have to serve 20 months. The system itself is flawed. For the last 20 years society has put the emphasis on the rights of the offender rather than the protection of society. This has to change.

The number one priority of the criminal justice system has to be the protection of society. We will never eliminate all the violent crime from our communities, from our society. Crimes of passion, fits of anger will always exist. Unfortunately a lot of crimes are committed by people who choose to abuse substances. That will always be with us unless we are willing to deal with the situation.

People are extremely upset when crimes are committed by previous offenders. How many opportunities must an individual get to continually violate, abuse and commit violent crimes against another person? How many people should an individual be allowed to hurt?

At the Reform Party's last assembly we passed a resolution that would call for criminals who have committed their second serious personal injury offence to be automatically designated as dangerous offenders. That means these people would be subjected to indefinite sentences. If the parole board believes these people are still dangerous they would continue to be incarcerated. If they are perceived to be a minimum risk or a good risk for parole, they could be paroled and let free. They would always be subject to some kind of supervision for the rest of their lives, considering what risk they pose to society.

Right away members from the Bloc will probably call such a measure draconian. The fact remains that a recent poll by Léger and Léger showed that 76 per cent of Quebecers agreed with this position. Only 16 per cent were opposed. I am confident that if a poll were taken across the country we would see similar results. Most Canadians agree that serious offences by dangerous offenders should be considered in that manner.

Canadians are sick and tired of criminals being allowed to commit serious crimes over and over again. Take the case of Wray Budreo. This man has over 35 convictions for sexual offences against children over a 30-year period. For his last conviction he received six years. Only a public outcry prevented him from receiving a statutory release and he was required to serve the entire sentence. The day his sentence expired people were outside the prison gates protesting his release, with just cause I would suggest. The law said that he had to be released even though many considered him still to be dangerous and a risk to society. When it was learned that he was residing in Peterborough many of the residents were concerned about his presence until he moved to Toronto.

(1220)

Mr. Budreo was upset with the attention he was receiving. He says he is not a threat and that he just wants to get on with his life. I hope Mr. Budreo knows himself well enough to be making that kind of assurance to society. I hope that he never commits another criminal offence. I hope no other child becomes one of his victims. But the odds are not in his favour.

Paedophiles like Ray Budreo cannot be cured. At the very best they can only be controlled. But because of our justice system we cannot even see that Budreo is being controlled. The justice system says there is nothing it can do to protect society, to protect other children from becoming his victims. It infuriates Canadians to hear that their justice system cannot do anything to protect them from this kind of violent offender.

There is something that we as parliamentarians can do and that is to enact legislation that is necessary to protect society. Some legislation may infringe on the rights of criminals but incarceration in itself can be considered an infringement on the rights of criminals. We cannot abrogate our responsibilities as lawmakers just because we fear court challenges. The people of Canada have entrusted us to enact the necessary legislation to protect them. I would suggest that we have an obligation to Canadians to do just that.

This thought, this concern, was reiterated by Justice George Finlayson of the Ontario Court of Appeal this past Friday. In commenting on the appeal of Keith Léger, the justice made the following comment: "If society wants paedophiles more tightly controlled then it is up to the Government of Canada to legislate—but certainly not up to the court to stretch existing laws to the maximum". I think with Léger that is what this trial judge did. That is where we are at. It is up to us to make the laws.

When the justice minister introduced his gun control package last week he said that his package has the support of the majority of Canadians. I am pleased to see that the minister acknowledges the importance of the feelings of Canadians. I would like to take it for granted that the minister will soon be introducing a bill that would reintroduce capital punishment. After all a majority of Canadians favour the reintroduction of capital punishment into our justice system.

Unfortunately it would appear that is unlikely to occur. I would like to suggest to the Minister of Justice that he cannot have it both ways. If he wishes to invoke the spirit of public support with some legislation then he should be doing it with all legislation. If his gun control package is good legislation because he has the support of a majority of Canadians then reintroduction of capital punishment would be an equally good measure because it definitely has the support of the majority of Canadians.

*Government Orders*

This is a deciding factor in distinguishing the difference between the two parties. For the Reform Party the will of the majority of Canadians has priority whether it conforms with party policy or not. With the Liberal Party public support is only relevant to those issues where the majority of Canadians happen to agree with it.

Let us not make any mistake here. The public are demanding that tougher laws be enacted in our criminal justice system. Right now the justice committee is considering Bill C-37 which deals with amendments to the Young Offenders Act. Nothing seems to stir up citizens more than seeing young offenders being dealt with with kid gloves after they have committed serious and violent criminal offences. If we condone or minimize the violent acts of our young people against others how can we stand in the House denouncing violence against women? It is one thing to bring in the reverse onus clause for 16 and 17 year olds but Canadians believe they should be treated as adults, particularly when they commit serious violent offences against others.

(1225)

In my spring householder I asked the following question: "Should the age limit in the Young Offenders Act be lowered from the current 12 to 17 year olds to cover only 10 to 15 year olds?" With almost 3,500 answers the response was 91 per cent in favour. Ninety-one per cent of my constituents thought that the age limit in the Young Offenders Act should be lowered. I am sure that if the Liberals asked the same questions in their householders they would get similar responses.

Does public opinion still matter to the government, or will it try and evoke that parochial attitude that "it knows better"? How can it use one tragic, heinous crime five years ago to justify an attack against all men as being violent against women in general? Canadians are demanding protection from all violent crimes; against men, against women and against children.

In the face of this concern experts keep telling us that violent crime is not really increasing. They point to a number of surveys to justify their claim. I do not feel like getting into a statistical war but I would like to present one statistic. According to Statistics Canada, in 1971 there were 204 crimes of violence for 100,000 persons; in 1991, just 20 years later, that rate had jumped to 1,099 crimes of violence for 100,000 persons. That is a 500 per cent increase in violent crimes in the last 20 years. That is what Canadians are concerned about.

Twenty years ago parents had no problem with young children playing with their friends outside. Today young children usually play under parental supervision. Twenty years ago high school students did not have any fears walking to school. Today young people are encouraged to walk in pairs or in groups, not just girls but also the boys.

The danger of walking alone really hit home in my community on October 4 of this year. Sixteen year old Pamela Cameron, a young girl who had just moved to our community, had just left school, had coffee and muffins with some friends of hers at a muffin shop and was walking along the busiest street in our community in the middle of the afternoon to visit her boyfriend. She did not make it.

Two blocks from my constituency office at four o'clock in the afternoon, Pamela Cameron was murdered. She was pulled off the busiest road in my community into some bushes and brutally murdered.

For the next week or so while the murderer was still at large, the community was in absolute distress. There was such fear in my community that parents would no longer let their children walk to school by themselves. They were driving their kids to school. They were driving their kids to their jobs. They were not allowing their daughters and their sons out of the house.

Ten days later when the individual gave himself up to authorities and was charged with the murder, there was a tremendous relief in our community. Finally they could finally feel a little more comfortable. Then the sense of relief over the tension of the capture of the accused turned to anger when they found out that this accused had a criminal record and was considered to be a violent and dangerous offender when he was released from prison.

To the credit of my constituents they turned that anger into something very positive. They formed community groups that would be available to search for missing youngsters immediately. They began a campaign to support my private member's bill which deals with being allowed to keep dangerous offenders in detention after the expiration of their warrant. In one day at a local shopping mall they were able to collect 1,000 letters each addressed to the Solicitor General and to the Minister of Justice. They were able to come up with a petition with 6,700 names. In Milton, Ontario, where the young girl came from her older sister collected over 10,000 names on a similar petition, a community showing its support for a private member's bill that talked about dealing with dangerous offenders in a very serious way.

(1230)

Something quite miraculous happened last week. Despite the fact that all members of the Liberal Party and the Bloc who spoke in debate were against the bill, last Thursday that bill miraculously passed second reading unanimously. I am not sure what happened but I would like to think it was the indication of the public that they were extremely concerned about violence in our society and they wanted this House to pass legislation to deal with the problem and to put the protection of society above and beyond the rights of the accused.

*Government Orders*

On this fifth anniversary of the massacre at l'École polytechnique we must pay special attention to violence against women. We as a society must clearly send a signal that domestic violence against women and children will not be tolerated any more than violence against strangers. Whether the violence originates with a spouse, another relative, a friend, a coworker, a boss or even a stranger it is a concern we have to deal with. Evolution has given males a physical strength, a superiority over females but our laws are supposed to level out the playing field.

Unfortunately for many years the law has been complacent with some forms of violence against women, especially spousal abuse. Even today while society publicly condemns the act, that the victim was the offender's partner appears to be a mitigating factor in these crimes.

We cannot continue to excuse violence against women or children. We must continue to address this problem. Whether it is through education, community intervention, treatment, or criminal sanction we have to repeat the message that violence is not an acceptable means of expression. It is not acceptable to abuse our spouses, our children or for that matter any other human being.

As the mother of four boys I find it difficult sometimes to encourage young boys who are rough and aggressive by nature to realize there are limits to that aggression. As parents it is our responsibility not only with our young boys but also with our young girls to get them to express their feelings of frustration and anger in non-violent ways.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak in this debate. I do hope we see a decided change in violence against all persons in our society over the next 20 years.

**Mr. Jim Jordan (Leeds—Grenville, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague on her fine speech and a lot of interesting statistics. I have no problem with a good deal of what she has related. The hon. member mentioned several sources of her material, some of the research that has been done and the sources of those. That is always worthwhile.

I would like to know which study determined that the majority of Canadians are now interested in returning to capital punishment. It seemed to me that was mentioned in the hon. member's speech and I am not questioning the validity of it. Perhaps she did not mention the source of that study. I would be interested in knowing what the source is and in asking for that I am not for a minute questioning the member's integrity.

(1235)

**Ms. Meredith:** Madam Speaker, actually there have been a number of polls. I believe the first poll was taken in 1982-83 where about 80 per cent of Canadians supported the return of capital punishment. There was another poll done a couple of years ago where 76 per cent of Canadians wanted the return of capital punishment.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I have listened attentively to my colleague's remarks. I would agree with her that it is important to denounce the deplorable crimes that have been committed, but I would point out that it is also important, in the course of a debate such as the one here today, to look for the real causes of this situation. The violent behaviour we are seeing is often just the symptom of a situation created by society.

In this regard, I think that particular attention should be given to the reform of social programs and to how we intend to help all members of society live in acceptable conditions.

If our analysis went deeper, might we not conclude that people exhibiting aggressive, unacceptable criminal behaviour often turned to this behaviour because they did not have the same opportunities as others early in life? Perhaps our social programs did not provide access to adequate daycare for those who needed it, and thus did not truly attempt to eliminate child poverty.

Should we not be examining this aspect of the problem in seeking definitive solutions, rather than limiting ourselves to remedial and punitive action?

Of course we will always be faced with finding solutions to specific cases of unacceptable violence, such as the one that took place at the École polytechnique, but there are also all the other cases that arise.

Should we, as elected representatives, not be looking for long term solutions, rather than enumerating truly reprehensible situations, situations that are unacceptable? Our examination of the problem must go deeper and it must produce solutions.

I would put the following question to the hon. member: Is there, in the Reform Party program, the necessary compassion, the necessary acceptance of situations, and satisfactory proposals for improvement? Is everyone ready to implement the 1989 Parliamentary declaration against child poverty? Should the emphasis not be on prevention, so that we do not repeat the American experience, where more money is being spent on prisons than on helping people?

[*English*]

**Ms. Meredith:** Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for the question. Certainly the Reform Party does support crime prevention but we cannot have crime prevention only and not deal with crime itself.

We believe the social programs should be directed to those most in need. In reality poor people commit crimes but so do rich people. Crime crosses all barriers. If the hon. member honestly thinks that to solve the problems of poverty is going to

*Government Orders*

remove crime, I would suggest that he take a better look at who is committing crimes.

A lot of crimes are committed by people who come from the most privileged situations. I could go on and name a number of them we are all familiar with, from Thatcher in Saskatchewan to Huenemann in B.C. who killed his mother and grandmother because he did not want to share a \$4 million estate.

Crime crosses all barriers. We have to deal with those problems we see in society that need to be addressed, poverty, illiteracy, those kinds of situations. We must direct that support to those most in need. We must not make it universal so that people who do not need the help get the help and the help that goes to those most in need is insufficient to look after the problem.

(1240)

**Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I listened carefully to the hon. member's presentation. I found it somewhat surprising that on a day when we are commemorating the murder of 14 young women that the member would be talking about reinstating capital punishment. That seems to be a contradiction in terms of the issue at hand. There are many criminal justice actions that can be taken.

Given the fact that part of the issues concerning the safety of women relate to their accessibility to information and support, does the Reform Party support core funding for women's centres? As the hon. member will know, every province and territory in this country provides that kind of support to women but we do not have core funding for women's centres. Would the Reform Party support that kind of proposal?

**Ms. Meredith:** Madam Speaker, I would not support core funding from the federal level. I do support funding from the communities where these programs are located. I would also support funding from the private sector in the local community and from the provincial governments. The support of these centres for the delivery of these services should be closer to the location.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Madam Speaker, I must say I find the hon. member's response rather shocking.

It seems to me that what the member is actually saying is that women who are beaten and sexually and physically abused should rely on bake sales. If we are really serious about violence against women in this society the bake sale option is not good enough. Let the military have a bake sale.

Does the member support zero tolerance of violence against women? If so, how does she propose that simply by the government not taking any role to support women through women's centres and support services that this will happen?

**Ms. Meredith:** Madam Speaker, I would suggest that as a member of the House of Commons my role is to make sure our laws take spousal abuse and abuse against women seriously. When an individual murders his spouse he should get more than five years for manslaughter or a 20-month sentence of incarceration. Until our laws seriously take into account violence against women and give a sentence appropriate for the act we will continue to need transitional houses of all kinds.

Many of my colleagues probably support these transitional houses through our 10 per cent donations to charity. I am not for a moment suggesting that bake sales are the way to raise money any more than I would suggest that bake sales are the way for anybody to raise money. However there are ways through education and promotion where the community can and does support transitional houses for battered and abused women and children.

That is where the emphasis has to be placed. It is the community's responsibility to take ownership of the problem and get involved. They must stop expecting government to do it for them.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Madam Speaker, can I be perfectly clear in asking the member, would she then say that she does not support nor does the Reform Party support any funding for transition homes through the Canada assistance plan?

**Ms. Meredith:** Madam Speaker, not knowing enough about it I cannot comment on whether or not I would support it. However, I would suggest that the Reform Party does support in many different ways, and I mentioned one through 10 per cent of our salaries being given to charitable organizations, that we do support charitable organizations such as transitional houses.

(1245)

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP):** Madam Speaker, first of all, I would like to note the contribution made by a former New Democratic member of this House, Dawn Black, who introduced the bill for the establishment of this day in memory of the 14 women from Quebec, to be observed throughout Canada every December 6 and known as the National Day of Remembrance and Action on Violence Against Women.

I think that it is very important to mention the names of these 14 women who died so tragically. Those who were killed must not be forgotten. The 14 victims were: Geneviève Bergeron, Hélène Colgan, Nathalie Croteau, Barbara Daigneault, Anne-Marie Edward, Maud Haviernick, Barbara Klucznik Widajewicz, Maryse Leclair, Annie St-Arneault, Michèle Richard, Maryse Laganière, Anne-Marie Lemay, Sonia Pelletier and Annie Turcotte.



*Government Orders*

I would like to quote from the brief by the Canadian Labour Congress and its status of women and human rights committee: "Imagine a world in which girls and women were safe in their homes, their schools, in the streets and in the workplace". Imagine, Madam Speaker.

[English]

All of us want to imagine what it would be like for all women and children to feel safe in their homes, in the streets and in their schools.

I will address several specific issues this morning. Many statistics have been given which I do not intend to repeat today. Rather, I will address several issues which I think are extremely important in specifically addressing the issue.

The first issue is that of gun control. It was for that reason in the previous Parliament my party supported legislation leading to greater gun control. It is still a question and more legislation will be coming before the House.

However I raise several points. In part I acknowledge the work of Yukon psychologist, Paula Pasquali. She raised some of these points as a woman and a psychologist who has worked tirelessly for many years on the issue of violence against women. She raised whether we are often talking about the wrong issue or asking the wrong question and whether we should be asking more specifically questions about safety. As Ms. Pasquali has noted, there is no doubt that some forms of gun control have certainly limited the accessibility of firearms to be used against women in the home, although we know it is still a great risk for many women because women have indeed been killed in the country.

She has proposed that we should also look at prohibiting individuals with a history of violence or threatening behaviour from acquiring firearms acquisition certificates and at taking firearms away from individuals who have been convicted of violent offences. We do not need any reforms to do that; we could do that under the existing Criminal Code.

One study funded by the Department of Justice found that police rarely seize firearms in homes where they respond to domestic calls, even though they know of their power to do so and are aware of the extent to which firearms are used against women. I would guess that firearms prohibitions are rarely ordered in cases of wife assault. This can be done under the existing law.

There is nothing radical about suggesting that firearms should be restricted for those who have committed violent crimes.

(1250)

One argument put forward is that taking away guns from people who rely on them for hunting or trapping would take food off their table or take away their livelihood. In those cases there is clearly an argument that they should be required to store guns

outside their family homes. I am talking specifically about people who have been convicted of violent crimes.

We should broaden the debate around gun control and not specifically relate it to the narrowness of it now. We should look very clearly at what it is we want to accomplish, which deaths and which crimes we are trying to prevent, and setting priorities. Should we be looking at more specifically violence in the home in addition to proposals that may reduce it through gun control? We also have to evaluate the current gun control act and look at how moneys could best be spent to eliminate violence in the home and the use of firearms in the home.

A second aspect of the criminal justice system of great concern to all of us is that we must insist that the system work to the benefit of women who choose to lay charges. There have been a number of studies. One recently completed in Ontario found that women were invariably disappointed with the response of the criminal justice system to assaults committed by the men with whom they lived. Many women do not want their partner to be punished but expect and need a system that will take effective action to ensure safety.

This Ontario study demonstrates that only rarely does the sentencing imposed accomplish the goal. Indeed Ms. Pasquali's own studies on sexual assault in Yukon do not give much hope unless there is a system in place which is clearly focused on the victim, on the needs of the victim, and on support for the batterer in terms of groups for batterers and so on.

In 1983 the Solicitor General of Canada issued a directive to the RCMP to lay charges and to the crown to prosecute charges of wife assault irrespective of the women's wishes. A lot of us at the time felt it was a good directive. Perhaps it is time to look at whether it has been effective for women. We should look at all laws that have been put in place to accomplish these ends.

A third issue in the criminal justice system I would like to address is the issue of those who have committed a violent crime getting a lesser sentence or being found not guilty on the basis that they were intoxicated by alcohol or had used drugs. The government should undertake to change the Criminal Code in this aspect. It has been a great shock to women across the country to know that in this day and age when the issues of violence have been so much addressed that this is still possible. It is totally unacceptable. I have received petitions from individuals all over the country who are outraged about it.

Services and the accessibility of services are very important. All women in violent situations live in fear. It has only been in the last 15 to 20 years that we have had a network of services: transition homes, hot lines, women's services and rape counselling centres. We have been able to say to women that violence is not acceptable, that they have an option. Society has taken on its responsibility. We as a society are responsible for the safety of our citizens.

*Government Orders*

I refer to the proposals of the Liberal member of Parliament from Hamilton—Wentworth who is saying that funding should be cut to interest groups. He cited in his comments in a number of places women's groups. Let me put forward a few statistics about what the priorities in society should be. We hear that society cannot afford some of the work support groups or advocacy groups do on behalf of women and children.

(1255)

Why is it, many women must wonder today, that in 1992 the Canadian government gave a federal grant to Pratt & Whitney of over \$54 million and in the same year gave the Canadian Day Care Advocacy \$183,000? Why is it that in the same year the Canadian Marconi company received almost \$10 million while the Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women received about \$250,000? Why is it that Spar Aerospace received almost \$14 million that year and the Disabled Women's Network of Canada received just over \$100,000?

Today of all days is the day to put to rest the mythology that it is not the responsibility of a government to address the safety of its citizens. To do so there must be local resources available for women and the federal government has a role in that.

In terms of accessibility I want to mention specifically rural areas of Canada. As many members will know, it is very difficult in most rural areas of the country for women suffering abuse to receive support services or often to receive legal or court services because of isolation. It is particularly important today to ensure that rural areas have a special focus in the planning done at the federal, provincial and territorial levels.

I can give two local examples. The Victoria Faulkner Women's Centre in Whitehorse, Yukon, has had to move three times in the last year. It is trying to offer services to women. It is one of a few services readily accessible to women in Yukon. It is shocking that this service cannot find a permanent home. Similarly in Watson Lake, Yukon, the Help and Hope Transition Home for Families is under threat and has had to shut down part time because of a lack of funding. It is through the Canada assistance plan funding for transition homes that territories and provinces receive partial funding for these homes.

We have not eradicated violence against women. I wish there was no need for transition homes for women who have been battered. However the need is there. Every day at the doors and on the phones of women's centres and transition homes across the nation, in every province and territory, there are people who are desperate for help. We cannot turn our backs on them.

This leads me to the social security review that barely addresses the particular issue. It addresses the Canada assistance plan. If the government were truly serious in its social security review about looking at all aspects of issues affecting families, it would have made a specific commitment to serious-

ly address the issue of violence against women and children. It is not there, which is very disconcerting to many of us.

The issues of poverty and inequality relate to violence against women. There is no doubt that things like the NAFTA and the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement have adversely affected the working lives of many women. Often it is women who have felt the brunt of the negative aspects of these trade arrangements. It is women particularly who have felt the brunt of cutbacks to social services in every province and territory.

It was mentioned today by the minister in an extremely important speech that women were central to the training of children in our families and to family life. Yet we still have one in five children in the country living in poverty, which means they have poor parents.

(1300)

This is a form of violence everywhere in the world but it is a form of violence we can do something about. We have been very good in the House, as we were in 1989, saying we want to eradicate poverty by the year 2000. Wanting is not good enough. We have to take action and we can do that.

There are many examples of inequalities. I gave some financial examples earlier where once again those who advocate on behalf of the interests of women received some government funding but nothing compared to the priorities in other areas.

It is absolutely essential that we commit resources and have resources available for these services. Accessibility is a problem that many immigrant women have, either accessibility to English as a second language or to support services. The responsibility we as a society have for each and every person must be taken seriously by the House.

The previous Reform speaker indicated that we could do this if we were a bit more charitable and had a few more bake sales I guess. I am not against it. In fact, almost all services for women do private fund raising. I have been involved in many of those efforts as I am sure other members have been.

The reality is that they need a certain amount of core funding to be able to continue their work. We cannot turn our backs and pretend we can go back to days of charity. There has been some progress and greater awareness since this day was brought into law.

It is absolutely essential that we recommit to specific actions to reduce violence against women, to eliminate violence against women. Zero tolerance must be the objective in everything we

*Government Orders*

do. I do not believe it is simply what governments do, what this Parliament does. It is what we do as a society.

There are many specific actions we can take if we want to, it is clearly a matter of will. I would like to end by quoting a comment that appeared recently in an editorial in the Whitehorse *Star* which sums up this issue very well:

A government's primary mandate is to serve its electors. It's difficult to pinpoint a more urgent role than helping to preserve these people's physical well-being from domestic criminals—if not their very lives.

I urge all members of the House to seriously address this issue in their constituencies and to support legislation which will help with the support services and ensure that we commit ourselves to zero tolerance on violence against women.

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I have a short question. I was interested in listening to the leader of the New Democratic Party speak on violence against women. She did not seem to be too supportive or think that the federal government should be involved more in the charitable aspect of dealing with the results of violence toward women, rather than dealing with the causes of the problem.

I know she would probably support measures regarding education that would relieve some of the problems about violence toward women. She did not really talk about what her party's position is on stricter sentencing and reform of the justice system so that violent acts are adequately punished. What is her position on a victim's rights versus a criminal's rights.

I would appreciate knowing what her party's position is on those very important matters that would prevent and discourage violence not only against women but against all Canadians.

(1305)

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Madam Speaker, I would be happy to answer those questions. I believe I addressed at some length some of the criminal justice issues, both regarding gun control and the fact that people who have committed violent crimes should not have access to guns.

Second, it is very important that the government act very swiftly to change the Criminal Code by creating the new offence of criminal intoxication.

Third, obviously part of any kind of program of violence against women must deal seriously with those who commit that offence.

As far as victims' rights, that is exactly the purpose of my talk today. Victims have a right to have support, to have counselling, not to be a victim in the first place. We should put in adequate preventive measures and adequate resources both in rural and

urban areas to say to women that it is not acceptable that they live in a violent situation. We have options.

There are people who can help women as advocates. There are transition homes. There are support services. The choice will remain with women because we have to respect the choices that they make. But in doing so, we want to prevent victims of violence. We can do it to a large extent with a number of the measures that I mentioned today.

**Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member for Yukon how she feels about violence.

As kids we were always taught at home when we went to get the cattle out of the pasture not to wear red because it could infuriate the bull in the pasture.

I have seen so much violence in my own community. When you look into some of these cases there is always stress which had developed by actions on both sides.

How could we diffuse this? What could we do to prevent this in a number of cases? It is a matter of prevention, not putting on the red shirt when we know there is already a problem.

That is the big answer to our problems. Somehow or other we must discolour that red shirt when there are problems in the family or problems between husband and wife.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Madam Speaker, I hope, and I will give the hon. member the benefit of the doubt, that he is not suggesting that women bring violence against themselves by their own actions.

I will take rather that the hon. member's comments are asking what we can do to assist those families who are having marital and family problems. I suggest we can do a fair number of things.

First, we can put in place economic measures that ensure that we decrease the amount of unemployment. Every study indicates that poverty and unemployment are contributors to violence in our society.

Second, it is absolutely essential that governments at all levels take responsibility for the safety of their citizens both in enforcing those measures already in place in the criminal justice system to deal with those who commit violent offences and to ensure that there is a core group of services available.

One can look for example at what some police forces have done across the country with their family violence prevention units. London, Ontario comes to mind. It has a very progressive program of going to a home where a call has been made, making sure that a social worker is present, that there is an option for ongoing counselling. It is not just a matter of one measure, it is a matter of several.

*Government Orders*

Finally, the attitude that our society has toward women is key to this. Denigration of women in any field will set the climate for the acceptance of violence. It is incumbent on each of us to ensure that the respect and dignity of both men and women is always in the forefront. In our position as members of Parliament we have a responsibility to ensure equal opportunities for women in every sphere of life.

(1310)

*[Translation]*

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Madam Speaker, today we commemorate the sad anniversary of the massacre at l'École polytechnique in which 14 young women died. Despite the horror and revulsion which we feel about it, this act is only a pale reflection of the violence women suffer. We should denounce this violence not only today but every day of the year.

What Marc Lépine did makes us all think, but it is just the tip of the iceberg. Violence against women is rarely so spectacular, fortunately. This violence takes many forms, some more pernicious than others. Women are victims of violence 365 days a year. Violence is insidious and affects every aspect of a woman's life.

The Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women defined violence against women as a complex problem which includes physical, sexual, psychological and economic violence against women and said that this violence depends on structures, values and social, economic and political measures that muzzle women in our society, promote discrimination on the basis of sex and maintain the inequality of women.

Violence is the weapon of choice for those who want to subdue and dominate. Men learned that a long time ago and use violence. Even today, we women are kept out and subjugated by an archaic macho attitude.

Our Catholic Church will not let us be priests but suggests that we do volunteer work. This is another way of telling us women that we are not educated, cultivated or even pious enough to have access to the upper echelons of a Church which is meant to be a reflection of society. From deacon to pope, the positions are all held by men who are often pretentious and full of themselves. Their authority over the faithful in general and women in particular is a good example of the masculine philosophy based on control and power. Do you really think that the Catholic Church would be in worse shape than it is now if the pope was a woman?

Unfortunately, the Church is not the only institution which treats women like that. Let us take a look in this House. In Canada, women account for 52 per cent of the population. However, if you count the number of women in the House of Commons, you will find 53 out of 295 MPs. Our great Parliament is very much a male stronghold. Over half of the Canadian

population is represented here by barely one sixth of the total number of MPs.

Therefore, it comes as no surprise that the government takes so long to table legislation to ensure the safety and well-being of women. A Parliament made up of men proposes and passes male-oriented legislation, with the result that we are still waiting for the Minister of Justice to table concrete legislation on firearms. There is no need to rush: After all, for every man who dies during a spousal argument, six women are killed. I am convinced that if the figures were reversed, the process would have been speeded up.

Do you not agree that, if the Minister of Justice were a woman, we would have a bill to amend the Criminal Code and strictly prohibit the mutilation of female genitals? But the victims are women and the Minister of Justice does not even intend to amend the Criminal Code. Not only did the justice minister put on the back burner the idea of registering all firearms, he also refuses to table a bill to protect the innocent victims of a cruel and barbaric practice.

The Minister of Justice promised to do everything in his power to end such criminal activities. Either the minister only has the power to make promises, or else protecting young girls from mutilation is not one of his priorities.

(1315)

The mutilation of female genitals is a form of violence against girls and violates their basic right to physical integrity. Will we have to wait until a similar practice is introduced that would mutilate male genitals for the government to make up its mind to act? If 52 per cent of the members of this House were women, I am sure these problems would already have been dealt with and legislation would already have been introduced, passed and implemented.

Last week, the Minister of Justice missed an excellent opportunity to show everyone he was concerned about the security of wives. It seems gun control is not the answer, because instead of tabling a bill, as he promised, he made a ministerial statement full of good intentions. Meanwhile, every six days, on average, a woman is shot and killed.

I can hear people saying that the lack of women in the House is our own fault, because we choose not to run for election. Nothing could be further from the truth. Some obtuse male chauvinists fail to understand what this means for a woman. These guardians of the male mystique cannot imagine that someone would hate the sparring at all-candidates meetings, that woman are fundamentally different in the way they live, the way they are educated and trained and in the way they act.

My answer to them is that I still hope that some day, this House will be truly representative of the population and that women will fill 52 per cent of the seats, in other words, have the representation they deserve.

*Government Orders**[English]*

**Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, as we rise to speak in the House today certainly our first thoughts are for the families who five years later still live with the pain of losing their children, more specifically losing their daughters.

What stunned the whole country five years ago on December 6 was not only that 14 young people just beginning their lives lost their lives, but that women were specifically singled out to die on that day. Men were moved out of the way so that the women alone could be shot. As a mother of two daughters in that age group I can only imagine the pain those families still feel.

Today I want to talk about how we as women live in society and why it is so important that all people particularly men understand that. I want to talk about the feelings of powerlessness that are ours from the time we become conscious of ourselves as human beings. It is vital that everyone understand that women live their lives differently. That difference is vitally important to society. It is vitally important to us as women that decisions not be made only on the basis of who is strongest and most powerful.

I realize it is very difficult for many men to understand what this means to women. Most men have grown up knowing from the time they were little boys that they would be big and strong, that they would have important jobs. That is not the way little girls grow up.

Most women have grown up knowing from the time they were little girls of less than two that they would always be smaller than their male counterparts, they would always be weaker, would never be as important, would never account for quite as much in society. They would never have as much money and for many they would never have money of their own. Their job would be to clean up after everybody else. They would always be good little girls because if they were not daddy might get cross, or mommy might get cross because daddy did not like it.

(1320)

This is why as we grow into women every day and every minute of our lives is regulated by the fact that we are women. We decide differently than men where it is safe to go at what time of day, whether we can go alone or whether we need to find somebody to go with us.

I doubt there is a man in this House who approaches his car in the parking lot at night with the same fear a woman does. It is important for us to understand this is why it is so important to women to have a different kind of society. That is why we need to find measures to equalize our treatment.

When I was teaching my 17-year old daughter to drive I taught her to lock the doors always when she was alone in the car, even in broad daylight, and never to get into a car at night

without checking the back seat to ensure nobody was hiding there. What I was doing was teaching her fear, the same fear that I and every woman live with daily. When I taught my son to drive a year later it never even occurred to me to give him the same lessons because he did not need them.

This feeling of being powerless, of always having to be just a little bit afraid, is partly what leads to the kinds of violence we have become so much aware of. It is what leads to the exploitation of women in a number of different ways around the world. It is what leads to the exploitation and abuse of power over women as a universal phenomenon. It is why women tend not to report crimes against themselves as easily or as readily. They know that doing so immediately places them in a situation where they again are powerless. Others are in control and they can be hurt more.

The motion today is so important. It is an expression of this House that this matters to us as parliamentarians, as the leaders of our communities and our country. It reinforces our hope and determination to change it.

I recall a report a couple of years back on why women were not in engineering. I happen to be married to an engineer, I have a son who is an engineer, and I have a son-in-law who is an engineer so I know a fair bit about engineers and what great people they can be.

I also know a fair bit about engineering faculties at universities. There is a whole culture there that is ugly and offensive to the very nature of women. It is so totally a male macho culture that no woman is comfortable in it. There are things like the fortunately now gone greased pole at Queen's. Tell me what woman wants to be an engineer when part of the initiation process is to expose herself to filth and I mean that in the most vile terms, believe me.

Why are there not more women in politics? We will not have the kinds of laws that make it easier for women to get justice until we have more women writing laws. It is not that I would write better laws than any of my male colleagues in the House; it is just that I bring a different perspective to it, a perspective I think is necessary to complete our humanity when we create laws in this House and decide how to allocate our resources.

Bertha Wilson said it best when she talked about the difference between how men and women deal with laws and why the justice system is anathema to women. The whole idea of winning and losing that seems so fundamental to our justice system also seems to be fundamentally a male concept. It is a concept promoted by those who are bigger and more powerful, who always have an equal chance of winning. It is not a concept that women are comfortable with.

I am being very open and honest today about my feelings because this motion is also about feelings. It is about pointing out that women who have been violated can turn to the justice

*Government Orders*

system that is supposed to be there to protect all of us. It is about having workplaces in which women are free from harassment.

(1325)

I want to shock the House a little today. I want to read from a harassment case that has recently come to my attention. This is a young woman, 21 years old, a university student employed in a summer job. I have met with this young woman and believe me, any of us would be proud to have her as our daughter. The following is what happened in her first four days of employment in an office in this city:

He sexually harassed me by hovering over me and by touching me in an inappropriate manner. He often touched my shoulders and on one occasion ran his fingers across my neck.

This is a mature married man.

He often called me "hon" and "love". On one occasion he announced to the office that his wife was out of town for the weekend and suggested I babysit him at his home. On one occasion while helping me with a file that I had been organizing on my lap he took the opportunity to rub my upper thighs. When he asked if I understood what he had just done I said "yes", to which he added: "That is too bad. I was enjoying playing with your legs".

On one occasion he said: "The problem with kids today is that mothers enter the workforce instead of staying at home to raise them properly".

He told the following joke: What is the difference between a lawyer and a woman? To win a case a lawyer puts on his robe while a woman takes hers off.

He sometimes cornered me and used his larger size to intimidate me. He came up behind me, swivelled my chair around, placed one hand on my desk, the other on my chair, so that I was trapped between his arms and asked me what was wrong.

I saw him slap a female coworker's behind. I heard him discuss male colleagues getting lucky.

This is a 21-year old woman working in a government office enduring this. She was discouraged from making an official complaint. A year later she is still suffering from the emotional repercussions. She will not be told what action was taken against that harasser because his privacy is being protected. Yet we know that for the victim to know what action was taken is a critical part of the healing process.

I want to speak a bit about a piece of legislation that is currently before the House. Bill C-41 has had a lot of discussion. In my view it has had a lot of discussion on the wrong issues. Bill C-41 talks about making crimes committed out of hate especially heinous and subject to more strict penalties.

Bill C-41 says that if you commit a crime of violence against a woman because she is a woman out of hate, you will be punished more severely than if you commit the same crime for purposes of theft, whatever. I think that is good law because we cannot say that it is okay to hate people because they are women, because they are black, because they are Sikhs, because they are gay. Bill C-41 protects children against abuse by providing

tougher penalties for people in authority who sexually or physically abuse children.

I want to support a bill that does that and I will. I want to challenge anybody who refuses to support a bill that provides that kind of protection against hate and violence in our society.

There are people who would pretend that violence is a society-wide issue and it is, but it is a different issue for women. It is a different issue for women because women have become the target of violence. I challenge any woman inside or outside this House to not remember even as a little girl when some man would rub up too closely against her deliberately on a street corner or a bus, or when she has not been accosted by some vile and foul sexual suggestions on the street.

(1330)

I say to the men in this House that I do not believe they understand. I ask them to try to understand the gut wrenching caring that that kind of an incident causes. I do not think they understand how I feel when one member of Parliament stands in this House and calls a woman member of Parliament a slut. I do not think they understand how in the last week our concerns about violence have been belittled in this House by comments from the other side. I do not think they understand. I ask them to please do their best to try. It is one more way of saying to me and saying to women in this country: "You don't count as much. You don't matter as much".

We also have to talk about the economic equality of women. It very much is an issue of equality. As long as we refuse to give women the same opportunities to be economically prosperous based on their own abilities, talents and application of their energies, women will not be equal politically, equal socially and they will not be equal before our justice system.

I totally reject the arguments put forward earlier this morning by the member for Beaver River who said that violence against women is no different than violence against men. It is. As long as we refuse to face that, we refuse to face that women are killed by men who are close to them, who are their husbands, their lovers, their partners, because of the power relationship. Until we accept that we are not going to understand the problem. If you do not understand the problem you cannot solve it.

It is fine to say these issues affect all members of our society, as the member for Beaver River did this morning, but that is turning a blind eye to the specific and serious problems that this motion before the House today wishes to address and that is very specifically the kind of violence that is directed against women because they are women.

*Government Orders*

Yes, we have grandparents and seniors who are verbally and physically abused. We have children who are physically abused. That is a reflection of a society value that says: "Power, might and strength are the most important values and if you have those you have the right to abuse others". Until we recognize that that power relationship is why so many women die as a result of violent incidents, we are not going to solve the problem. We are not going to have a better society.

I thank the House for its attention today. I thank all those who gave unanimous consent to the debating of this motion. I regret in a sense that the motion had to be watered down to deal more generally with violence in society as opposed to only violence against women on this particular day just to ensure that unanimous consent would be given.

This is an important issue. It is an issue on which our government is working. As the Minister of Justice said very recently: "We have not done enough but we will do more". I believe this kind of debate strengthens our courage and strengthens our resolve to do more and to leave to our children and grandchildren a world and a country in which all are equally valuable. I say that on behalf of both the granddaughters and the grandsons I hope to have some day.

(1335)

I think men too benefit from a society in which power is not the ruling dictate, in which equality and respect for all human beings regardless of whether they are men or women is a hallmark of this society, perhaps as in no other in the world, and that is a record that I would like to see this nation achieve.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the remarks of the hon. member who just spoke. I have three girls myself. They are still young, of course, but they will grow up. I realize that Quebec has gone much further than the federal government with respect to equality between spouses and equality for women.

In 1990, for example, Quebec passed an act to encourage economic equality between spouses, so that when they divorce, or separate or one of them dies, the property acquired by the couple is divided pretty fairly between the two former spouses, the man and the woman. Canada lags far behind Quebec and several other provinces on this issue of recognizing spouses as equals.

I remain somewhat sceptical just the same. In a justified and justifiable outburst, the previous speaker mentioned women being in danger on our streets and everywhere, women being done an injustice.

I have a problem reconciling this with the fact that the hon. member herself and her colleagues recently rose in this place and brought the house down when the Minister of Human Resources Development tabled his famous bill amending the Unemployment Insurance Act. The policy statement says that from now on, entitlement to UI benefits in Canada will be based on family income. Unfortunately—and the Bloc Québécois and I did not make this decision—women are hit hardest by such a measure. If the husband's annual income is, say, \$55,000 and his wife earns \$22,000, \$25,000 or \$28,000 per year, and becomes unemployed, she will not be entitled to UI benefits because her husband makes good money.

The hon. member opposite rose in this House to applaud this measure at the time it was introduced by the Minister of Human Resources Development. Personally, I find it is all too easy to act offended, to rise and say that the right hand does not know what the left one is doing or vice versa. Logic should prevail and one should rise once in a while, not only on days when we debate the status of women, violence against women or other such issues, and tell the minister that he is off the beam with his procedure.

It seems to me that the story changes depending on the circumstances. On days when we are dealing with women's issues, violence against women or matters affecting women directly or indirectly, they come here and denounce injustices. I agree there are some, but in the normal course of day to day administration, knowing that federal legislation concerning women is 30 years behind provincial legislation, I think that more could be done, besides such statements, to remedy the situation.

This concerns men and women alike, including fathers like me. I have three young daughters who will grow up to be women living in this society and I am not so proud of the legacy we are leaving them. In Quebec, there is an ad on television that says: "I myself am not affected by violence. I do not go out at night; I stay home. I do not talk to strangers; I stay home. No, I cannot say that I am affected by violence".

That is similar to the situation faced by women in Canada. My friend, the hon. member for Frontenac, said earlier that while walking in a somewhat disreputable neighbourhood in Sherbrooke, his daughter was asked by police officers: "What are you doing walking at night in a neighbourhood where you should not be?"

(1340)

This does not happen only in Sherbrooke. It happens in Halifax, Edmonton, Calgary, and many other places. What are we doing about this? What steps did the Liberals take to address the situation? They gave us a nice gun-control policy to be implemented in the year 2003. It took Marc Lépine 20 minutes

*Government Orders*

to go on a shooting spree at the École Polytechnique five years ago. How many more shooting sprees can we expect before 2003? When all you need is 20 minutes, it is anybody's guess.

I think that the government must translate words into action, show some backbone and try to do something so that women will feel after today's session that something was accomplished in the House of Commons today and that there is a political will to achieve justice for women. But no. All members of this House make big speeches but when the time comes to support or reject motions that go against women's interests, the party line comes before anything else, including nice speeches like the one that the hon. member just gave us.

I strongly disagree, because I do not want to see my three young daughters in 10, 12, 15 or 20 years treated even worse than their mother is being treated at this time.

**Ms. Catterall:** Mr. Speaker, frankly, today I do not feel like debating who does more for women—the provinces or the federal government. I think it is clear that all parties must do much more, especially for family welfare. Clearly, throughout Canada, a family's welfare depends on the woman and the man in the couple.

As for social welfare, yes, there is lots of room for improvement. I want to say that in Quebec, for example, the family has to take responsibility before someone can get welfare. That is not the case throughout Canada.

I really think, as my minister and I admitted, that we are not doing enough to improve the status of women and especially the conditions that cause violence against women. More must be done at all levels in every country in the world. I am convinced that with more women in Parliament, on both sides of the House, it will be easier to do it more quickly.

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to what the hon. member said, and I would like to give her the assurance that many men have thought and are thinking and learning about what is happening in society today.

Like the previous speaker, I also have children, two girls and one boy, and I want them to have the same opportunities in the years to come. That is why I think the government must send the right signals. You say you do not feel like having a debate on this today. I realize that the issue of violence against women is a universal one, but at the same time we are here to ensure that the appropriate measures are taken.

Without in any way blaming the government, we can at least consider what signals the government could perhaps send tomorrow morning. For instance, in connection with social program reform, could it suggest ways to fight poverty other than targeting poor parents and poor children, which does not provide any help for the middle class? There are all kinds of family support programs, but are they adequate?

(1345)

And could the present climate of violence in our society be due to the fact that for the past 20 or 25 years, we have failed to provide equal opportunities for everyone? This is true in the case of women, the disabled and several other categories. And should the government not make this the spearhead of its action to eliminate child poverty by the year 2000, for instance? If it does, it may succeed in considerably reducing violence against women.

**Ms. Catterall:** Mr. Speaker, our objective is to improve the economic situation of women and children and, more specifically, to eliminate child poverty. However, to eliminate child poverty, we have to eliminate the mother's poverty first. That is one of the things we are trying to achieve through our social program reform, by putting more emphasis on training and providing more support for women with children and families with young children.

These are some of the things I personally and many of my colleagues have said to the Minister of Human Resources Development. Women and children should be—

**The Speaker:** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but her time has expired.

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, before expressing my views on this issue, I want to say that I regret that the Official Opposition was only informed yesterday of the motion tabled this morning in the House. I do hope that this late notice does not reflect a lack of concern by our society on the issue of violence against women.

It is with sadness, dismay and pain that I participate in this debate to commemorate the tragedy which occurred on December 6, 1989.

In Quebec, as well as in Canada, that tragedy put the issue of violence against women in the limelight. This episode, more than any other, forced our society to stop and think. Experts in every possible field analyzed the whys and wherefores of such horror. However, the answers are neither simple nor clear. Our society is suffering, and the result is that women and children are often the victims of violence triggered by this unhappiness and malaise.

More often than not, violence is insidious, sneaky and imperceptible from the outside. At other times however, it can be visible, unbearable, terrifying and very concrete.

Statistical data cannot accurately measure psychological violence. It is a form of communication between the tormentor and the victim which undermines the soul and kills self-esteem. In fact, even though current data on physical violence is overwhelming, it only represents the tip of the iceberg.

Just recently, in 1993, Statistics Canada gathered the following information: One woman out of two was a victim of at least



*S. O. 31*

one violent act since the age of 16; one in ten who lived with a spouse feared, at one time or another, for her life.

Other statistics released in 1991 by the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women provide a clear and hard picture of the plight of those women who live in poverty.

(1350)

In 1989, eight out of every ten women living on reserves in Ontario were victims of violence. In 1989, eight out of ten women inmates of federal penitentiaries had been abused before their incarceration. In 1989, four out of ten women with disabilities had been abused or raped. While weakness should spontaneously generate an attitude of protection and help, we observe paradoxical behaviour. The weakest are at the highest risk of violent treatment. How can this troubling reality be explained?

In a document on spousal violence and its effects on children, Beth Allen bore out the theory that children from violent homes are at greater risk of committing, or being the victims of acts of violence. It is as if witnessing violent behaviour causes violence to be incorporated in the behaviour pattern of the child who witnesses such violence.

While some may learn violent behaviour at home, the role played by mass media in trivializing this violence cannot be denied. Even the most horrible things end up losing any meaning when you are exposed to them every day. You become indifferent to the horror. Parliament has a major responsibility in this regard. Today, on the eve of the third millennium, do victims of violence speak more freely of the abuse they suffer?

It is currently estimated that one out of every four women who fall victim to violence will report these acts of violence to the police. Other figures are much more conservative, as they indicate that one woman in ten would report it. Perhaps these figures are more accurate. At any rate, fear and silence go hand in hand. Is this society prepared to let battered women be heard? The question has been put, but I am afraid that the answer is no.

In 1991, 270 women were murdered in Canada, a 33 per cent increase over 1988; 85 of these women were shot dead. Thirty per cent of women slain in Canada and Quebec in 1991 were slain with firearms which were generally used against them by people they knew. While the women of Quebec and Canada were confidently expecting a fair and reasonable gun control bill to be tabled, the Minister of Justice announced in a ministerial statement made on November 30, that we will have to wait until 1998 for the registration of firearms to start and until 2003 for it to be completed.

Mr. Speaker, I put the question to you: can this society afford to wait? Do these women have the time to wait? I am sorry that this government is not prepared to let women victims of violence be heard.

Let me tell you about another form of violence. I will do so in English. It should be painfully slow, as I am already a slow reader in French.

[English]

Generally, when we speak of violence against women we focus on physical and psychological damage inflicted by one individual against another. However, what of the more insidious ways in which women are subjugated? The wounds inflicted by society and borne silently can be felt as keenly as physical blows.

(1355)

Allow me to illustrate my point with an example. There is a new medical industry in Canada growing and developing with a life of its own. A full year after the final report of the royal commission on new reproductive technologies, the federal government has not introduced a single measure to regulate the use or further development of these new technologies. As a result, we see women at Toronto's IVF Canada clinic selling their eggs to pay for expensive and unproven fertility treatments. We see women desperate for money renting out their wombs in surrogacy arrangements.

This is exploitation in its worst form because the federal government, I regret sincerely, turns a blind eye to it. Just as violence against women is the abuse of physical or psychological power, the exploitation of women's reproductive capabilities is the abuse of economic and political power. By not acting swiftly to regulate this industry and to put a halt to the most exploitive and ethically abhorrent new reproductive technologies, the federal government is demonstrating complacency in the form of violence against women. This lack of action can no longer be tolerated by the women of Quebec and Canada.

I will continue later.

[Translation]

**The Speaker:** I am sorry to interrupt, but the member will have the floor again around 3 p.m.

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]

### HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on December 12, 1948 the United Nations Assembly adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Since then the world

has witnessed great changes in the global order and an abundance of human suffering still exists.

Canada, a country composed of many cultures, has long been respected for its commitment to human rights. We must continue to use our influence to encourage other governments around the world to heighten their human rights' standards.

I am pleased that this government is addressing the issue of human rights at home by introducing programs to improve the treatment of people who suffer discrimination because of their race, sexual orientation or because of a physical or mental disability. Indeed, the increase in both hate crimes and hate propaganda is a disturbing trend.

As we recognize this week Human Rights Day we must continue to meet the many human rights challenges that we face in both the domestic and international community.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### SOCIAL PROGRAM REFORM

**Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, beyond polls, yesterday, women's groups clearly expressed their opposition to the federal government's social program reform. Calling the human resources development minister's proposals discriminatory and regressive, the National Action Committee on the Status of Women firmly rejected the provisions to cut women's UI benefits.

Under these provisions, women's access to UI would be determined by spousal income, although women would, of course, continue to pay premiums. These measures are a direct attack on the financial independence that women have worked so hard to achieve in the last 30 years.

By completely disregarding the issue of fairness raised by his reform, the Minister of Human Resources Development is simply implementing a series of blind cuts at the expense of women, among others, dictated by his fight against the federal government's deficit.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this morning our leader, the hon. member for Calgary Southwest, announced that as a caucus we are opposed to the inclusion of sexual orientation in the Canadian Human Rights Act on legal and human rights grounds.

*S. O. 31*

He also made it clear that the Reform Party was against the recognition of same sex spouses and the extension of spousal benefits to same sex relationships as per the resolution adopted at our October 1994 party assembly.

Canadians across the country are concerned over the government's intentions to include sexual orientation in both the Criminal Code and the Canadian Human Rights Act.

The present course of action taken by the Liberals is not spelled out in their red book. It is presumptuous of them to say they have the mandate to proceed.

Canadians are further exasperated when they realize that no free vote will be held on the issue so that their concerns cannot be reflected democratically.

Our party is listening to Canadians in reflecting their concerns. Why are the Liberals afraid to do the same? Perhaps it is because their mandate is not based on listening to Canadians.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### JOB FINDING CLUBS

**Mr. Gilles Bernier (Beauce, Ind.):** Mr. Speaker, after 10 years of existence, the services offered by Job Finding Clubs have been modified following a change in the rules of the game by Human Resources Development Canada. The department requires that a large percentage of training referrals be UI recipients, thus closing the door to those left out of the statistics, who were the main users of services offered by Job Finding Clubs.

The goal is, of course, commendable: returning unemployed workers to the labour force as quickly as possible. But what are we doing for young people just out of school and for people without income, who would greatly benefit from job finding sessions but whom the government is now trying to exclude on the pretext that they are not counted in the official statistics? They are human beings with an urgent need to find work, and I think that the department should relax its rules.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Ms. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today many men and women across the land are wearing white ribbons to remind us that five years ago on this day 40 young women were tragically gunned down by a man at Montreal's l'École polytechnique, simply because they were women.

Sadly today little has changed. Women around the world still live in fear of violence by the hands of men they know and of men they do not know.

*S. O. 31*

Much has been done to raise awareness of violence against women by Health Canada and other government and community agencies. The justice minister has, with his recent gun control proposals, moved one small step closer to protecting Canadian women but it is not enough.

It will never be enough until we women can walk the streets and be safe in our homes without fear. Yet there is still considerable denial by men of the cause and effect of this violence. Today the YMCA rose button and white ribbon campaign make a statement of remembrance and commitment.

I ask all men who love a daughter, mother, wife, partner or friend, to wear one of these symbols in solidarity with us. We need their support. The violence will not end unless they rise now and move positively to help us stop it.

\* \* \*

**VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN**

**Mr. Guy H. Arseneault (Restigouche—Chaleur, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today, December 6, is Canada's national day of remembrance and action on violence against women.

We mark this day to remember the December 6, 1989 incident in which 14 young women were tragically killed at l'École polytechnique de Montreal.

[*Translation*]

Violence against women is a sad reality that we must change. However, we cannot change it without the combined efforts of everyone in our society. Statistics Canada recently reported that 51 per cent of women in Canada had been assaulted at least once in their adult life. The problem is very serious.

[*English*]

We have to remember the events of December 6, 1989 and ensure that this kind of tragedy never happens again. We should strive to create a Canada in which violence against women and against all individuals will not be tolerated.

\* \* \*

**VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN**

**Mrs. Marlene Cowling (Dauphin—Swan River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today is the national day of remembrance and action to end violence against women.

We remember the 14 women who lost their lives at l'École polytechnique de Montreal. We remember all Canadian women whose lives were ended by senseless acts of violence, who were taken away from family and friends.

This year 15 women lost their lives to violence in my home province of Manitoba. These women are more than statistics; they are mothers, daughters, sisters, friends and neighbours.

As a nation we mourn their loss and the tomorrows they will never see. We as legislators mourn but remember that we also must act today to educate, to support and to protect. We must make a commitment to the women of Canada, to all Canadians and to ourselves to stop violence.

\* \* \*

(1405)

[*Translation*]

**VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN**

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, five years ago, the murder of 14 young women at l'École polytechnique in Montreal moved and troubled all Quebecers and Canadians. Physical, psychological and sexual violence in many homes, sexual harassment in the work place, incest and genital mutilation are only some manifestations of this violence that millions of women experience daily here and in other parts of the world.

To end this cycle of despair, we must use all the available legal and financial resources, promoting awareness campaigns and education in the broadest sense.

This sad anniversary is an invitation to all governments to step up their efforts so that the events of December 6, 1989 will never happen again.

\* \* \*

**HIBERNIA PROJECT**

**Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to deplore the fact that my native province, Saskatchewan, is not receiving its fair share of work on the Hibernia project.

With almost 3.5 per cent of Canada's population, we did not even get a shipbuilding contract. Our busy shipyards on the shore of Lake Wascana in Regina are ready to contribute. After generations of colonial exploitation by Ontario and Quebec, it is high time that they gave us our share of the gravy. We demand fairness. We must get down to work.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**BANKS**

**Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, when inflation is high bank profits are high. When inflation is low bank profits are high. When interest rates are low bank profits are high. When interest rates are high bank profits are high. Banks made over \$4 billion in profits last year alone. No matter what the economy does banks are consistent winners.

S. O. 31

The finance minister is looking for new sources of revenue to pay down the deficit. Why is he not doing the obvious and asking banks to pay their fair share of the deficit? Why does he continue to burden taxpayers and small business owners with high taxes and reduced services? Why are the banks getting a free ride? Why is he asking Canadians to continue to tighten their belts with social program cutbacks while banks pay no taxes on their profits? Is it because the banks gave over \$700,000 to the Liberal Party's election fund last year?

The government must investigate the banks' profits to ensure consumers and small businesses are not being gouged and to ensure banks pay their fair share of taxes.

\* \* \*

#### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I just returned from a ceremony at the National Research Council of Canada to remember the young women who were murdered at l'École polytechnique de Montréal five years ago.

This ceremony was particularly moving because these young women were in the forefront of women in science and technology. They were students at one of our leading national establishments of science and technology, l'École polytechnique de Montréal.

Some of them were co-op students at the National Research Council that was remembering them this lunch hour.

Let us remember the young women of Montreal and work to remove all the barriers faced by young women in the future, especially those women in science, technology and engineering.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### TRAGEDY AT L'ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE

**Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, December 6, 1989, began like any other day, but by the time it ended, 14 female students at l'École polytechnique in Montreal had been killed by a man who could not accept women invading what he considered to be an exclusive male preserve.

[English]

Fourteen young lives were sacrificed, leaving 14 families, many friends and all Canadians in dismay. Violence against women is the most despicable act society has to face because it is an act of weakness.

In Vancouver a women's monument will be inaugurated in my riding of Vancouver East in the summer of 1995. "Marker of Change" by Beth Albert is comprised of 14 benches of pink Quebec granite. Each bench will bear the name of one of the women murdered at l'École polytechnique.

[Translation]

This monument will be an official declaration that women's lives are precious and that violence cannot be forgiven.

Today I would like to assure the 14 families and the many friends of the women killed on December 6, 1989 that we mourn their loss and that, like them, we will not forget.

\* \* \*

(1410)

[English]

#### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today is the national day of remembrance and action to end violence against women.

It was five years ago today that 14 young women tragically lost their lives at l'École polytechnique de Montreal. Just as disturbing is that 51 per cent of all Canadian women have experienced at least one incident of violence by a man in their adult lives.

It is important that all Canadians reflect on what we can do to eliminate violence against women in our society. We can all make a difference in committing to a principle of zero tolerance. Whether through the support for services to victims, working with local transition houses, shelters, rape crisis centres or by raising awareness within the community we can send a message that such violence is not acceptable.

Violence against women is a reality of our society that must be changed. Let us all work together in the House to realize that change.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### REFERENDUM ON SOVEREIGNTY

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this morning the Quebec Premier, Mr. Jacques Parizeau, made public the draft bill and the consultation process which will lead to the referendum on sovereignty.

What distinguishes this process is its clarity and openness. Indeed, 15 regional commissions will be set up to hold extensive consultations on Quebec's political and constitutional future.

In order to ensure that the debate is as extensive as possible, elected representatives from all political affiliations, as well as non-elected people, will sit on these commissions.

This approach will also ensure that the referendum issue is not debated only by political parties but rather by all Quebecers.

*Oral Questions*

In conclusion, we hope that the Quebec members of the Liberal Party of Canada will respect this process and that they will accept the invitation of the Quebec government to participate in the consultation exercise.

\* \* \*

[English]

**VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN**

**Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, today marks the fifth anniversary of the terrible massacre of 14 young women at l'École polytechnique de Montreal. Once again the families and friends of those who were murdered will suffer the pain and anguish of that tragic day.

Our hearts go out to them as we here and all Canadians pause to remember those loved ones who were so cruelly and senselessly taken from them. Although not part of this tragedy, in far too many cases the use of alcohol fuels the drive to abuse or kill.

Recently the abuse of alcohol has unfortunately been allowed as an excuse for violent action against women. We in this place must ensure that the young women we remember today have not died in vain. Something must be done and done quickly to reverse the message that violence will be tolerated if intoxicated.

Today let all members rededicate themselves to removing violence from our society in whatever form it shows its ugly face.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**TRAGEDY AT L'ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE**

**Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint-Denis, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today is a day to remember and mourn the senseless killing, by a man, of 14 young women at l'École polytechnique. It is also a day to remember all the men, women and children who tragically lost their lives at the hands of armed people.

As parliamentarians, the memory of these innocent women reminds us that we must do everything possible to ensure that such violence does not happen again.

The new regulations on firearms tabled by the Minister of Justice are in response to the need to implement more stringent monitoring measures.

[English]

My sincere condolences to the families of the 14 Montrealers. I wish to let them know that their memory serves as a reminder to all of us that the status quo is no longer acceptable and that the government, through the Minister of Justice, has acted to protect the safety of all Canadians.

[Translation]

**TRAGEDY AT L'ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE**

**Mr. David Berger (Saint-Henri—Westmount, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, five years ago today, Canadians were shocked and horrified to learn that 14 young women had been killed at l'École polytechnique, in Montreal.

Last week, the Minister of Justice announced a series of proposals for better control of firearms. These proposals were well received by the families of the victims, which leads me to believe that this is a step in the right direction.

(1415)

Today, let us remember the victims. I ask members of this House and all Canadians to remember Hélène Colgan, Annie St-Arneault, Maryse Leclair, Geneviève Bergeron, Annie Turcotte, Maryse Laganière, Barbara-Maria Klucznick Widajewicz, Anne-Marie Lemay, Michèle Richard, Sonia Pelletier, Nathalie Croteau, Maud Haviernick, Barbara Daigneault and Anne-Marie Edward.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[Translation]

**GUN CONTROL**

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, five years ago today, fourteen young women lost their lives at l'École polytechnique in Montreal, slain by a murderer who bore a grudge against women. This tragic occurrence sparked a strong movement in favour of increased gun controls as well as an awareness of the pervasive violence against women in our society.

Would the Minister of Justice agree that five years later, the same type of weapon used by the murderer at the polytechnique can still be easily obtained on the market, and that being said, why is he content with a mere action plan instead of tabling legislation with teeth to regulate the sale and circulation of firearms, as he and the Prime Minister promised to do?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last week in the House, we announced what we had decided to do in connection with this government's policy on firearms. We have decided, for instance, to table a bill next February here in the House, to amend the existing legislation. We have three objectives. First, we want to make it clear that Canada does not want the gun culture that exists in the United States and that we need stricter controls on firearms for society in general. Second, we want to make changes in the Criminal Code to ensure that people who use firearms to commit crimes will go to court for appropriate sentencing, and third, we want to protect the public by

*Oral Questions*

introducing universal registration of all firearms and thus encourage compliance with safe storage requirements.

We announced what the government has decided to do with respect to firearms, including—

**The Speaker:** I am sorry, but the minister's time has expired. The hon. member for Roberval.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice is saying some very fine things, but will he admit that under the plan he has put forward, the owners of some 13,000 automatic weapons registered in Canada, including 4,000 AK-47s, which are military weapons, will be legally entitled to keep them until their death?

[English]

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the firearm that was used by Marc Lepine in the tragic events five years ago today will, under the decisions made and announced last week by the government, be prohibited from future sale when the law is enacted and its power exercised.

We have also said that an order in council will be put in place January 1, a few weeks from now, to prohibit outright certain assault pistols and assault shotguns which will be confiscated from those who now have them.

Further, on January 1 next an order in council will be passed which will prohibit over 200 types of paramilitary and assault firearms.

(1420)

It is true to say that those paramilitary firearms, as well as the prohibited handguns, will remain in the hands of those who now have them. However they may not transfer them. They may use them only until they die. They can surrender them to the police or they can disable them. That is the policy.

[Translation]

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister knows perfectly well there are regular instances of firearms being in circulation when owners declare they have been stolen, lost or have otherwise disappeared. His regulations will not solve that problem.

Why does the minister not understand it is important to act now, considering that a large number of women, in Quebec for instance, have been killed by firearms since the tragic events at l'École polytechnique and that his action plan will have no measurable impact before the year 2003?

[English]

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** May I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that nothing is postponed about this plan. On January 1, less than a

month from now, the order in council prohibiting a wide range of firearms will come into effect. In the calendar year 1995 we shall have legislation enacted through Parliament that will introduce the strong criminal penalties that we have announced.

On January 1, 1996 the registration system will begin. Through incitements to early compliance, we expect that the vast majority of firearms and their owners will be registered in the system in the early period after the introduction of that system.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

According to Canadian police and customs officers, prohibited weapons continue to flow into Canada. The vice-president of the Canadian custom officers union is of the opinion that the justice minister's plan of action contains no measure to stop gun smuggling from the United States.

Does the Minister of Justice not agree that the stricter control measures that his government announced last spring have had no effect to date and that his action plan will not be any more successful?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member. We made public last week decisions concerning stricter border control. The Minister of National Revenue, the Solicitor General and I announced last week that the Government of Canada will take steps to ensure that control is exercised at our borders.

[English]

The minister of revenue has announced specific changes in both operational policy and statutory amendments that will give us greater control, including insisting that all shipments of firearms coming to Canada will have permits issued in advance. Second, there will be enhanced supervision at the borders. Third, we will limit the points at the borders at which firearms may enter the country.

Along with universal registration, this will make a difference in cutting down smuggling.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Justice tell us if he plans to take as long to put in place measures to stop gun smuggling from the United States as to implement the registration of firearms?

[English]

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the changes in the administrative and operational practices at the border which were outlined by the minister last week will be effective immediately. Other changes in the statutes will be affected by the bill we will put

*Oral Questions*

before Parliament next February. As soon as that bill is passed those changes will be in place and will be effective.

May I encourage the hon. member opposite to join with the government in these important steps that we have taken for what I know is a common objective between us, a safer country. May I encourage her and her colleagues in that party to join with us in making these changes happen.

\* \* \*

**PROVINCE OF QUEBEC**

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the premier of Quebec today released a draft bill entitled an act respecting the sovereignty of Quebec.

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

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

(1425)

**Mr. Manning:** He also declared his intention to secure the unilateral passage of this bill by the Quebec assembly prior to any referendum.

The bill in question contains references to territorial boundaries, native affairs, federal social programs, citizenship, currency and international treaties, all of which are clearly under the sole jurisdiction of this Parliament.

Does the Government of Canada agree that the draft act respecting the sovereignty of Quebec is beyond the legal powers of the government and assembly of Quebec?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada has every confidence that the people of Quebec, when given the chance to vote on the real question of whether they want to become a part of a separate country or whether they want to stay in Canada, will vote an overwhelming yes to Canada.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we too have confidence that the people of Quebec will make the right decision but that was not my question.

Does the Government of Canada agree that the draft act respecting the sovereignty of Quebec is beyond the legal powers of the government and the assembly of Quebec?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the question of the leader of the third party is as confused as the question of the—

**Some hon. members:** No, no.

**Ms. Copps:** The premier of Quebec has no right to put a bill before the people when the people have not chosen the route of separation.

We do not intend to enter the kind of slippery slope of speculation that the leader of the third party wants to take us down.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this debate between federalism and separatism will only be enhanced by people being presented with the facts.

I ask the Deputy Prime Minister the question once more. Does the Government of Canada agree that the draft act respecting the sovereignty of Quebec is beyond the legal powers of the government and the assembly of Quebec?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the leader of the Reform Party is playing Jacques Parizeau's game.

We do not intend to play that game. We intend to ask the people of Quebec a very clear question: Do you want to stay with Canada or do you want to separate? That is the question they will be voting on in the referendum.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**BOSNIA**

**Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister of defence.

While the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe is meeting in Budapest, where the international community is endlessly debating how to make the Bosnian Serbs listen to reason, the Bosnian Serbs themselves continue to thumb their nose at the UN and the major powers. They still refuse to release their 309 detainees, including 55 Canadian peacekeepers.

Does the defence minister confirm that the 55 Canadian peacekeepers held hostage for 13 days have not been released, as the Bosnian Serbs promised, and is this not another proof of the bad faith of the Serbs, who do not honour any of their commitments?

**Hon. David Michael Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that a meeting was held yesterday between the UN commander in Bosnia, General Rose, and the Bosnian Serbs.

The Bosnian Serbs have given General Rose assurances that all detainees would be released soon.

[English]

That means we have had assurances from the Bosnian Serb leadership, Dr. Karadzic and General Mladic, yesterday in Pale when General Rose met with them that all of the UN detainees—there are about 350 right now—will be released soon.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Serbs have promised several times to release the peacekeepers, but it has not happened yet.

(1430)

Are we to understand that the Bosnian Serbs have not agreed to release the peacekeepers held hostage because the UN refuses to promise that NATO will not launch more air strikes against them?

[English]

**Hon. David Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do agree with the hon. member that it is very frustrating to have these continual assurances from the Bosnian Serbs. We had it on Friday when Mr. Akashi, the Secretary-General's representative, negotiated a deal with the leadership and only a few people were subsequently released. We hope that this latest negotiation will bear fruit.

With respect to the specific aspect concerning NATO air strikes, that framework was agreed to by NATO last spring. Canada is a signatory to that framework. Those air strikes can be utilized when and if the double key is unlocked, i.e., the commander on the ground advocates it and NATO agrees and of course the UN representative Mr. Akashi also agrees.

\* \* \*

#### PROVINCE OF QUEBEC

**Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in replying to the leader of the Reform Party the Deputy Prime Minister said, and I paraphrase it, that we intend to ask a certain question and that is the question of the unity of Canada versus the separation of Quebec.

Shall we take from that response that it is the intention of the federal government to put its own question to the people of Quebec and to the people of Canada on the clear question of separation?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** The House leader of the Reform Party is on very dangerous ground when at a very crucial point in Canada's history he and his leader and other members of his party are more intent on attacking the federal government than on attacking the separatists.

What I said in response to the question of the leader of the Reform Party was that we will not be drawn into speculation. The supposed bill that was put before the people of Quebec today by the premier of Quebec is not legitimate because the question has not been asked. The key question and the question that we will ask and ask and ask again over the next number of

#### Oral Questions

months to the people of Quebec is: Do you want to separate from Canada or do you want to remain?

We are confident that by working with all members of the House, working with the Reform Party, working with the Conservative Party, working with the New Democratic Party, that the cause of federalism will succeed because Quebecers want to be a full participating partner in Canada.

**Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome two pieces of information from the Deputy Prime Minister. One is that she and her government will have a co-operative attitude with all federalist parties. The second is that she views the bill tabled today by the premier of Quebec as not legitimate.

Is it therefore the intention of the Government of Canada to make it clear to the government of Quebec and to Mr. Parizeau that this Parliament has the sole legal right and the sole jurisdiction in areas such as boundaries, native affairs, citizenship, currency, international treaties and federal pension programs? Is that the intention and does she intend to express that view clearly to Mr. Parizeau?

[Translation]

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what we will say to Mr. Parizeau is that if he really had the courage of his convictions, he would ask the real question, which is: Do you want to separate, yes or no?

Since he did not ask that question but tabled books and studies by commissions, he is not sure that he will win. We are convinced that Quebecers will vote to stay in Canada.

\* \* \*

#### MIL DAVIE SHIPYARD

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry. This morning, we learned that the deputy ministers of Transport and Industry of the Quebec and federal governments will meet right here in Ottawa tomorrow on the future of Quebec's last great shipyard, MIL Davie, which is threatened with closure.

Can the minister tell us what mandate he gave senior officials concerning what his government intends to do to help the MIL Davie shipyard?

(1435)

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I explained several times here in the House, I think that the first thing is for MIL Davie to complete a business plan and have it accepted and supported by its shareholder, the Government of Quebec, and have it accepted by the employees of MIL Davie.



*Oral Questions*

There are very difficult problems these days. We are prepared to discuss with the shareholder, the Government of Quebec, but there will still be several things to discuss. We are always ready to hold meetings like the one scheduled for tomorrow.

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question concerned the mandate.

Can the Minister of Industry confirm whether, in addition to a contract for building a new ferry for the Magdalen Islands, the question of benefits from the Hibernia megaproject will be discussed, following the flagrant injustice which the Hibernia consortium did to MIL Davie?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** As always, Mr. Speaker, the Bloc engages in demagoguery. Is the hon. member prepared to accept that yesterday, when the member for Roberval spoke about a process of rationalization, he had the facts wrong? He misrepresented them when he said that most of the rationalization was in Quebec.

Is the hon. member ready to accept, first, that the Government of Quebec, as MIL Davie's shareholder, is responsible for taking a position on the business plan? Does the Bloc think that the Government of Quebec is unable to solve the problems of its company, MIL Davie? If they think so, do they think that the Government of Quebec is unable to handle the business of the province of Quebec?

\* \* \*

[English]

**SMALL BUSINESSES LOANS ACT**

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the government plans to increase the lending ceiling under the Small Businesses Loans Act to \$12 billion. This money is available for fixed assets, not working capital.

The industry committee report "Taking Care of Small Business" identified working capital as the problem, not asset capital. In fact suppliers of funding for asset financing asked that the government not compete with them.

Why did the government not follow the recommendations of its own committee and address the working capital needs of small business particularly exporters, rather than increasing competition with the existing sources of asset capital at significant expense to taxpayers?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let us understand first of all the proposal we brought forward yesterday. It indicates clearly that in making the amendments to

the Small Businesses Loans Act it is our intention to ensure that program is of no cost to the government.

In that sense the additional fees we proposed to charge and the cap on the interest rates will contribute to that. We have indicated we will work with all stakeholders to ensure that the changes we make continue to provide an effective program for small businesses to meet their needs and will not cost the taxpayers by way of calls on the loan guarantees.

I also want to emphasize for the hon. member that the reason we raised the limit is very simple. Over the course of the last 18 months the demand by small businesses for assistance under that program has caused it to reach its limit of \$4 billion. That is how successful and popular the program is. I believe it contributed directly to the 400,000 jobs that have been created in this country in the last year.

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, you do not have to be rocket surgeon to figure out that if you increase the rate, if you lower the amount that is available, if you make it easier for the banks to roll over their delinquent or their poorer loans, people are going to take advantage of it. The problem is that we are making it easy for the banks to get rich.

Canadian taxpayers now subsidize the Small Businesses Loans Act up to \$100 million a year. The government proposes a 1 per cent fee to offset anticipated future losses. However, the industry committee recommended that small business loans guaranteed under the act carry an interest rate commensurate with risk.

(1440)

What specific safeguards has the minister implemented that will ensure this does not become just one big subsidy program for the banks?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, you do not need to be a brain scientist to know that if you are going to get a government program right you really ought to consult with the stakeholders that are using it.

The member raises a serious question. I want to assure him that I share his concerns as he has expressed them about what could be done with the program.

The hon. member should know that we did commission a study of this program by Professor Allan Riding of Carleton University. His study indicated that the changes that were brought into effect in 1993 have actually resulted in increased loans at least 60 per cent of which were incremental to what would otherwise have been out there and were directly related to job creation.

That is why we believe the first priority should be to raise the cap so that the program continues to be as useful as it was to

*Oral Questions*

small business. We will make the changes. I understand what he is asking for. That is what we will endeavour to do in the changes. We do not want the program to be a subsidy to the banks.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### SOCIAL PROGRAM REFORM

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Yesterday, the minister claimed that 96 per cent of Canadians supported an in-depth reform of social programs. The minister even had the nerve to claim that these 96 per cent supported his approach. However, he should know that Canadians do not support a social program reform which will be effected at the expense of the poor.

How can the minister claim that his reform is supported by a majority of Canadians when over 80 women's groups, including the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, clearly reject his UI reform because it is discriminatory and primarily targets women?

[*English*]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what I said yesterday was simply to repeat the results that were taken by a nationwide survey.

What is important to note is that when the survey is broken down by region as many people in Quebec support the social reform proposals of the government as in the rest of Canada. What is equally important is that according to the survey as many women support the programs for social reform as do men. There is absolute equality among genders in supporting our social reform proposals.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, when will the minister realize that his reform will make women more financially dependent on their spouses, since their eligibility for UI benefits as well as the level of those benefits will depend on their spouses' income?

[*English*]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Actually, Mr. Speaker, it is quite the reverse.

If one looks at the proposals for two tiers established by some income test the fact of the matter is low income women in poorer regions would be the major beneficiaries of that proposal. That is the point of debate. The facts and analysis being presented by

the hon. member have no root whatsoever in the real analysis and evaluation. I would be glad to share that with the hon. member as it was contained in the unemployment insurance papers.

That is the point. Let us get away from mythology. Let us get away from exaggeration. Let us get down to the facts. The facts are that under our proposals for improved child care, improved working opportunities and improved benefits, women will be much better off in terms of gaining equal access to the workforce.

\* \* \*

### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for the Status of Women.

It has been five years since 14 women, all student engineers, died at l'École polytechnique in Montreal. It has been four years since the all-party report on violence against women was tabled in this House of Commons.

Since none of the report recommendations have been implemented to date, could the minister tell this House when we might see action on the proposals contained in the document?

**Hon. Sheila Finestone (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I know my colleague has been very committed to the whole field of action against violence and was a very important member of that committee that deposited that report.

(1445)

Violence against women and children is a question which we have addressed in our red book. It is a question to which this government is very committed. It is a multifaceted program which includes legislative action, educational activity and co-operative development with our federal, provincial and territorial partners as well as with police, the advertising industry, et cetera.

I think the Minister of Justice has brought in a very significant package that does answer many of the reports. The fundamentals and our first task in this House is to bring forward legislation that will set the guidelines, the yardstick, the measurement against which we will attend to people who commit and continue violence against women.

I say that the other role we have to play is educational.

**Mr. Abbott:** Time.

**Mr. Peterson:** More.

**Mrs. Finestone:** You are not the Speaker.

**The Speaker:** I was going to say once you sit down, you are out of the game.

*Oral Questions***EMPLOYMENT EQUITY**

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Although employment equity already exists in practice across much of the federal government, the minister will soon legislate hiring in the public service based on race, gender and disability. The minister says that he does not believe in hiring quotas, but his legislation will instead require numerical goals.

Will the minister tell us the difference between numerical goals and hiring quotas in the fulfilling of the demands of the employment equity program?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows that was a clear commitment we made during the last election campaign, that we would reform the employment equity programs. I would remind hon. members we have over 170 members to prove just how many Canadians supported that mandate.

The importance of ensuring equal access and equal opportunity in the workplace is one of the primary objectives to ensuring a good effective economy as well as ensuring the rights of men, women and all those who have disabilities or are visible minorities.

I will be tabling legislation next week in co-operation with my colleague the President of the Treasury Board. At that time the hon. member will get a full view of what is presented in the legislation. I cannot pre-present myself. I think the hon. member should wait and see what the bill has to say.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the public service has always prided itself on the fact that it has always done its hiring based on merit and merit only. The managers who fail to meet these numerical targets, goals, quotas or whatever the minister may want to call them will inevitably be disciplined.

What will the minister do to ensure that the managers who are doing the hiring and firing in the civil service are doing it based on merit and merit alone?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should know that the public service of the Government of Canada has been subject to a series of guidelines related to employment equity going back to the previous Liberal government when the then Solicitor General who was responsible established a very good regime.

We want to ensure in the legislation that there is clear parity and balance between the rules that apply in the private sector

and the public sector. This is something that was asked for by the public servants of Canada.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN**

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Health.

I would like to remind the minister that the director of the bureau of veterinary drugs at Health Canada, and I think she should know this, the boss of the bureau that is examining somatotropin to advise the minister on the approval being sought for this drug, is lobbying on Parliament Hill to promote the advantages of this hormone.

How can the minister blatantly use her director's leave without pay as an excuse, as she did yesterday, to condone this conflict of interest?

**Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the person in question has been on leave of absence for a year and a half. During his leave of absence, he does work for Health Canada and does not speak on behalf of Health Canada.

(1450)

That being said, I am aware of the hon. member's concerns about this matter, and I have asked my deputy minister to look into the matter in order to give everyone the assurance that the conflict of interest guidelines for the Public Service have not been circumvented.

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, how can the minister guarantee that her director, who is on leave without pay and is lobbying on behalf of a number of drug companies, will not influence the recommendations of the bureau of veterinary drugs of Health Canada regarding somatotropin, since the director did not reveal his connection with the department?

**Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I may remind the hon. member that bovine somatotropin has not been approved and that this drug will only be approved once the department's researchers have the assurance it will have no negative effects on either Canadians or cows.

\* \* \*

[English]

**CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD**

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the minister of agriculture defended commissioners of the Canadian Wheat Board by stating that they participated in

*Oral Questions*

public meetings by “discussing a broad variety of aspects pertaining to the marketing of western Canadian grain”.

The minister also said: “None of the commissioners were actively involved in any campaign for the advisory committee”. It seems curious that the minister did not see the article written by commissioner Richard Klassen in various farm papers promoting not a variety of views but one particular view on the Canadian Wheat Board.

Will the minister review the actions of Mr. Klassen and the other commissioners to see which commissioners violated the stance of political neutrality?

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it seems to me not unusual that a commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board would from time to time defend the policies and practices of the Canadian Wheat Board. That seems to be quite logical in the ordinary course of events of being a commissioner of the wheat board.

If the hon. gentleman has any specific allegation that he would care to make with respect to any kind of impropriety on behalf of any particular individual or commissioner associated with the Canadian Wheat Board, I suggest that he should bring that allegation forward specifically and not engage in these broad based innuendos.

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, section 17(4) of the Canadian Wheat Board Act states: “It is the duty of the board to exercise direction and supervision over the administrative conduct of an election of members of the advisory committee”. Therefore the role of the commissioners is parallel that of Elections Canada in a federal election.

Several commissioners by promoting the point of view of one group of candidates violated the Canadian Wheat Board Act. Will the minister call for the resignation of all commissioners who actively campaigned during the period leading up to the election of the Canadian Wheat Board advisory committee?

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the short answer to the hon. gentleman’s question is no because I have no information before me at the present time that would justify any of his allegations.

\* \* \*

**PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT**

**Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Transport Canada has more than doubled the parking meter rates at Pearson International Airport terminals 1 and 2, hiking the rates from \$3 per hour to \$8 per hour.

Will the minister explain why such huge increases are being levied on the travelling public at a time when disposable income is on the decrease?

**Mr. Joe Fontana (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I know that the member is concerned with the safe and efficient operations at Pearson as the minister is. I want to tell the member that the rates have not been changed since 1991 except for the changes necessary because of the Ontario tax changes. Also, the parking meters are provided at the most congestion sensitive areas of the airport and are only meant to provide short term parking for luggage and dispersing of passengers. If people want to park for longer periods of time then the parking garage at Pearson is only \$3 per half hour. That is how we are going to deal with the congestion problems at Pearson.

\* \* \*

(1455)

[Translation]

**FISHERIES**

**Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

At the last federal-provincial Conference of fisheries ministers, on November 1, the Government of Quebec ask the federal government to transfer a portion of the fisheries management function to the province. Soon after, the minister of fisheries announced in this House that he intended to reorganize fisheries, stating that he was looking forward to pursuing productive exchanges and discussions with all the provinces, including Quebec.

Why has the minister not yet responded to the request from the Quebec fisheries minister, when he is about to table a fisheries plan that will affect the entire industry in the Atlantic zone? Why?

[English]

**Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member is absolutely right. It is a shocking thing that fully 35 days have passed since the Government of Quebec tabled a proposal that would radically alter the nature of the relationship between the federal government and the provincial government. This government has not yet offered a comprehensive response to this radical altering of the nature of the way in which we manage the marine fisheries and we have had fully 35 days to deal with it, to fully discuss it and implement it. It is a shocking, shocking thing and I will attempt to do better in the future.

\* \* \*

**GUN CONTROL**

**Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in Revenue Canada’s press release last week on gun control it was indicated: “The RCMP and Revenue Canada Customs are using

*Oral Questions*

resources allocated under the government's anti-smuggling initiative and will continue with stepped up measures to combat smuggling". Even the justice minister accepts the fact that there are thousands of guns coming across the border every month and yet the port of Fort Erie across from Buffalo has only interdicted six per month in the last year, six out of one thousand.

Does the revenue minister agree that both he and the justice minister are giving a false sense of security to Canadians with their ill thought out gun control legislation and the fact they will not be able to enforce the laws at the border anyway?

**Hon. David Anderson (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member appears to be unaware that the proposals for gun control are extremely well thought out and in fact have wide support among the Canadian people.

Further, with respect to the border, I do not know where he gets these precise accurate figures on illegal weapons unless he himself is out there doing it.

\* \* \*

**VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN**

**Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. As she will know, in the last four years we have had two major reports on violence against women: one, the war on women which is a subcommittee of Parliament and, second, the panel on violence against women which cost over \$11 million. She will also know that transition homes, rape counselling centres and women's centres continually struggle for adequate funding.

I want to ask the Deputy Prime Minister whether her government is committed to ensuring through core funding the continuation of these essential services which help to prevent, to treat and counsel against violence against women and whether her government will do so through shared costing with the provinces and territories.

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I can certainly assure the hon. member, knowing her own personal interest in this issue and the interest of her party, that we are going to do everything we can to live up to the commitments that we made in the red book to make Canada a fairer and a safer place for all women.

That is why we moved within the first year on specific legislation on gun control, a very strong package which could prevent the Marc Lepine massacre from happening again. That is why we are moving very soon on pay equity legislation, so the women in the public service get the equal treatment they deserve. That is why we will respect our commitment to core funding for transition houses, so the women of Canada can be

protected from violence whether it comes from the streets, from their neighbours or sadly, from their own homes.

\* \* \*

(1500)

**CORNWALLIS PARK DEVELOPMENT AGENCY**

**Mr. Harry Verran (South West Nova, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in South West Nova the Cornwallis Park Development Agency has been established to promote economic development since the government announced the closure of CFB Cornwallis.

Can the Minister of National Defence assure this House that the government remains committed to ensuring the economic viability of the Cornwallis community? Will the Department of National Defence work together with the Cornwallis Park Development Agency to render CFB Cornwallis property attractive to outside investors?

**Hon. David Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I can certainly give the assurances to my hon. friend from South West Nova who has worked very hard for the interests of his constituents after we closed the forces base at Cornwallis.

One of the things the government announced in the last budget was the establishment of the Lester B. Pearson Peacekeeping Institute. We want to make this a world class facility for trainers in peacekeeping techniques.

We hope to be able to divert more funding through bilateral arrangements with some of the eastern European nations and other European nations as a result of the readjustment of NATO infrastructure funds.

We are absolutely and totally committed to helping make that establishment a world class facility, but also to preserving many of the buildings on the site so that the hon. member and the local authority can market them and give that base a new economic life.

\* \* \*

**POINTS OF ORDER**

## COMMENTS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.):** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think upon reflection you will find that the Minister of National Revenue has accused me of smuggling guns. I believe that was exactly what he had to say.

**Hon. David Anderson (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if there was any suggestion that the hon. member was smuggling guns I immediately would like to correct that impression. My question was only how does he get these accurate figures on the guns that are smuggled?

*Government Orders*

**The Speaker:** I take it that whatever was said hopefully is withdrawn and that no offence was intended.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond–Guiral (Laval–Centre, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a thought on violence against children, a painful reality I have often been confronted with in my profession.

Even if our instinctive reaction of outrage tends to overshadow everything else when we are confronted with such unacceptable tragedies, I have learned from experience to read in this violence the signs of a society which is out of balance, a society in which social expectations of performance at any cost, family isolation, financial difficulties and psychological deficiencies play a major role. These are sick families.

As Fairholm wrote in a book published in 1990 and entitled “Child Abuse Prevention Program for Adolescents”, children of all ages are abused. In every social, economic, racial and ethnic environment, there are adults abusing children under their care. All families and all children are vulnerable to this problem. Psychological violence is at the root of all forms of abuse or negligence, but we do not know how common physical neglect actually is. Is such ignorance tolerable? I do not think so.

(1505)

In conclusion, I would like to go back to the events of December 6, 1989, exactly five years ago today. A light late afternoon snow is falling on the city, when horror suddenly strikes: 14 young women are gone forever, robbed of a promising future.

This tragedy affected me personally because I knew one of the victims; her name was Anne–Marie. In memory of all her sisters, I laid 14 white lilies near her grave. I thought for a moment of adding a red rose dedicated to Marc Lépine’s mother, but I decided against it because the violence done to this woman in the evening of December 6 was beyond imagination. This woman died deep in her soul.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Dear colleagues, the issue we are dealing with is a very serious one, so I would ask my colleagues to hold their discussions outside the House. The hon. member may continue.

**Mrs. Dalphond–Guiral:** Mr. Speaker, I thought for a moment of adding a red rose dedicated to Marc Lépine’s mother, but I decided against it because the violence done to this woman in the evening of December 6 went beyond imagination. This woman died deep in her soul.

I want to tell her today what I could not tell her on December 6, 1989: We share your pain in solidarity and we refuse to condone daily violence because it always erupts in the end, leaving indelible scars.

I say to the grieving families, particularly the three families in Laval, that they are in our thoughts and that this ultimate sacrifice has become the symbol of the campaign to eliminate violence against women.

[*English*]

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** December 6, 1989. Memories come flying of that night five years ago. I remember it very well. I remember it was cold and there was a lot of snow in Ottawa.

I remember the night particularly because the then Leader of the Opposition, the then member for Vancouver Quadra had a party at Stornoway for members of the Liberal caucus. I remember the fellowship, the Christmas cheer.

I remember a number of us going out for dinner after the party at Stornoway. I remember in particular there were more than a dozen of us in a downtown Ottawa restaurant waiting for the member for Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte, now the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. We were wondering what was keeping him and why he was holding up our evening. I can remember. So many memories like this are etched in our minds. I can see the hon. member standing ashen faced in the restaurant doorway coming to tell us he had just heard the news on the radio of the 14 young women at l’École polytechnique.

I remember many things and forget others. Hon. members know the hon. member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke has sat for many years in this House and is one of its senior members. He was sitting next to me and he said things like that do not happen in Canada. They are not supposed to happen.

(1510)

I remember later that night back in my apartment the member for Saint–Laurent—Cartierville and I were riveted to the television set watching Ian MacDonald of CBC report from l’École polytechnique. I remember the flowers in the snow. In particular I remember a beautiful young student talking about her fateful meeting with Marc Lépine in one of the corridors at l’École polytechnique. She described how she saw him and she crouched down and how he pointed the gun at her and fired twice. Both times through chance and the incredible grace of God it misfired. She kept saying she did not know why she was alive and the others were not.

*Government Orders*

I remember most particularly from first hearing the news to today five years later realizing that in this instance women were culled from the crowd. They were singled out. They were stood against a wall and they were executed.

They were executed because in that diseased mind, and there is no question of that, they had raised themselves above the trench, if you will. They had taken a step away from the norm. They had gone into a non-traditional profession for women. They had dared to do something that in that diseased mind women were not supposed to do.

I want to say a very special word about two of my former colleagues in this House. I want to pay tribute most particularly to Dawn Black, the former New Democratic Party critic on the status of women. Through her efforts on a private member's bill she sponsored this day has become the day of remembrance and action.

I remember being in this House many times speaking and supporting Dawn and being supported by the other women I would like to pay tribute to today. There is the Hon. Mary Collins who was then the Minister responsible for the status of women. I also want to pay tribute to our colleague from Saint-Hubert from the Bloc Quebecois who also supported us very much on that.

I remember these things and I want all of us to remember these things. I remember the people I met when this terrible tragedy focused the debate and the battle against violence against women. One person I will never forget and to whom I would also like to pay tribute today is Suzanne Laplante-Edward, the mother of Anne Marie Edward, one of the victims. She would probably not want to be singled out. She would talk about herself as a parent and an activist but she has become a symbol as well. She would probably have preferred to remain the mother of an engineer.

What happened on that cold December night in Montreal galvanized all of us to a degree but we still have much farther to go. It is very true that violence against men and against children exists in our society. However it is not sensible to refuse to recognize that violence against women is a particular problem that exists in every cultural group, in every society, east, west, north, south, in every racial background. It is a tragedy and a horror, but it is there. Asking what about men and what about children does not take away from the fact that there is the peculiar and particular problem that in far too many cases women wake up in their own houses and are afraid. When we talk about fighting this problem it does not mean that we think less of the victims of other forms of violence. It does mean that we underline this problem as a special one, as one that needs special responses and special protections. I mentioned journalists before and I spoke about Ian MacDonald from the CBC. I want to say a word about Stevie Cameron. I doubt there is a

woman who read the *Globe and Mail* that week that does not remember Stevie Cameron's incredible column that was entitled "What do we tell our bright and shining daughters?" She spoke for all of us, those who are the mothers of daughters and those who are not but who have a responsibility to all the daughters. She talked about issues of safety. She talked about bringing up young women so that they do not have to be afraid. She talked about the way we all worry about our young, whether they are ours personally or ours generically. I will always remember her words.

(1515)

Just yesterday I looked at a plaque in my office with the pictures of those 14 young women. I think the average age was 22. There was one I remember looking at and saying: "Gosh she was quite old. She was 29". I think of the terrible waste that took place in Montreal that night. Those young women would have made such a contribution to their profession, to their own families, to their communities, to their province, to their country, to all of us.

Madam Edwards mentioned in her interview in the *Montreal Gazette* this morning that what was lost there was not just all that beauty, talent, youth and enthusiasm. As a country we lost some of our innocence and our naivete because, as my colleague from Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke said, this is not supposed to happen in Canada and suddenly it had happened.

We have many spirited debates about the question of gun control, about questions of violence, about how to deal with and how to make sure that what happened in Montreal will never happen again. If we are lucky never again will we see a mass murder like that. We all pray that we will not. The tragedy is that we do see this violence against women every day.

There is a badge that some of us are wearing today that says: "Never again, December 6, 1989". The tragedy is that it is still going on. The tragedy is that we have not yet come to grips with how to deal with the question of violence against women. The tragedy is that every six days a woman is killed in this country with a firearm. I did not make up that statistic. It is not false. It is there. The tragedy is that women are beaten, brutalized and abused.

Yes, others are beaten, brutalized and abused but on a continuum—I underline this and repeat this—there is a particular, horrible and deep-rooted problem in our society, right here in Canada, whether in British Columbia, Yukon, Nova Scotia, southern Ontario, whether in a city or on a farm, it can and does happen in every single one of our ridings. To a degree we are all frightened and struck by our helplessness in the face of this ghastly and unacceptable situation.

We are legislators. We are all here, every one of us, no matter what our political belief or background, because we want to do what is best for our constituents and for the people of our

*Government Orders*

country. We have to legislate in the way we see fit. We have to understand that to root out this kind of horrible growth in our society, sometimes the surgery that has to be undertaken is radical.

(1520)

If it means intervening and removing certain rights, whether it is the right to privacy, the right to have certain things in our possession, then I have to say that every single one of us has to understand that the problem is so severe and so ongoing and so all-pervasive that I fear we will all be judged very harshly if we do not take the steps necessary to cure it.

A year and a half ago the blue ribbon panel on violence against women reported. It was the summer before the election and part of my job at that time was to respond. I now think that to some degree my response was harsh. It was an expensive panel. As the hon. member for Yukon mentioned, it spent almost \$11 million. To this day I have reservations about some of its responses.

However, one thing I did not make enough of at the time and I need to make something of today, and I know other speakers will also, is the committee very clearly stated the acceptance by the general population of the deep-seated problem of violence against women. I call it what it is, violence against women. It is not domestic violence, not spousal violence. Do not try to hide it behind words. It is violence against women. It is something that too many people in our society still do not accept. They think that it belongs to some strange subculture. There are some even in the House, and again I impute no motives but is just a lack of awareness, who think it is provoked, who think that there are reasons in a victimology that creates violence against women.

We all have to ensure that we understand the issue, and that we understand that to hit another person is wrong. It is a criminal offence. It does not deserve to be put in a special category because it happened in the home, because it was between husband and a wife, because it was between two people who share a bed and a history that it is somehow different. It is violence. It is always a crime. It is never acceptable. There are too many dead bodies. There are too many injured women. There are too many scarred children.

This is Canada. The member for Renfrew—Pembroke—Nipissing said it five years ago tonight: “This kind of thing does not happen here”. This kind of thing should not happen here. But we have a responsibility to do everything in our power as legislators to ensure that it does not.

**Ms. Catterall:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Because of the interest in this debate, I wish to inform you and the House that the government members will be dividing their time from this point on.

(1525)

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join in the debate and to follow the very moving and eloquent words of the member for Halifax. I am sure the House was moved in a very real and a very positive way five years ago when this tragic occurrence took place.

It is particularly timely to reflect on that. We are exploring violence in our society as we begin to discuss the impending legislation, Bill C-41, which is the hate law and the legislation to come on gun control.

All of these things are intermingled and mixed with the violence that seems to be pervasive in our society. When we turn on the television and see children's programs that are one violent scene after another, when we go to movies and see that they are based almost exclusively on violence can we wonder when it happens in our midst what causes it?

This incident was horrible to a degree that we in Canada had not ever seen previously. It was aimed not randomly but specifically at women. The action was taken by someone who could have lived next door to any one of us, by someone who could have been one of our children, someone who otherwise seemed to be normal and just like everybody else.

This happened to ordinary people who were identified specifically because they were women and the killer thought they were a threat to him. They were engineering students in an occupation that traditionally has not had a lot of women.

My wife and I have a daughter who is an engineer. We understand that females who are engineers are unique because there are not that many of them. This touches so many of our lives because of the very ordinariness of the people who were affected by it and by the fact that it happened in Canada. This kind of thing just does not happen in Canada.

It does happen in Canada. It happens all over our country. It happens with alarming frequency. It happens with randomness. Here in Ottawa we had a young man who had just finished university shot and killed by a random act of violence in a drive-by shooting by a young offender.

When we compare that to the horrific events of the l'École Polytechnique five years ago, we have to speak to all of the people who are victims of violence, not just those who were tragically killed that night. Barb Danelesko was awakened in her home. She is just as dead, just as gone from her loved ones as anyone else.

As a society and as a legislative body we need to get beyond the superficial and see if we cannot find out what are the underlying problems in our society that cause or will allow this



*Government Orders*

kind of tragedy to happen. Violence against women is usually a domestic situation.

(1530)

One thing that has puzzled me is that when there is violence in a domestic situation it is the women and the children who end up leaving the home and going to a shelter. The perpetrator of the violence is given a warning but usually that is about it. It is usually a male and he is usually allowed to go to work and lead a fairly normal life. What happens to the children? They end up being shunted about, torn from their home, torn from the things most familiar to them, torn from their friends and perhaps even torn from extended families if they are being stalked.

Why can we not throw the husband in jail? It is because the husband has rights. Society does not have rights. The children do not have rights. The wife who may well be dead does not have rights but the husband has rights.

The member for Halifax mentioned in her dissertation when she alluded to the question of gun control that sometimes in the greater good the rights of others need to be trampled. I believe in this reference she was speaking about firearms, and perhaps the rights of people to own and use firearms for the greater good have to be in some way restricted.

If we accept that as being true, surely in the interest of the same greater good the rights of husbands should also be curtailed. It makes absolutely no sense to me that society would have a situation where we protect the rights of an abuser or a husband, take the wife and the children from the home and put them into a shelter because we cannot in any way interfere with the rights of the husband. It makes no sense whatsoever. Why can we not throw him in jail for 90 days or 120 days, for a cooling off period?

Statistics show the vast majority of women are injured or killed as a result of domestic situations. However also in a vast majority of cases neighbours or friends know a disaster is about to happen. If we as fellow citizens, neighbours or relatives know that, why can we not intervene? Why can we not tell the police?

One of the underlying factors in domestic homicide is violence. If people are not getting along the chances of them being shot are greatly enhanced. Therefore it would be a good idea if the police very quietly and very gently said: "We know you are having problems. We do not want them to get worse. We know that you have guns. We want to remove these guns from your home for the protection of society and for the greater good. When the problems abate we will return them".

These laws are on the books right now. It would not require one new law. The police have the right to confiscate weapons if they feel and have good knowledge that there is the possibility of a crime being committed with the weapons.

We need to be cautious when we are promulgating laws that deal with violence in homes, violence in general or violence in society. We have a situation in the country where violence is really endemic in society. In my view we are now trying to put politics ahead of principle. The principle we as a nation should hold dear is that we will not condone or in any way allow violence to become the way to resolve disputes in our society. Whether it is father and son, husband and wife or brother against brother, we are not going to use violence as a means of solving disputes in society.

(1535)

We all agree on principle. I am sure every member of the House would disagree with the statement of principle that we do not want violence to be the means by which we resolve differences. What happens in a society when we say that some forms of violence or violence directed toward some people is more reprehensible than others? In my view that happens when we start to introduce penalties associated with a defining characteristic of the victim rather than the principle that we should not be doing it. It is almost as though we make allowances for some forms of violence or violence toward some people because they do not happen to fit in to a protected category.

I know this is not the intent of the legislation. I know this is not the intent of the government. However it is the reality of the legislation and the government if not the intent. We have abrogated the principle of evenness and fairness to all and replaced it with the notion that crimes committed against a person of a particular gender or with a particular defining characteristic are more heinous than crimes committed against the norm. That just does not make sense.

It does not speak to the root problem in society, that we tolerate ever increasing levels of violence as a means of resolving disputes. We see that in our grade schools. We see that on television when we turn on the TV. I wonder how many people have ever seen "Power Rangers", the children's program that was banned in many places.

When children grow up watching an ever increasing level of violence that is accepted, tolerated and condoned, is it any wonder that we end up with a society that uses violence to resolve disputes? I am speaking directly to the question of domestic violence, which is the vast majority of violence in our society.

Another form of violence I would like to spend a few minutes speaking to this afternoon is the violence directed toward children. That violence is the passive violence of neglect. In Edmonton there is a home called the Youth Emergency Shelter which is pretty much run by a few professional, very capable staff members and a lot of volunteers. It is pretty much supported by donations. It has a tremendous reputation within the community.

*Government Orders*

In 1983 in a nine-month period the Youth Emergency Shelter in Edmonton comforted around 200 young people around the ages of 14 to 16. Last year it was 200 and some or about a 15 per cent increase in the number of people helped by the Youth Emergency Shelter. We talked to the people at the shelter and asked them why people came to them and what their success rate was in salvaging young lives.

(1540)

If we are to use a prophylactic approach to violence in our community, it would make great sense to be far more interventionist in support of agencies like the Youth Emergency Shelter so that children and young people 13 years old, who certainly could not be called children, have a place to which to go and be welcomed without question. They do not have to go to the door, knock on the door and ask to come in because they have done this or that. All they have to do is show up. When they are there they have to abide by the rules. They are welcomed. They are fed. They are given warmth and love. An attempt is made when possible to reunite the young people with their families.

What often happens is that a situation between a parent and a child becomes desperate and reaches a pivotal moment. Words are said and perhaps even blows are exchanged. One thing leads to another and the child leaves the home. Even if it is not the case, many young people feel they just cannot go back, that they are not welcome.

In many cases all that is required is a cooling off period, an opportunity for the young people to give it a second thought and the parents to speak to someone who has had some experience in this regard. As parents we all perhaps think we are inventing every situation as it comes along, but I have learned through my association, limited thought it is, with the Youth Emergency Shelter and my long experience with the youth programs of the Rotary that none of us are going through a unique occurrence. It has always happened to someone else before and many of us are in exactly the same boat.

It requires someone with some skill, some compassion and motivation to be an intervener and to build a bridge between the parents and the children to get the children, where possible, back into the nurturing environment of their homes. As we know that is not always the case. From time to time the only hope for a young person is to get out of an abusive situation.

We could make a tremendous return on our investment in society if we were to ensure that those young people who could not go back to their homes had another place to which they could go where they would feel safe and secure. We could keep them out of jail and perhaps they could become productive members of society.

I have had an opportunity to share in the debate today. I did so recognizing that violence in society directed toward women is something that all of us, men and women, have a role to play in preventing or in some way ameliorating. As well we need to look

at the complete and the broader picture of violence as a part of our society, in particular the passive violence of neglect and abuse of children at home.

*[Translation]*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Earlier I said that I would recognize the hon. member for Matapédia—Matane. Since the Minister of Justice is not here to take the floor, I recognize the member for Matapédia—Matane.

**Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that we must remember. I was at home when I heard about the tragedy at the École polytechnique. Even five years later, the memory is almost just as painful.

I spent my whole adult life as a high school teacher in a rural area.

(1545)

Even in a comprehensive secondary school with 1,200 students, there was quite a bit of violence, so much so in fact that some children were persecuting each other in almost a tragic way.

When I first started teaching there was some violence, but it was more sporadic. However, toward the end of my career, it had become almost a daily occurrence.

Earlier, we referred to verbal abuse, which is very prevalent among young people. It is fine to describe that violence, and when we discuss violence, we forget about partisan considerations and think only about the victims, but we forget about meanness.

I have a question for this House: Why is there so much violence? It goes without saying that if a young boy is not loved, he will not like himself. And a young boy who does not like himself will develop a mean streak which he will express in various ways.

How does he behave? He hits, makes harsh comments, or hurls insults. It is said that violence generates violence. Gangs are organized: three against three, four against four, and so on. These gangs carry on their activities; they often use drugs and then they find weapons. There is practically no limit to what they will do.

How do we stop that? I believe there are several ways. By looking for the causes of violence, we will find the means to stop it. We feel that prevention is an excellent means to that end. In some schools, there is a lot more prevention than in others and violence has diminished considerably.

It is also true that where poverty and unemployment are a fact of life, crime tends to be more widespread.

The massacre of these young students was a tragedy, I agree. But two young people who make a suicide pact is also a tragedy. This happened in my riding two years ago, when two young people committed suicide. When you consider that these were intelligent, healthy youngsters, you wonder why they no longer

*Government Orders*

wanted to go on living. Why did they want to take their own lives? There must be a reason. And I wondered how at sixteen, seventeen or twenty, you could consider suicide. Many of my students committed suicide, and every time I said to myself: There is a reason. There is a reason, because we instinctively hold on to life, as anyone who has been near death will agree.

(1550)

If you are in good health and you decide to take your own life, there may be several reasons but we have to find the right one.

Other students are in prison, some of my own students whom I see from time to time. Apparently, at 15 or 16 they were like everybody else, just as open-hearted. So what happened? Why did it happen to him and not someone else? Maybe it was some experience they had in their lives or somehow they had reached the point of no return, with very unfortunate results.

I agree we need legislation on firearms but we need more than that. I think that starting with primary school, we must find ways to wipe out this petty violence that occurs year after year. How can a three or four year old child become so aggressive that he is almost ready to strangle his next door neighbour? If we take them at 25 and send them to jail, the cost to society is enormous. Sometimes they get out with new tricks, and some, although not all, become repeaters.

My main concern is not firearms. I agree that we should control guns. I could not agree more. It does not make sense to send people to prison for 20, 25 or 30 years, and turn them into hardened criminals. I am not saying we should not do that, that is not what I mean. My point is that we have to go to the root of the matter and find out the initial causes as soon as possible.

Some children go to primary school without breakfast or lunch and only have a snack for supper.

Some of my oldest students were saying that poverty did not exist or hardly. Once, during the holiday season at the school where I taught we made Christmas baskets. I told these older students who were big and tough and sure of themselves to come with me. They came, and the first house we went to we saw two cases of empty beer bottles, each with 24 bottles, and a man lying on a kind of chesterfield. The cupboards were bare and children were crying.

When we got back, these guys who were 16, 17 or 18 and pretty tough, said: Poverty does exist, and we should go and visit poor families more often. These kids had been in trouble before, some had been convicted of theft. They felt they were luckier than others, but it takes time to make them understand. They should have these experiences, otherwise they harden their

hearts and lose their self-esteem, and then they will do anything to survive. They try to be tough and become marginalized.

So to come back to what I was saying, I am glad the Minister of Justice is here.

(1555)

I want to ask the minister whether all the legislation we are going to adopt should not emphasize prevention. Prevention should take place at the earliest possible age, because once a person is 40 and has been in prison repeatedly, I am not saying nothing can be done, but it is certainly far more difficult.

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me quote the message published in Quebec newspapers today:

Every citizen had to open their eyes and refuse to tolerate the various expressions of violence against women, from the smallest to the biggest, most obvious ones.

“Never again, Polytechnique!”

I have personally undertaken, as Minister of Justice, to put forward measures to counter violence.

*[English]*

When we are asked what the government is doing with respect to violence in society and violence against women in particular, a frank and direct answer must be that we are not doing enough.

We have taken certain steps and we resolve to take others. Working with the members of the House who have expressed so eloquently today their commitment to the principles we share and to the effort which we have embarked upon, I think we can truly make a difference through this legislation.

The steps we have taken include the changes contemplated in Bill C-42 to the regime of peace bonds which makes peace bonds easier to obtain from the court, which permit the applications for those protective orders to be made by police officers on behalf of women victims and which makes the enforcement and the consequences for the breach of such orders more significant.

I refer as well to the creation of the National Crime Prevention Council. I agree without hesitation with the comments made by the hon. member who spoke just before me about the importance of prevention in everything that we do. The National Crime Prevention Council which met for the second time in October has taken violence against women and children in Canadian society as one of its priority objectives during the coming months.

I refer as well to the family violence initiative, led by my colleague the Minister of Health, and the efforts that initiative involves to co-ordinate the actions of governments at all levels to address domestic violence toward women and children.

*Government Orders*

I refer to the announcement last week of the firearms control policy of this government and the very direct way in which it is intended to deal with domestic violence. Yesterday morning I had the honour of speaking in Edmonton at a breakfast organized to raise funds for shelters for women who are the victims of violence and for community services for such victims. I emphasized there one of the reasons why our firearms control policy is sensible. One of the reasons why universal registration is required is so that it will permit police the real tool to enforce prohibition orders where they are made in the context of a domestic dispute.

Nowadays, although prohibition orders are provided for by law, when the police officers arrive to enforce them they have no idea of what firearms are in that home. They must take the word of the occupant to determine what firearms should be taken away. That is simply not good enough. There should be a register. There will be a universal register of firearms and that will be overcome.

I can refer as well to the fact that I co-ordinate the efforts of nine ministers in the federal cabinet who work in a co-ordinated way to address the subject of violence in Canadian society generally. This includes the Minister of Canadian Heritage, for example, whose preoccupation in this context is with violence in broadcasting. It includes the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development whose concern is for the incidence of violence in the aboriginal communities. Together, the nine ministers co-ordinate their efforts, working in a variety of ways to reduce and address the issue of violence.

(1600)

*[Translation]*

Finally, on June 13, we tabled Bill C-41, to make a number of changes to the sentencing procedure. Under these proposals, abusing a position of trust or authority to commit a crime would be deemed to be an aggravating factor for the purpose of sentencing.

This bill is designed to provide women with further protection against the violence they suffer at the hands of persons in a position of trust.

*[English]*

That too will help, although none of these specific measures will be enough on its own.

There is a great deal more for us to do as a government. We must do a better job in the Department of Justice in testing and auditing the impact of all laws, particularly the criminal laws in terms of gender. What is the gender impact of changes we propose from time to time to the criminal law?

We must in the Department of Justice work harder and more urgently to resolve the issue that is getting worse by the month, dealing with the disclosure of confidential records in the course of criminal prosecutions, confidential records relating to female complainants that are subpoenaed from professionals who are treating the complainants, from confidants who may have heard the complainant make statements, from rape crisis shelters that may have helped the complainant immediately after the alleged event.

We have to find a way to resolve that issue, balancing on the one hand the right of the accused person to make full answer in defence, which is fundamental to the law, but at the same time the right of complainants not to be revictimized through the unwarranted invasion of their private affairs and what amounts to intimidation to prevent them from participating in the prosecution.

We must also grapple with the drunkenness defence in respect of which I am at work now to prepare legislative proposals for February. In many ways that is a woman's issue as well as a criminal law issue generally. It is no accident that the Daviault case involved allegations of sexual assault by a man against a woman. It is no accident that the cases that occurred subsequently in other provinces too often involved allegations of violence by men against women.

As we address these challenges, as we face up to the fact that we are not doing enough and that we must do more, as we approach the remaining tasks with an enhanced sense of urgency and commitment, I urge all members of the House to participate with the government, to take on this societal imperative. Our daughters must grow up to inherit a different country, a country which expressly and as a fundamental matter of citizenship rejects violence in all forms and rejects violence against women and children in particular. That must be our goal and we must work together to achieve it.

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any doubt that everyone in the House abhors violence, whether it is against women or against anyone else. There is no doubt about that.

I have heard a recurring theme here today. It is a theme, it seems to me, to make all of us feel guilty, especially men. This theme runs through the Canadian Human Rights Act, through the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and through other legislation that has been directed against men and in particular white men.

I would like to ask a rhetorical question of the minister. Is this fair? Is it not time to talk about violence against anyone as a serious matter? Is it not time to deal with the criminal who is committing the violence and deal to some extent with the potential criminals who are likely to commit violence? You do that best in a family setting. Instead of just trying to make men

*Government Orders*

particularly feel guilty, is it not a better approach to deal with the criminals and with the crime that is committed and with prevention through the family?

(1605)

Instead of putting forward legislation that is damaging the family, destroying the family, instead give the family fair treatment under our tax regulations, under our social program system and under other areas of law, particularly under the minister's control.

I have one further part to this question concerning gun control. If the gun control the minister is proposing prevents violent crime, will the minister take personal responsibility for any crime that is committed once these laws are in place? Will the minister, when realizing that this gun control legislation totally fails, take the next step which is confiscation of all firearms?

**Mr. Rock:** Mr. Speaker, I do not speak as I do because I wish to make the hon. member or any other person feel guilty. I speak as I do to make all of us together feel responsible for changing the way things are.

I do not single out white men or middle aged men or men with blond hair or any other subcategory of the population. What I am suggesting is that we must face the facts. Violence in all of its forms against anyone is unacceptable. However sometimes violence against particular groups in society is so predominant, so widespread, so ingrained in the culture that it has to be identified for particular action.

Let me tell members why I say that. In November 1993, Statistics Canada published a survey which was unique in all the world. It surveyed a huge segment of the population about violence. All members of the population surveyed were women.

They found, among other things, that over half of the women surveyed had been the victims of an act of violence committed by a man against them during their adult life. That is extraordinary.

What am I? I am a middle aged white Anglo-Saxon male. If members went out and surveyed the middle class, white, middle aged Anglo-Saxon males you would not find anything like that kind of statistic in terms of victimization of violence. Why do we not face the facts? We have a problem here. We have a problem.

The man who walked into l'École polytechnique with the Ruger Mini-14 five years ago today said something when he pulled the trigger. He said bring on the women. I want to get the women. He killed 14 of them and injured another 13. It was at random. He was not after white, middle class Anglo-Saxon lawyers. He was after women, so let us deal with the reality.

It is everywhere. May I ask the hon. member if he has seen the television programs recently, the rock videos on MTV or the commercials that peddle products? What is implicit in them is the victimization of women which is deplorable. Let's stop it. I am not doing that to make anybody feel guilty.

Of course I support the family. That is where we must begin. We must teach children from the beginning to treat other people as human beings first, not on the basis of gender.

In so far as gun control is concerned, yes, I strongly believe that those measures will help address, among other things, domestic violence. Do I say that such violence will never occur with these changes? Of course not, because we cannot make it a perfect world. But I firmly believe that they will help to make things better.

I urge the hon. member in closing to not feel guilty because it is not anyone's intention to make him feel guilty for what others have done, rather to join us in feeling responsible. Together as members of this legislature we can do something to make it a somewhat a better world.

**The Deputy Speaker:** There is about a minute left. I would ask the member and the minister to divide that minute between the two of them please.

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not have much time therefore I will just say what I want to say to the Minister of Justice.

I listened to him talk about prevention. Prevention is a key element in cutting the violence in our society. I hate and despise violence as much as anyone in the House. I want to hear the hon. minister use the words deterrent, consequence and penalty more often so that I can have some comfort in my belief that more severe consequences for violent crimes is on the hon. minister's agenda.

(1610)

**Mr. Rock:** Mr. Speaker, I will be brief in just saying that deterrence is an essential part of this. I am the person who introduced decisions last week increasing to four years mandatory minimum penitentiary time for anyone who uses a firearm in any one of ten serious offences, including robbery.

**Mr. Thompson:** No parole?

**Mr. Rock:** No, but we will discuss this in committee. I am the one who proposed—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The time has expired.

**Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this matter today.

Geneviève Bergeron, Hélèn Colgan, Nathalie Croteau, Barbara Daigneault, Anne-Marie Edward, Maud Havernick, Barbara Marta Klucknik, Maryse Laganière, Maryse Leclair, Anne-Marie Lemay, Sonia Pelletier, Michèle Richard, Annie

St-Arnault and Annie Turcotte. These are the names of the 14 women whose lives were needlessly extinguished at the École Polytechnique five years ago.

It has always bothered me that the name of their assailant comes more readily to mind than theirs. Today and every future December 6 is now designated as Canada's national day of remembrance and action to end violence against women. Ceremonies, vigils and public actions will focus public awareness on the many far-reaching implications of violence against women. These involve the social, psychological and economic well-being of women, men and children across society and across Canada.

Tonight in my city of London a monument memorializing the 14 women and others who are victims of violence is being unveiled. The monument is inscribed: "The London Women's Monument was dedicated on December 6, 1994, the fifth anniversary of the Montreal massacre. It is a place to remember and reflect on violence, particularly violence against women, and all women and men who work to end it".

Women's rights are human rights. We must acknowledge that violence against women is often a byproduct of gendered social inequality and can be a rejection of women's progressive empowerment.

Change can be led by governments but the most effective change begins with individuals. All men and women can make a personal commitment to the principle of zero tolerance, that no amount of violence is acceptable and that women's safety is a priority. As individuals we can focus more on co-operation instead of competition.

Earlier today the four federal and provincial female London politicians, representing three different political parties, issued a joint statement speaking out against violence against women. Violence against women is a social issue, even though many see it only as a political issue.

As individuals we can decide not to laugh at women-hating jokes, just as we do not laugh at racial slurs. Violence against women is not a funny issue. As individuals we can listen and discuss women's experiences, their fears and the equality barriers they face. It is still much more comfortable to be dismissive or to trivialize the alarming statistics which we have now compiled. Denial has never solved problems. It is time now to speak out and challenge any tolerance of violence or sexist behaviour.

Where possible, individuals can give financial or political support to services for victims and survivors. Individuals can volunteer at local transition homes and rape crisis shelters and be supportive of municipal, provincial, federal and non-government initiatives in their own neighbourhoods and cities. Violence

### *Government Orders*

ence against women robs women of their self-esteem, their dignity and in too many cases it robs them of their life.

Since Statistics Canada conducted its first national survey on violence against women in 1993, which was the first of its kind worldwide, the gravity of the situation has been brought to light. According to this survey, as many as 51 per cent of Canadian women have experienced at least one incident of physical or sexual violence since the age of 16. Almost 45 per cent of all women experienced violence by men known to them, their dates, boyfriends, marital partners, friends, family, their neighbours.

(1615)

A woman is shot every six days in Canada. Firearms are the weapon of choice for spousal homicides. During the period between 1974 and 1992, 42 per cent of the women killed by their spouses were shot. As shattering as these statistics are they only account for part of the problem since Statistics Canada defines violence as experiences of physical or sexual assault. It does not touch upon other dimensions of violence to which many women are subjected.

Three other areas identified in the 1993 report "Changing the Landscape: Ending Violence—Achieving Equality" are psychological violence, being violence that encompasses various tactics to undermine a woman's self-confidence; financial violence whereby a woman's access to employment or investment opportunities are curtailed by a partner or family member; and spiritual abuse in which cultural and religious beliefs are destroyed through ridicule or punishment. A wide range of indicators give evidence that this societal ill is pervasive and systemic.

As a result women from all walks of life are targets of various acts of violence. Not only are the causes and the forms of violence against women extremely insidious but so too are their effects. Violence scars not only women but also the children and the men around them. It marks the body but also deeply wounds the mind and the spirit of those affected.

As a result of having been abused a woman's physical and/or mental health may be at stake. Her chances of advancement in her working life may be jeopardized and her interpersonal skills generally deteriorate.

As well as having these devastating effects on the women concerned, such violence is proven to seriously destabilize the children who witness it. Boys who are brought up in an abusive household are more likely to become violent fathers and girls are more likely to become victims at the hands of their future partners. In fact women with violent fathers-in-law are three times more at risk than those women with non-violent fathers-in-law. We have to stop these cycles.

As in other issues such as poverty and crime there will never be one Utopian legislative effort. There are no magic wands that can instantly eradicate the scourge of violence against women.

*Government Orders*

As with all complex issues there must be interdisciplinary approaches.

First, we must state what we stand for. Canada has done this internationally by initiating the UN declaration on the elimination of violence against women which was adopted in December 1993. For the first time internationally we have the appointment of a United Nations special rapporteur on violence against women who will report to the United Nations Commissioner of Human Rights starting March 1995.

Next we look at all levels of government agendas and incorporate concrete concepts that will move us toward the goal of ending violence against women. This will of necessity include increased public education.

Last April the Department of Canadian Heritage collaboratively launched a three year radio and television campaign on violence in society. In October 1994 the court challenges program was reinstated to ensure funding for legal cases of national significance which clarify equality and language rights under Canada's Constitution.

The sentencing reform bill is now being studied in committee which would assist in providing different options to deal with crime, including violence.

Earlier this year in the House I spoke on another bill with more than 100 amendments to the Criminal Code, including provisions that would make peace bonds more effective. For example, police officers will be able to apply for peace bonds on behalf of the women at risk.

The National Crime Prevention Council was established in July 1994. It will address women's vulnerability to crime as part of its mandate.

I believe that the firearms control being introduced will also effect safety in our homes and in our streets. A national firearms registry, the banning of certain firearms, including the one used in the Montreal massacre, and more flexible prohibition orders, will benefit women and should save lives.

Last June the federal, provincial and territorial ministers responsible for the status of women adopted the Regina declaration on the rights of women subjected to violence which calls on the justice system to ensure the equal protection of women subjected to violence. In the same month the federal justice minister, the federal health minister and the Secretary of State for the Status of Women held a consultation with women's groups on the issue of violence against women. Further consultation will continue. I believe that it must be ongoing if we are to succeed in overcoming this problem.

I am grateful that members of this House have been offered this opportunity to speak on the issue today.

(1620)

My wish and my hope is that the sentiments expressed within this House today will carry us forward each and every day in our jobs as legislators so that we are ever mindful of the situation of

women who experience violence in Canada. I believe we are progressing and I am grateful for that. However, there is much that can still be done.

I hope that individual Canadians listening today will continue to do their part in their homes, in their communities, and in our ridings.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The Chair views this as a very serious debate and would indicate that I recognized a member earlier who was in fact not on the list. I had misread the list and recognized the hon. member from the Bloc and gave him the floor which I should not have done.

[*Translation*]

I was told that there was an agreement between the two parties. Because I made a mistake, the Official Opposition is now willing to let four Liberals speak one after the other. Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I am sure that, with this agreement, all the members who want to do so will speak this afternoon. I now recognize the hon. member for York—Simcoe.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York—Simcoe, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from a woman in my riding by the name of Sally. Sally has given me permission to make her letter public. Sally's letter speaks to the impact of violence on women and the resulting poverty they face. The letter was prepared for our Campaign 2000 meeting. Campaign 2000 is an umbrella organization comprised of many drawn together to fight child poverty.

"My name is Sally and I am the independent parent of two little girls. I am also a financially challenged recipient of family benefits. While I am grateful for the assistance I receive, I will say that I have become discouraged by the system's lack of insight and insensitivity to the roadblocks faced by myself and others on the road to financial independence.

"When I first became aware of Campaign 2000, the word poverty was a difficult one to envision in relation to my situation. Visions of starving children in third world countries leapt to mind. However, over time it has become increasingly difficult for me to meet my children's needs and systems and bureaucrats turn deaf ears in a country such as Canada. I have come to the brutal realization that I do indeed fall far below the poverty line.

"In making the decision to leave an extremely abusive situation and needing to enter a woman's shelter, my life and that of my children changed abruptly two years ago, now reduced to relying on a system where \$1,028 per month is to cover living expenses being accommodation, phone and utilities. Clothing and feeding myself and my two daughters becomes a hard lesson in the realities of life for far too many children in Canada. Food bank? I can only go once a month if I

*Government Orders*

can get transportation. So, why not get a job? I have tried, but unfortunately I live in a rural area where one opening at a local store gets over 300 applications. Tough competition for a stay at home mom out of the workforce for seven years.

“Add in the problems of transportation and day care of an affordable nature and the picture becomes bleaker. So why not get some upgrading? Better your education. Again the obstacles of transportation, day care and waiting lists loom large.

“Support? For two years now I have struggled with a system of lawyers, legal aid and the family support person in trying to get some financial relief for my daughters. After this period I have succeeded in having \$22,000 in legal aid liens placed against my home and an agreement from my husband to pay \$100 a month support, that is \$50 per child. Since this agreement in June of this year has been in effect and in spite of the fact that he makes \$50,000 per year, I have not received any support from him.

“This person is also on probation for uttering death threats. Two provisions of his probation are (1) he must maintain his dependents. He has failed to do this. I have spoken with lawyers and his probation officer to try and enlist their help but my words fall on deaf ears.

(1625)

“A second provision of his probation order is that he must seek and maintain employment. I’m now told he was laid off when he requested help from his probation officer in getting some relief. Despite that fact he still is seen at his work daily and despite that if he is in fact unemployed, that is the second breach of his probation. Still nothing is done.

“A third provision of his probation is that he remain 300 metres away from myself and my residence. He repeatedly breaks this provision. I have been again to his probation officer. I have been to her supervisor. I was told by a police officer that I was fabricating lies and thrown out of the police station by this officer. The police have been to my home repeatedly. One of the officer’s comment was that until someone shows up with a bullet hole there’s nothing that we can do.

“If you are wondering what the third provision has to do with poverty and the plight of my children, I’ll tell you. The financial strain of repairing busted doors, windows, plumbing that’s been drilled and cut, slashed tires, having a crowbar taken to the side of my vehicle and numerous other acts of vandalism begins to take its toll.

“The police have recommended doorbolts and deadlocks, expensive outdoor sensor lights. Well, for that you need money and hydro. A year ago in April after being unable to meet a payment deadline, the hydro to my home had been disconnected.

It still remains so. Hydro tax-rolled my bill after running an original \$800 bill up to over \$1,700 with service charges and late payment charges. They also charged me for having their line and a hot water heater even though they cut their service off. They still come every three months to read a meter I no longer have and then service charge me.

“It was also explained to me that if I ever wanted Ontario Hydro back, I would pay for the lines to be reconnected plus they would require a \$1,600 deposit. I would have phoned their head office, but in July of that same year Bell disconnected my phone for a \$50 bill, despite the fact that they had required a \$200 deposit from me, despite the fact that at that time I was in a women’s shelter while the trial was going on against my husband. While he was out on bail he left his probation officer’s office and came to my home to once again threaten my children and myself.

“In June of this year I received a call from the bank. Due to my husband’s refusal to sign the mortgage renewal despite the court order that allowed me to reside in my home and add the fact that I’m on family benefits, I was told I had 30 days to vacate, despite the fact that I have faithfully paid the mortgage, taxes and now the hydro arrears. Another lawyer, another bill. I have one year to get this straightened out. Time is running out.

“I rely on your imagination and empathy to realize what effect all this has had on my two little girls. I say those magic words social assistance and watch human decency and respect fly out the window. Buy a car? Home improvement loan? Start a business? I can hear the bank manager’s laughter still ringing in my ears. I almost gave up there and then.

“But I am here tonight because I owe it to my children to keep trying and hopefully one day someone will listen and changes will be made so my two daughters and all the other children in this nation of plenty will have a bright future.

“Thank you for listening”.

It is my understanding that Sally is now in hiding away from her abusive and very violent husband. I hope that somehow someone will be able to get these words to her so she will know that her story has been told on the floor of the House of Commons.

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we have just heard a very touching story. It is upsetting to me because it shows that the proper laws are not in place to protect this person or that they are not enforced. Either case is totally unacceptable.

The member should let the justice minister know this is totally unacceptable and demand that either the proper laws are put in place or that the laws that are there are enforced. I would like the member to comment on that.



*Government Orders*

**Mrs. Kraft Sloan:** Mr. Speaker, I think it is very clear that in Sally's letter she has outlined a number of situations of institutional abuse.

(1630)

It is very difficult when women are placed in this situation and they go to those people they feel should be protecting them, for example the police, and their charges are dismissed. They are told they are troublemakers. Part of the problem with this has to do with overall societal attitude.

The Minister of Justice is very sensitive to these issues. I have heard members opposite say that we should be concerned about violence against all people. I totally agree with that but somehow violence against women is a special category and they are being made a special interest group.

We have to understand that until we address the issue of violence against women as a particular kind of violence and the kinds of intimidation it creates for an entire group within this society, namely women, we will never be able to address the problems of institutional abuse. No matter how good our laws are unless the attitudes, the understanding and the sensitivities that are related to this very complex and devastating issue are understood these matters will not be addressed.

**Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on this national day of remembrance and action to end violence against women I believe we should not only remember this act once a year but throughout the year.

This House is well apprised of the statistics relating to the violence and abuse against women. These numbers represent those incidents which have been reported, the ones we know about. However, the number of violent and abusive incidents which have not been reported are even more frightening. It is a tidal wave which must be abated.

When safe houses must be established in urban areas and police must begin escorting women to their homes to claim sometimes only the clothing on their backs or to visit their children, then it is a sad testimony to the state of relationship deterioration between men and women as well as the new face that family life in Canada is taking. When we must stand up in this House and legislate against indecent abnormal behaviour then the time has come for action not only on the part of government but also individuals and corporations, all who live within our communities.

Violence is not some strange enigma which explodes from the ground in random procession. Its seeds are planted carefully years and even generations in advance. The images of violence children are exposed to on television and in society at large and the subsequent lessons they learn from parents sets in motion a cycle of learning aggressive behaviour which is as precise as clockwork.

If through this cycle we instil in our children a low sense of self-worth or never help them to build a sense of self-esteem their lives are threatened. This is extremely counterproductive and increasingly dangerous as they grow older and develop intimate relationships because under the threat of having self-worth challenged they will either withdraw or lash out. Unfortunately more often than not the males in society are prone to lashing out with anger while females tend to withdraw.

More often than not pressures are exerted from poverty, communication breakdown, community decay, alcohol and drug abuse, barrages of messages in the media to possess or acquire material goods in order to be relegated upward from a non-person status. All of these contribute to the already overwhelming pressures of rearing children and making choices in this day and age.

All too often the metaphor that when soldiers are not fighting on the front they are fighting in the camps can be applied to this appalling situation of violence against women and children. Many good decent people who start off in a relationship with the best of intentions end up watching with shock and horror as their relationship decays into verbal and physical abuse as individuals either lash out with threats or actual violence.

Why is this? The pressures of everyday life and finances draw a family's attention away from its primary goal: the establishment of family, roots and future to each other's personal performance and contribution in the relationship. When self-esteem is challenged there is either a withdrawal into separation and divorce or again lashing out in anger.

(1635)

It is not the function and purpose of this government to interfere in the personal lives of Canadians. However, I believe we have a responsibility and we must make a conscious choice for the future on behalf of the family and on behalf of women and children specifically.

Programs and policies must be developed which provide not only for zero tolerance but also give teeth that will allow law enforcement to implement changes. This must be set as a last resort for those who cross the line, who choose not only to brutalize but to exploit women and children as well.

We must also change our view and our bias of interpersonal relationships. The laws we write must encourage protection of both the immediate and extended families. We must allow for dealing with potential abuse through caring professionals. A sense of community and personal accountability must be developed in the inner cities.

Finally, we must not only begin to communicate but we must also listen. I would venture to say that the 63 women who were murdered in 1993 fell prey to a person who was already in a state of detachment and isolation. If only there had been in existence a network of people with whom these spouses could talk openly

*Government Orders*

and honestly about their situation. We know that open and honest communication is not a prelude to murder.

Again there must be communication in our society not only among our peers but outside our comfort zone as well. Parents must start talking to their children, grandparents with grandchildren, men with women, and labour with management.

I fear that if the tide does not turn on this problem, if we do not start honestly communicating in a fashion that will solve rather than dissolve our relationships, then we as a society will be so distrustful that our internal growth will cease and Canadian families will continue to perish and die.

**Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on my colleague's excellent articulation. I thank her for her thoughts. I would like to share a few of my thoughts by way of comment.

Violence against women in a real sense is an insult to life. It is an indignity to our core Canadian values. As well it is a challenge to peace, order and good government.

The incidents mentioned are staggering, but the real concern of course are the people who are affected the most: orphaned children, grieving families and the suffering of the whole community.

I congratulate the member for her participation. It is hoped that violence against women which happened in the past and continues to happen will not happen in the future.

**Mrs. Brushett:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his comments. As he has said, this does go beyond women, men and children. It is a community. Life in my estimation is a process of human relationships. The process of living is developing and sharing those relationships. Those relationships are what accumulate to make up the family which in turn makes up the community.

I believe as the hon. member does that violence against any person is a violation of the dignity of human life. Human life is at the bottom of the foundation of all things we must respect in our communities.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, when I heard of today's debate, I naturally thought about the victims at l'École polytechnique, but I also thought about all the other victims of violence, about the 300 and some women who have died in violent incidents since 1989, and about the thousands of women who face various acts of violence every day. It is important to see this situation, not necessarily as a particularly atrocious fact, but as a situation prevailing throughout our society, which has led to unacceptable behaviours and to

which we must give priority so that Quebec society, Canadian society can be held up as an example of a violence free society.

(1640)

Part of the problem we are facing can be found in this House today: all members are denouncing violence and saying that we must take the right measures to prevent such incidents from happening again in the future, but we encounter the same problem in society.

Violence is often a problem, partly because we do not talk about the reality, the fact that people are affected. Victims of violence are not allowed to speak out, so they can overcome their fears and get on with their lives after going through a period of violence. For example, violent men have few opportunities to express who they are and release this negative energy, so that they can clean up their act and allow the situation to evolve.

That is why, in considering what I expected from this debate, I thought a great deal about my children, my two daughters, Audrey and Maude, and my son, Renaud, because it is for them that we are trying to build a different society.

When we read stories about how violence is perpetuated, we see that some behaviours are often passed on from father to son or from mother to daughter and that even abusers are not necessarily aware of their violent tendencies. As I said earlier, we must hold a public debate on the subject and initiate a dialogue that will enable us to correct these situations.

Some specific ways to promote this dialogue are by supporting women's centres or groups that look after violent men, because you may have the best intentions in the world, but if you do not have the energy and resources needed for these discussions to go on, they will not take place and we will inherit the negative results, as we have for a long time, with tragic events like what happened at l'École polytechnique and all the tragic events that we learn about and which we hear reported as anecdotes; repression is suggested as the way to deal with them, but I think that repression is a last resort to prevent physical violence.

Of course, we must eliminate violence by properly controlling firearms and all other instruments of violence; we must control them to prevent a recurrence of events like those at l'École polytechnique. But at the same time, we must look further and see what is behind this event and find out what caused it.

We realize that conjugal violence and violence in general is a complex phenomenon because it involves not only poor families, middle class families or rich families. Domestic violence occurs in all classes of society and we must find ways to correct this problem.

*Government Orders*

Earlier, I talked about creating proper conditions. However, many people in our society have basic needs that are not met, for education, family income, child care, equity in social programs; also, the new types of families in our society do not have the support services they need. Single-parent families and blended families experience completely new situations to which our social programs are not necessarily suited.

I would also say that violence has a subversive aspect, a rather perverse aspect due to the inequality between men and women in terms of employment and career opportunities.

(1645)

This perpetuates the feeling of inequality, and often allows some men to establish relations in which women are dependent, thus creating a situation which can potentially lead to violence. But there is not only physical violence; there are many other forms of violence.

Consequently, it is important to do prevention from the time a child is born, since the way that child will develop will influence, to a degree, his perception of things. We must ensure that families can give birth to children in acceptable conditions, feed them properly and provide them with all the necessary elements to grow and build their self-esteem, so as to help them develop respect for their fellow citizens, members of the opposite sex and friends, as well as relations based on mutual respect instead of dependency.

Clearly, we must launch an attack on several fronts. We are faced with a situation similar to that of child poverty, in the sense that a preventive and comprehensive strategy is required to end violence, but we also need ad hoc measures to deal with emergencies.

It is also important to look at what can be done during the various stages of a child's development to curb the tendency to resort to violence. Do we grant adequate maternity leave to all Canadian women, so that they can give birth in proper conditions? If these women are single parents situation, do they have adequate financial resources to live in acceptable conditions?

Later on, when a child is growing, does he benefit from adequate daycare services? Are there not people right now who would like to have access to such services to help their children develop in a proper environment? Do we not stereotype people increasingly?

Children born in relatively well off families that can afford privately funded quality daycare will receive a more stable education. These children will develop more self-confidence. On the other hand, there are those who are trapped in the vicious circle of financial dependency and can see no way out. So we have to work to ensure that equal opportunities become more prevalent, so that 20 or 25 years from now, changes will be

noticeable, with less violence and fewer groups living in conditions conducive to violence.

Then there is school and career. If women go back to experiencing difficulty in finding employment and to being in a position of inferiority in the jobs that they do get, if they cannot have access to university careers, if we fail to eliminate stereotypes in that regard, we help perpetuate the existing climate.

On that subject, choices must be made—they are still under consideration—concerning the social security reform for example. Students could have to take full responsibility for their loans. This means that they will have much higher debts to pay off when they graduate. And it would be unfair to women who would choose to start a family.

Specific measures such as these do not have a direct bearing on dramatic acts of violence, but nevertheless add to the set of conditions which eventually lead to violence.

(1650)

I would also like to see that, later in life, women who have grown up and become adults are able to start a family and have children in acceptable conditions, so that they do not find themselves in a situation where they themselves could become violent toward their children because we have failed to put in place an adequate social system to enable them to raise them in decent conditions.

This whole debate on violence is a societal issue and, perhaps it should also be pointed out, an individual issue. Because somewhere we have to take a good look at ourselves and at our own behaviour. I think that if this debate made all Quebecers or all Canadians take a moment of their evening to think about and discuss potential sources of violence in their environments, as well as individual behaviours which could be corrected, and the need to adapt, we could say that we helped reduce the opportunities for violence in our society. I think that this would be a good response to today's debate. It is up to each one of us.

This is also a government responsibility. A review is under way. The Minister of Justice spoke earlier about a series of measures that have been or will be taken, but important choices must be made regarding the resources to be allocated to the various programs, the approach to this problem, and I think that the results will show how successful our efforts were. This government must take concrete actions that will bring about some improvement in the situation and make our society better before the new millennium rolls around.

When we commemorate again in five or ten years the terrible event that occurred at l'École polytechnique, instead of talking about the negative side of the current situation, we will at least be able to tell all those who were made aware of the issue of violence by this event, all those who made a contribution, all the women who circulated petitions until a gun control law was passed, that the mission has been accomplished. We will have

*Government Orders*

succeeded in reducing violence in our society, and this may be the best test.

[*English*]

**Mr. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think this afternoon in this debate that many of us are in agreement. We in this House are very disturbed and share the sense of horror at the events that took place five years ago today. When we hear of these kinds of actions and hear about human suffering, we think of ourselves in those moments as one family, that it is one of our family who is suffering.

I want to ask the member a question. It seems to me that he mentioned that social conditions are very important to people who may become violent in their lives. I wonder what he feels is the role of the economy. Does he feel that a weakened or a stronger economy that may have some impact on these sensitive issues?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Crête:** Mr. Speaker, I think that is an excellent question and I discussed it a little in my presentation when I talked about employment. Yes, I think that if this country had an active job creation policy for using our human resources to their full potential, it would mean that every man and every woman in our society could make his or her contribution to it.

(1655)

An active employment policy would mean that we would care more about the whole social aspect, because our society now often tends to emphasize productivity as an end in itself, although Canadian society, despite its faults, has still developed some values like compassion.

In this day and age, we should avoid following the American model blindly; we see the results they have obtained in terms of violence. They are our southern neighbours and we can see it right away. I think that is what haunts us in actions like the terrible event at l'École polytechnique, as someone said in an article in *Le Devoir* today. The writer saw it as an indication of what we might see, which is more commonly associated with the United States.

I think that to counter that, to get back to the hon. member's question, yes, if the economy works well, if people work, if they pay taxes, we will be able to have a better distribution of justice. I think that is a contribution which this government could and should make in particular when it will have to adjust its reform of social programs to respond more closely to the representations made to it by many groups across Canada.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, very quickly to the hon. member for Kamouras-

ka—Rivière-du-Loup. He spoke with great integrity about women, the difficulty of developing careers and raising families, and the need almost to be a super human being, to do it all and to do it well with grace, dignity and respect for the children and family.

What role do you believe that men play in the lives of sharing some of the responsibilities of child nurturing and rearing so that some of that pressure is relieved from the women in our society?

**The Deputy Speaker:** Unless members want to hear from the Speaker I would ask them to put questions through the Chair.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Crête:** Mr. Speaker, I have a great interest in this issue, considering that with our work schedule as members of Parliament, it might be very tempting to adopt the traditional role of the father. That being said, as a man, I can only pay tribute to the hon. member for her work with children.

One of the main things we can do is to act as men and parents who believe in a different model than the traditional one, a model based on respect for young girls and women, based on the belief that they deserve the same opportunities as men to develop their potential, and also based on real support in every day life, whenever possible.

In the case of families where both spouses are often together, I believe in sharing chores. It is also important—and that goes for every family—to discuss problems and other issues such as spousal abuse, because these things do exist. For example, if we witness this type of violence on TV, it may be good to discuss it for a minute, instead of quickly switching channels.

I also think that when half of the seats in this House will be filled by women, our institution will more balanced and will pass better laws which will take into account to an even greater degree what must be done to have new views on success and power.

**The Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Malpeque—Trade; the hon. member for London West—Violence Against Women; the hon. member for Berthier—Montcalm—Canadian Security Intelligence Service.

(1700)

[*English*]

**Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commemorate the infamous day of December 6, 1989. The national horror is incomprehensible, for there are no simple answers, no easy inferences to be drawn. We have an atmosphere of our times which seems to reflect a violent society. It is seen that our crime rates reflect a national psy-

*Government Orders*

chology. At times listening to what is put forward as fact in the House reflects a mood that could kill the soul, for we are so adversarial both in the House and in the community.

As a former worker in the criminal justice system, I dealt too frequently with both the offender and the offended. Violence lessens us all in society. We as a society are all responsible for the permissiveness in general and our lack of courage as a community to denounce perpetrators.

I concur with what has been said in the House today but, with due respect for this day, we must also recognize community trends. In the past crime was far from being an equal opportunity employer between the sexes, but the gap appears to be closing. Although five men were charged with criminal offences last year for every woman charged, a decade ago the proportion was seven to one. A similar trend is apparent in the United States where statistics show that the male:female arrest ratio in 1992 had declined to just over four to one.

Nowhere is the change more pronounced than in violent crime. In 1981 the ratio of men to women charged with crimes in this category which runs the gamut from threatening violence to cold blooded murder was almost nine to one.

People who specialize in the study of crime say that statistics may also reflect a democratizing trend in the application of criminal justice. Maybe it is the end of chivalry. Studies have found differences in the way the criminal justice system historically has treated men and women. For instance, in the U.S. the death penalty has been much less likely to be imposed on a woman.

Another possible explanation is that women are more likely to be charged today because society's growing intolerance of violence means that more people in general are being charged with low level violent crimes such as threatening.

To the extent that women commit less serious violent crimes, there would be a bigger percentage increase. Statistics indicate that 62 per cent of women charged with violent offences involve assaults at the lowest level compared with 55 per cent of men charged.

The fascinating question then is whether women are in fact becoming more criminally active. It is possible the trend is now surfacing in the newer data since there have been indications that the gender gap in crime is closing faster for young women.

A definitive answer would require following the police around and seeing under what circumstances they lay charges. There has been an enormous amount of discretion in the criminal justice system that has tended to screen out charges against women at the street level.

We really do not know what it means until we start looking at specific categories of crime. Does this reflect a real increase in violence or in property crime, or does it reflect a difference in the way in which our legal system processes crime? It is probably a mix of the two: some real change in behaviour and some change about how we count the numbers.

It is important to look at the numbers because our beliefs and then perhaps our legislative responses are affected by what we think is true. The veracity of statistics is fundamental to our beliefs which then brings action.

On November 19 of last year the news media across Canada led with the shocking results of a major Statistics Canada survey. "Fifty per cent of women report assaults", read the headline. "Ground breaking StatsCan survey finds violence pervasive". The findings on wife assault were horrifying: 29 per cent of women who had ever been married reported being assaulted by a current or previous husband. That would mean a staggering 2.6 million Canadian women have been the victims of wife assault.

Other news sources reported the story in much the same way. *Maclean's* magazine quoted a woman who "used to wake up with a knife at my throat. Maybe now people will believe it".

Women's groups expressed outrage. Social services groups said the survey proved how endemic violence is in our society. A federal cabinet minister pledged to meet with women's groups to launch a national campaign to combat violence against women. Commentators, male and female, cited examples of the dangers that women routinely face in daily life. We have heard many of those sentiments today in the House, but I must give at least a murmur of dissent and provide balance so we may move forward more resolutely.

The national survey was delivered with all the credibility of StatsCan behind it. Officials billed it as the most comprehensive of its kind ever conducted in Canada. It cost \$1.9 million. It included 12,300 women and, the clincher, its finding included only physical or sexual acts that could result in criminal charges.

No one in the mainstream media did a critical analysis of the StatsCan's findings or compared them with the most authoritative work on the subject undertaken in the United States.

(1705)

Let us start with the Criminal Code. A StatsCan survey says:

Violence in this survey is defined as experiences of physical and sexual assault that are consistent with legal definitions of these offences and could be acted upon by a police officer.

This turns out to cast a very wide net indeed. It includes offences known in police jargon as level one. Examples could be a neighbour who yells a threat across the back fence or a stranger who makes a belligerent remark on the street. Any remark or

*Government Orders*

gesture perceived by the person on the receiving end as a threat can qualify as a level one offence.

The most common form of violence, the survey says, is wife assault. In calculating the rate of wife assault it classifies many domestic encounters as violent that most people would not. These include behaviours that do not involve physical contact such as threats and throwing things. Then comes minor contact: pushing, grabbing and shoving. The survey summary, which is as far as most reporters read, lumps all these things together with actions that anyone would agree are clearly violent: beating, hitting with an object, choking, sexual assault or using a knife or a gun to threaten or injure. Throwing a plate has the same weight as a knife attack.

How many women who are or have been married reported incidents that are clearly violent? The answers: 11 per cent say that they have been kicked or hit with a fist; 9 per cent say they have been beaten up; 7 per cent choked; 6 per cent hit with something; and 5 per cent threatened or attacked with a knife or a gun. Because multiple responses are allowed there is a heavy overlap among those answers. They also refer overwhelmingly to former, not current spouses.

StatsCan borrowed its questions on wife assault from extensive U.S. surveys conducted by Richard Gelles and Murray Straus for the National Institute of Mental Health. This work is regarded as a benchmark. Unlike the StatsCan survey, it breaks out the results in a way that distinguishes between minor violence, no injuries or little intimidation, and severe violence, kicking, hitting and worse.

Messrs. Gelles and Straus found that domestic violence, mostly grabbing, shoving and hitting, occurs 16 per cent in U.S. families and that between 3 and 4 per cent of women have suffered at least one act of severe violence by their partners.

Wife assault is a national problem and a deep social evil in Canada. We should do everything to stop it, but this does not afflict nearly one-third of Canadian wives as some news reports said, 29 per cent as StatsCan said, or 2.6 million women.

No one, neither the surveyors nor the media, that reported their conclusions had any intention of misleading the public. They were conscientiously doing their job of spotting and documenting social change. However, if they had drawn a more reasonable conclusion from the violence data—rates of spouse abuse probably have not changed much in the past 30 years and most wives with abusive husbands get a divorce—there would be no real headlines and not much justification for their existence.

Instead the sensational findings dug yet another deep trench between the sexes with their inescapable implication that not just tens of thousands but millions of Canadian men are domestic thugs. Do members of the House really believe this? I do not.

Most men were socialized from childhood to defer to girls in play and boys hitting little girls is more severely denounced. That was the character of our social history.

Finally, if we do not have an accurate view of the problem, how can we hope to arrive at the best policies to address it? Surely we do not need to exaggerate the numbers in order to make the case that family violence and violence against anyone is a corrosive social ill?

Surely we do not need to induce national moral panic in order to get attention and action, but many women believe that we do and so they may be upset. Many women believe that the StatsCan survey captures some larger psychological truth about the myriad subtle ways in which women continue to be devalued in the world. The trouble is that there are many important things StatsCan just cannot measure, and it should not try.

We know that more women than men are responsible for child abuse. In domestic conflict more women than men are likely to resort to using a weapon against a spouse. The conclusion about what men or women are doing is not the point. The point is that there is just too much violence. We must all collectively share responsibility for the violence on TV, movies and magazines. The media reflects ratings of what sells. The media are not totally to blame, for they reflect the worst aspects of our society.

The Montreal tragedy, remembered today, will not be forgotten. We can find a vision of a new Canada where a rejection of violence both overt and implied is how we will live.

(1710)

We must denounce violence and the excuses for it such as intoxication defences or freedom of expression in the performing arts and the mass media. We especially remember today the loved ones of the victims of violence. We must all commit to live to a higher standard where conflict resolution and frustrations are kept under self-control. We each must resolve to live a kinder and gentler life that makes pandering to violence uneconomic for its sellers.

We affirm the positive and resolve to pass on to our children a clear sense of values that preclude thoughts of violence. I have a vision of Canada that we can build, where we can live in peace, restore broken relationships, yet strongly defend our ideals.

**Ms. Colleen Beaumier (Brampton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I vowed I would never do this but I listened to the members across the way and I wondered if their lack of discomfort is really the issue.

I knew a young woman 25 years ago who was raped. She did not report it because 25 years ago women could run faster with their skirts up than men could with their pants down. I knew a woman 25 years ago who was beaten by her husband. She was sent to hospital. She did not report it because it was a shame that

*Government Orders*

she had chosen that poorly and obviously she was beaten because she deserved it; she must have irritated him.

Because of our actions, because of the noise and because of the circumstances of today, women can do that. This woman was not included in that survey. I was that woman. As much as I realize that we have to get a balance, it is also an issue we must address. We must stand together.

Does the hon. member think that today's incidents are perhaps recurring more frequently or that we have now lost our shame and are able to report them?

**Mr. Forseth:** Mr. Speaker, I believe we are in a violent society. We must do everything we can within our own purview, within our own families, to make sure we do not act in a violent way. It begins in a small manner with even the frustration of being at a stoplight and thinking about the car next to you or the one that has cut you off.

I was trying to emphasize today that when we see statistics, let us make sure we have an accurate analysis of them so we can move forward resolutely with appropriate social policy.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, what I just heard is simply absurd. I think the hon. member of the Reform Party needs a good dose of real life.

He quoted statistics and figures, and meanwhile, some terrible things are happening, and the hon. member of the Reform Party does not see anything at all. I wonder whether people come and see him at his riding office and whether he ever had specific cases involving battered women and women who were unemployed and had children who did not get anything to eat for breakfast.

In my riding, I see this regularly. In my riding, we have two shelters for battered women and only 20 spaces altogether. We do not have enough locations to help these women.

I would appreciate it if the hon. member would tell me if in his own riding he sees these people and really tries to help them instead of trotting out figures and statistics like he is doing now, information that to me is absolutely irrelevant. I see what is going on in my riding, and I must say it is not a pretty picture.

When we have a recession like the one we have just been through, guess what happens? The crime rate goes up, and women and children pay the price. I cannot believe that everything is just fine in his riding because of these statistics. I hope that when he gets back to his riding on the weekend, his wife will forgive him for the speech he made here in the House.

(1715)

[*English*]

**Mr. Forseth:** Mr. Speaker, here is another fine example of what I talked about, why we are so adversarial in this House, where someone's words are willingly twisted.

If it is an issue of personal credibility, I spent my career of 22 years in the criminal justice system dealing with those people most in need and in time of crisis when in conflict with one another, be it an offender or an offended.

I spent all Saturday night riding with the local police in my riding, looking at the difficulty of conflict resolution and the kinds of things they have to deal with.

If we in this House are going to deal properly with the issues of the day, the various studies that are bantered around by members of this House and as was mentioned today by so many speakers, the StatsCanada study, then we must look carefully and make sure we read and draw the appropriate conclusions from those studies.

**Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Prince Albert—Churchill River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member made mention of the fact that there is a greater involvement of women in crime. He cited errors in the study done with respect to the incidence of violence against women. He stated that more women commit child abuse than men. I find that all of these statements are made to minimize and trivialize violent acts against women.

When we think about what happened a number of years ago on this day, we must remember today what damage violence against women in our society does and we ought not to speak in such a manner as to trivialize and minimize it and make it an excusable type of behaviour.

I want to ask the hon. member if he still feels that these types of remarks under these circumstances are justified.

**Mr. Forseth:** Mr. Speaker, the member gets a little emotional when he hears the truth.

Throughout the day certain statements were made and it is appropriate to provide a balancing alternate view without taking any of my words and twisting them to somehow diminish or demean the conflict and the social trouble we have out there and the level of violence which is unacceptable in our society.

**Ms. Shaughnessy Cohen (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to simply start into my text when I have been faced with the address we just heard in this House. I have to say that if education is the answer to many of the ailments in our society and if the problems we have are problems of ignorance, we need to spend a great deal more money and a great deal more time educating people so that attitudes such as those that were just reflected do not become prevalent in our society.

*Government Orders*

When I stand on this side of the House and I look across at so many middle aged, middle class white male faces and hear the kind of venom that was just spewed I have to react strongly.

One woman is shot dead every six days in Canada on average. On December 6, 1989, 14 women were wiped out with bullets in just a few minutes.

Others have risen in this House from the other quarters today to recognize these women, to remember their lives, to mourn them and in their name to look toward a time of hope when violence will be a thing of the past.

One woman is shot dead with a bullet every six days in our country. A woman is nine times as likely to be killed by her spouse as by a stranger. They do not just use bullets. They beat them, stab them and suffocate them.

(1720)

Some want to talk about statistics. Some want to talk about women engaging in crime. Women are violated and abused because of an attitude in our society that suppresses women and that seeks to continue to suppress women even though it is 1994, even though we are moving toward the 21st century, even though women are in the political leadership of our country, in the business leadership of our country and in the parenting leadership of our country; even though women have struggled and continue to struggle to make the same salary as their male counterparts and even though women continue today to lead single parent families from a position of poverty.

Life is very simple on the other side of the House. Those members would like to arm us all. They would like to cut \$15 billion out of our social programs with no priorities. They would like to suggest that statistics in the most comprehensive study that has ever been done on violence against women in Canada are eschewed because they do not like the sound of them. Life is not that simple.

We have tremendous problems in this country. We have people who want to help. They want to help women, children and yes, they even want to help white, middle aged, middle class men to have a better life. We do it by bringing prosperity to this country, jobs to this country, by observing the precepts of the Charter of Rights of Freedoms and by following the rule of law. We do it by treating other human lives with the dignity that they deserve and by remembering respectfully, very seriously and very intently the lives of women like the 14 at l'École polytechnique that were lost because our society is less than perfect.

This Friday evening I will return to Windsor—St. Clair and I will join former colleagues, colleagues who are also great and tremendous friends of mine in Windsor. We will have a little Christmas cheer but we are going to do so as persons joined, friends and colleagues united in a cause, a cause which is very

important in my community which is the support and the perpetuation of the programs and the spirit of a place called Hiatus House.

Hiatus House is an interval home in Windsor, a transition home for battered women and their children. It is a home that, in spite of what my friends opposite think, is always full, always has a waiting list and does wonders in our community. Hiatus House operates under the guidance and direction of Donna Miller, executive director. I am proud to say that she is a friend of mine and I am also happy to tell this country, through this House, that she is a visionary as are many women and men who work in this field.

This is an incredible place. This is a place that pioneered transition homes in Canada. It pioneered special programs for the children of battered women. It has also pioneered a program called "Fresh Start" which is a program designed for the treatment of spouses who batter, of men who batter their wives and children.

It is a transition home that faces the ugly realities that these people live with and that tries so hard to put these people back together in one piece again, to break the cycle of domestic violence.

(1725)

I am proud to stand today as the member for Windsor—St. Clair to talk about Hiatus House. I wish I could have spent more time at it but I felt compelled to comment on other things.

December 6 can never be forgotten by Canadians. It can never be forgotten because there are still Canadians who are oppressed. There are still Canadians who are repressed and there are still Canadians who are not white, middle aged, middle class males who make \$64,000 a year.

As long as those people are suppressed, as long as our greater political and societal structure is such that there are people who are less equal, then I think we have an obligation to continue. I am proud to be part of this government. I am proud to follow a leader who believes in these principles and I am proud to be on this side of the House even if talking about those principles means that one has to be hackled.

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate what the hon. member was saying. I too helped to set up a crisis house. I donated money, time and energy to do that because I think it is important. We need to do more of that. It is too bad we have to have them.

She talked about the jobless, the economy, et cetera. We go back as far as the depression. During the time of the depression when the economy could not have been worse and jobs could not have been worse, amazingly enough on a per capita basis that was when there was the least amount of crime. That can be



*Government Orders*

checked. If one denies it to be true, it can be checked. One will find that is the case.

I remember maybe 40 years ago when there was respect that was really taught. I was about that age when my father would have a fit if I did not show a little more respect, particularly to the opposite sex in terms of helping them when they needed it. Opening doors was a common practice and things of this nature. We did not swear in front of a woman because it was not an acceptable thing to do.

This violence against women is abhorrent. It really is, believe you me. I believe that. I am trying to figure out what in the world brought us to this point? What is it that has advanced us so far along the line that causes men to do the things they do to women? Please do not point a finger at me because I have not laid a hand on a woman in my entire life.

**Ms. Cohen:** Mr. Speaker, that is quite an opening. I am going to resist. I have no doubt that the member for Wild Rose believes everything he just said. I have no doubt that he abhors violence against women. The problem I have is this difficulty in seeing the bigger picture, this tremendous desire for the quick fix, for the simple solution that I see in his party's policies.

In the dirty thirties women were victimized in the same way, perhaps worse than they are now. The problem is that in the thirties the culture was such that they did not report it. They were afraid to. They thought it was their place to take this. They thought they had to put up with it.

Times have changed. Unfortunately some people have not changed with the times and some people refuse to accept that women have a place in society. We are not a special interest group. We do not want a privileged position. We just want to be equal.

**Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in the space of a couple of centuries women have advanced from being chattels to being real persons and now in the pantheon of the politically correct back to being mere victims.

I find this extraordinarily offensive and I think it demeans women. Women are people and should be treated as such. Violence exists throughout society. It is symptomatic of an alarming loss of civility, traditional values which have gone down the pipe.

Talk about women being victimized in the thirties. I am old enough that I can remember those times. Yes, spousal abuse went on in those days but when it did anyone who took part in that sort of activity was (a) socially ostracized or (b) stood a very good chance of getting the socks beaten off him by the abused woman's brothers, father, cousins, uncles and so on. This was commonly done.

You don't know; you were not there, madam.

**Ms. Shaughnessy Cohen (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. In the pantheon of the politically correct, sir, may I say that I do know. I was there, and you are wrong.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY ACT**

The House resumed from December 1, consideration of Bill C-46, an act to establish the Department of Industry and to amend and repeal certain other acts, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

**The Deputy Speaker:** It being 5.30 p.m., pursuant to the order made Thursday, December 1 1994, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at the report stage of Bill C-46, an act to establish the Department of Industry and to amend and repeal certain other acts.

Call in the members.

(1750)

*And the division bells having rung:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The first question will be on Motion No. 1.

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 123)

**YEAS**

## Members

Asselin	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Brien
Bélisle	Canuel
Caron	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Dalphond—Guiraud
Debien	Deshaies
Duceppe	Fillion
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin	Guay
Guimond	Jacob
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Loubier
Marchand	Mercier
Ménard	Nunez
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Sauvageau
St-Laurent	Tremblay (Rosemont)—40

**NAYS**

## Members

Abbott	Adams
Althouse	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellemare	Benoit
Berger	Bernier (Beauce)
Bethel	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Cannis

Catterall  
Chan  
Clancy  
Collins  
Cowling  
Cummins  
DeVillers  
Dingwall  
Duncan  
Easter  
English  
Finestone  
Flis  
Forseth  
Fry  
Gagliano  
Galloway  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Grose  
Guarnieri  
Hanrahan  
Harper (Calgary West)  
Harris  
Harvard  
Hermanson  
Hopkins  
Ianno  
Irwin  
Jordan  
Kerpan  
Kirkby  
Kraft Sloan  
Lee  
MacAulay  
MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)  
Maloney  
Manning  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
Massé  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)  
McKinnon  
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)  
Meredith  
Milliken  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Morrison  
Murray  
O'Brien  
Parrish  
Payne  
Peters  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Ramsay  
Regan  
Ringuette—Maltais  
Robinson  
Rompkey  
Serré  
Sheridan  
Skoke  
Solomon  
Speller  
Steckle  
Stinson  
Szabo  
Terrana  
Thompson  
Torsney  
Vanclief  
Volpe  
Wappel  
Wells  
Williams

Chamberlain  
Chatters  
Cohen  
Copps  
Culbert  
de Jong  
Dhaliwal  
Dromisky  
Dupuy  
Eggleton  
Epp  
Finlay  
Fontana  
Frazer  
Gaffney  
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Grubel  
Hanger  
Harb  
Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
Hart  
Hayes  
Hoepfner  
Hubbard  
Iftody  
Jennings  
Karygiannis  
Keyes  
Knutson  
Lastewka  
Loney  
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marleau  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
Mayfield  
McGuire  
McLaughlin  
McWhinney  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Mitchell  
Murphy  
Nault  
Pagtakhan  
Patry  
Penson  
Peterson  
Pickard (Essex—Kent)  
Proud  
Reed  
Rideout  
Robichaud  
Rock  
Schmidt  
Shepherd  
Silye  
Solberg  
Speaker  
St. Denis  
Stewart (Brant)  
Strahl  
Taylor  
Thalheimer  
Tobin  
Ur  
Verran  
Walker  
Wayne  
Whelan  
Zed—182

*Government Orders*

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Bachand	Bouchard
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Collins
Daviault	Dubé
Duhamel	Dumas
Gerrard	Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde	Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Shefford)
Minna	O'Reilly
Ouellet	Paré
Rocheleau	Telegdi
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Valeri
Venne	Wood
Young	de Savoye

(1800)

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 2. A vote on Motion No. 2 also applies to Motions Nos. 4, 5, 6 and 7. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 2 obviates the need for a vote on Motions Nos. 3, 6 and 8. A negative vote on Motion No. 2 necessitates a vote on Motion No. 3.

[*Translation*]

The vote on Motion No. 3 also applies to Motions Nos. 6 and 8.

The next question is on Motion No. 2, standing in the name of the hon. member for Richmond—Wolfe.

[*English*]

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I think that you would find unanimous consent to apply the vote just taken on Motion No. 1 to Motion No. 2.

[*Translation*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 123.*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 2 lost. Consequently Motions Nos. 4, 5 and 7 are lost.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 3.

**Mr. Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, as the whip for the New Democratic Party caucus the New Democratic Party members present in the House vote yea for Motion No. 5.

**The Deputy Speaker:** We will come to that shortly.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent that the whips or representatives from each party could rise and indicate how their colleagues who had voted on the previous vote would be applied as voting on the present vote. In terms of Liberal members, Liberal members will be voting nay along with the hon. member for Beauce on Motion No. 3.

*Government Orders*

[Translation]

**Mr. Duceppe:** Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois members will be voting nay on this motion.

[English]

**Mr. Silye:** Mr. Speaker, the members of the Reform Party who are present today will vote yea unless there are those who wish to vote otherwise.

**Mr. Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, the members of the New Democratic Party who are present today vote no on Motion No. 3.

(1805)

**Mrs. Wayne:** Mr. Speaker, as the whip for the PC Party, all PC members present tonight will be voting nay.

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negatived on the following division:)

*(Division No. 124)***YEAS**

## Members

Abbott	Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Chatters	Cummins
Duncan	Epp
Forsyth	Frazier
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Hayes	Hermanson
Hoepfner	Jennings
Kerpan	Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Penson	Ramsay
Schmidt	Silye
Solberg	Speaker
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson	Williams—40

**NAYS**

## Members

Adams	Althouse
Anderson	Arseneault
Assad	Asselin
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Berger	Bergeron
Bernier (Beauce)	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bethel
Blaikie	Blondin—Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brien
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Béclair
Bélisle	Caccia
Calder	Campbell
Cannis	Canuel
Caron	Catterall
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Clancy
Cohen	Collins
Copps	Cowling
Crête	Culbert
Dalphond—Guiral	Debien
de Jong	Deshaies
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Dromisky
Duceppe	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
English	Fillion
Finestone	Finlay

Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gagnon (Québec)	Galloway
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harvard
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jacob
Jordan	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Landry	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)	MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchand
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McGuire
McKinnon	McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McWhinney
Mercier	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Ménard
Nault	Nunez
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Proud
Reed	Regan
Rideout	Ringuette—Maltais
Robichaud	Robinson
Rock	Rompkey
Sauvageau	Serré
Shepherd	Sheridan
Skoko	Solomon
Speller	St-Laurent
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Szabo
Taylor	Terrana
Thalheimer	Tobin
Torsney	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Ur	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wayne	Wells
Whelan	Zed—182

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Bachand	Bouchard
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Collins
Daviault	Dubé
Duhamel	Dumas
Gerrard	Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde	Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Shefford)
Minna	O'Reilly
Ouellet	Paré
Rocheleau	Telegdi
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Valeri
Venne	Wood
Young	de Savoye

## Government Orders

(Division No. 125)

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

[Translation]

The next question is on Motion No. 9.

[English]

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I think you will find unanimous consent to apply the vote just taken on Motion No. 3 to report stage Motion No. 9.**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 124.]

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 10.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I think you will find there is consent from the whips or representatives of each party to indicate how their colleagues who have voted on the previous vote will be voting this time.

The Liberal members will be voting nay along with the hon. member for Beauce.

[Translation]

**Mr. Duceppe:** Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois members will be voting yea on this motion.

[English]

**Mr. Silye:** Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find that the Reform Party members present today will vote nay unless there are those who wish to vote otherwise.**Mr. Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, the NDP members of the House of Commons vote yea on Motion No. 10.**Mrs. Wayne:** Mr. Speaker, the members of the PC Party who are here this evening vote yea.

(The House divided on Motion No. 10, which was negatived on the following division:)

Althouse  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)  
Bergeron  
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)  
Brien  
Canuel  
Chrétien (Frontenac)  
Dalphond—Guiral  
de Jong  
Duceppe  
Gagnon (Québec)  
Godin  
Guimond  
Landry  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)  
Marchand  
Mercier  
Nunez  
Plamondon  
Robinson  
Solomon  
Taylor  
Wayne—49

## YEAS

## Members

Asselin  
Bellehumeur  
Bernier (Gaspé)  
Blaikie  
Bélisle  
Caron  
Crête  
Debien  
Deshaies  
Fillion  
Gauthier (Roberval)  
Guay  
Jacob  
Langlois  
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)  
Leblanc (Longueuil)  
Loubier  
McLaughlin  
Ménard  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pomerleau  
Sauvageau  
St-Laurent  
Tremblay (Rosemont)

## NAYS

## Members

Abbott  
Anderson  
Assad  
Baker  
Barnes  
Bellemare  
Berger  
Bethel  
Bodnar  
Boudria  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Brushett  
Bélair  
Calder  
Cannis  
Chamberlain  
Chatters  
Cohen  
Copps  
Culbert  
DeVillers  
Dingwall  
Duncan  
Easter  
English  
Finestone  
Flis  
Forseth  
Fry  
Gagliano  
Galloway  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Grose  
Guarnieri  
Hanrahan  
Harper (Calgary West)  
Harris  
Harvard  
Hermanson  
Hopkins  
Ianno  
Irwin  
Jordan  
Kerpan  
Kirkby  
Kraft Sloan  
Lee  
MacAulay  
MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)  
Maloney  
Manning  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)

Adams  
Arseneault  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Benoit  
Bernier (Beauce)  
Blondin—Andrew  
Bonin  
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)  
Brown (Oakville—Milton)  
Bryden  
Caccia  
Campbell  
Catterall  
Chan  
Clancy  
Collins  
Cowling  
Cummins  
Dhaliwal  
Dromisky  
Dupuy  
Eggleton  
Epp  
Finlay  
Fontana  
Frazier  
Gaffney  
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Grubel  
Hanger  
Harb  
Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
Hart  
Hayes  
Hoepfner  
Hubbard  
Iftody  
Jennings  
Karygiannis  
Keyes  
Knutson  
Lastewka  
Loney  
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marleau  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)

*Government Orders*

Massé	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McGuire
McKinnon	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney	Meredith
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell	Morrison
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien
Pagtakhan	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Penson	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Ramsay
Reed	Regan
Rideout	Ringuette—Maltais
Robichaud	Rock
Rompkey	Schmidt
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Silye
Skoke	Solberg
Speaker	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stinson
Strahl	Szabo
Terrana	Thalheimer
Thompson	Tobin
Torsney	Ur
Vanclief	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Whelan	Williams
Zed—173	

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Bachand	Bouchard
Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	Collins
Daviault	Dubé
Duhamel	Dumas
Gerrard	Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde	Lavigne (Verdun—Saint—Paul)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Shefford)
Minna	O'Reilly
Ouellet	Paré
Rocheleau	Telegdi
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Valeri
Venne	Wood
Young	de Savoye

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry):** moved that the bill be concurred in.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I think you will find consent that the whips or representatives of each party will indicate how their caucus colleagues will be voting.

The Liberal members will be voting yea on the concurrence motion.

[Translation]

**Mr. Duceppe:** The members of the Bloc Québécois will vote nay.

[English]

**Mr. Silye:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present this evening will vote nay unless there are those who wish to vote otherwise.

**Mr. Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, the members of the NDP who are in the House will vote no on this concurrence motion.

**Mrs. Wayne:** Mr. Speaker, the members of the PC Party vote yea.

(1810)

[Translation]

**Mr. Bernier (Beauce, Ind.):** I vote yea, Mr. Speaker.

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

(Division No. 126)

## YEAS

## Members

Adams	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellemare
Berger	Bernier (Beauce)
Bethel	Blondin—Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Caccia
Calder	Campbell
Cannis	Catterall
Chamberlain	Chan
Clancy	Cohen
Collins	Copps
Cowling	Culbert
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Dromisky
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	English
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jordan	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lee
Loney	MacAulay
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)	MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McGuire	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien
Pagtakhan	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Proud
Reed	Regan
Rideout	Ringuette—Maltais
Robichaud	Rock
Rompkey	Serré
Shepherd	Sheridan
Skoke	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Szabo
Terrana	Thalheimer
Tobin	Torsney
Ur	Vanclief

## Government Orders

Verran  
Walker  
Wayne  
Whelan

Volpe  
Wappel  
Wells  
Zed—134

[English]

## INCOME TAX ACT

The House resumed from December 2 consideration of the motion that Bill C-59, an act to amend the Income Tax Act and the income tax application rules, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to the order made Friday, December 2, 1994, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on second reading stage of Bill C-59, an act to amend the Income Tax Act and the income tax application rules.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to seek unanimous consent to apply the vote just taken on the concurrence motion to the motion on Bill C-59.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent by all members in the House?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 126.]

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

\* \* \*

## CANADA GRAIN ACT

The House resumed from December 5 consideration of Bill C-51, an act to amend the Canada Grain Act and respecting certain regulations made pursuant to that act, as reported (without amendment) from the committee; and Motion No. 1.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The House will now proceed to the taking of deferred divisions on report stage of Bill C-51.

The first question is on Motion No. 1.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You would probably find unanimous consent that the whip or representative of each party indicate how their colleagues are voting.

Liberal members will be voting nay on Motion No. 1.

[Translation]

**Mr. Duceppe:** The members of the Bloc Quebecois will vote yea, Mr. Speaker.

[English]

**Mr. Silye:** Mr. Speaker, you will find that the Reform Party members will vote yea to this unless there are those who wish to vote otherwise.

**Mr. Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, members of the New Democratic Party vote nay on Motion No. 1.

**Mrs. Wayne:** Mr. Speaker, nay.

**Mr. Bernier (Beauce):** Nay, Mr. Speaker.

## NAYS

## Members

Abbott  
Asselin  
Bellehumeur  
Bergeron  
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)  
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)  
Brien  
Canuel  
Chatters  
Crête  
Dalphond—Guiral  
de Jong  
Duceppe  
Epp  
Forseth  
Gagnon (Québec)  
Godin  
Grubel  
Guimond  
Hanrahan  
Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
Hart  
Hermanson  
Jacob  
Kerpan  
Langlois  
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)  
Leblanc (Longueuil)  
Loubier  
Marchand  
Mayfield  
McLaughlin  
Meredith  
Morrison  
Nunez  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pomerleau  
Robinson  
Schmidt  
Solberg  
Speaker  
Stinson  
Taylor  
Tremblay (Rosemont)

Althouse  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)  
Benoit  
Bernier (Gaspé)  
Blaikie  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Bélisle  
Caron  
Chrétien (Frontenac)  
Cummins  
Debien  
Deshaies  
Duncan  
Fillion  
Frazer  
Gauthier (Roberval)  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Guay  
Hanger  
Harper (Calgary West)  
Harris  
Hayes  
Hoepfner  
Jennings  
Landry  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)  
Manning  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)  
Mercier  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Ménard  
Penson  
Plamondon  
Ramsay  
Sauvageau  
Silye  
Solomon  
St-Laurent  
Strahl  
Thompson  
Williams—88

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Bachand  
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)  
Daviault  
Duhamel  
Gerrard  
Lalonde  
Lefebvre  
Minna  
Ouellet  
Rocheleau  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)  
Venne  
Young

Bouchard  
Collins  
Dubé  
Dumas  
Harper (Churchill)  
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)  
Leroux (Shefford)  
O'Reilly  
Paré  
Telegdi  
Valeri  
Wood  
de Savoye

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

*Government Orders*

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 127)***YEAS**

## Members

Abbott	Asselin
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Bélisle	Canuel
Caron	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Crête
Cummins	Dalphond—Guiral
Debien	Deshais
Duceppe	Duncan
Epp	Fillion
Forseth	Frazier
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hart	Hayes
Hermanson	Hoepfner
Jacob	Jennings
Kerpan	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier	Manning
Marchand	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mercier	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Ménard	Nunez
Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Ramsay	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Silye
Solberg	Speaker
St-Laurent	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Williams—80

**NAYS**

## Members

Adams	Althouse
Anderson	Arseneault
Assad	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellemare
Berger	Bernier (Beauce)
Bethel	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Cannis
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Clancy
Cohen	Collins
Copps	Cowling
Culbert	de Jong
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Dromisky
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	English

Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jordan	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lee
Loney	MacAulay
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)	MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)	Massé
McGuire	McKinnon
McLaughlin	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney	Mifflin
Miliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Reed
Regan	Rideout
Ringuette—Maltais	Robichaud
Robinson	Rock
Rompkey	Serré
Shepherd	Sheridan
Skoke	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Szabo	Taylor
Terrana	Thalheimer
Tobin	Torsney
Ur	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wayne	Wells
Whelan	Zed—142

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Bachand	Bouchard
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Collins
Daviault	Dubé
Duhamel	Dumas
Gerrard	Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde	Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Shefford)
Minna	O'Reilly
Ouellet	Paré
Rocheleau	Telegdi
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Valeri
Venne	Wood
Young	de Savoye

[Translation]

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, the Liberal members will be voting nay on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Duceppe:** Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Quebecois vote nay on this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. Silye:** Members of the Reform Party will vote nay on this motion unless there are those who wish to vote otherwise.

**Mr. Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, members of the New Democratic Party caucus who are present today vote yea on this motion.

**Mrs. Wayne:** Mr. Speaker, members of the PC caucus here today will vote nay on this.

**Mr. Bernier (Beauce):** No.

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 128)***YEAS**

## Members

Althouse	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Blaikie	de Jong
McLaughlin	Robinson
Solomon	Taylor—8

**NAYS**

## Members

Abbott	Adams
Andersson	Arseneault
Assad	Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Benoit
Berger	Bergeron
Bernier (Beauce)	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bethel
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélisle
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Cannis
Canuel	Caron
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Clancy
Cohen	Collins
Copps	Cowling
Crête	Culbert
Cummins	Dalphond—Guiral
Debien	Deshaies
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Dromisky
Duceppe	Duncan
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	English
Epp	Fillion
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Forseth	Frazier
Fry	Gaffney

Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gagnon (Québec)	Galloway
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Beaver River)	Grose
Grubel	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harb	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hart	Harvard
Hayes	Hermanson
Hoepfner	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jacob	Jennings
Jordan	Karygiannis
Kerpan	Keys
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Landry
Langlois	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loney	Loubier
MacAulay	MacLaren (Etobicoke North)
MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Manning	Marchand
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McWhinney
Mercier	Meredith
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell	Morrison
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	Nault
Nunez	O'Brien
Pagtakhan	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Penson	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Proud
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Rideout
Ringuette—Maltais	Robichaud
Rock	Rompkey
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Silye
Skoke	Solberg
Speaker	Speller
St-Laurent	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Terrana
Thalheimer	Thompson
Tobin	Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Ur
Vanclief	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Wayne
Wells	Whelan
Williams	Zed—214

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Bachand	Bouchard
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Collins
Daviault	Dubé
Duhamel	Dumas
Gerrard	Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde	Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Shefford)
Minna	O'Reilly
Ouellet	Paré
Rocheleau	Telegdi
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Valeri
Venne	Wood
Young	de Savoye



*Government Orders*

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 4.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, Liberal members by unanimous consent will be recorded as voting nay.

[Translation]

**Mr. Duceppe:** Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois vote nay on this motion.

(1815)

[English]

**Mr. Silye:** The Reform Party members present this evening vote yea, except for those who wish to vote otherwise.

**Mr. Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, New Democrat members of Parliament are proud to vote yes on this motion.

**Mrs. Wayne:** Mr. Speaker, the PC caucus votes nay.

[Translation]

**Mr. Bernier (Beauce):** Mr. Speaker, I vote nay.

(The House divided on Motion No. 4, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 129)***YEAS**

## Members

Abbott	Althouse
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Benoit
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Chatters
Cummins	de Jong
Duncan	Epp
Forseth	Frazer
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Hayes	Hermanson
Hoepfner	Jennings
Kerpan	Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McLaughlin
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Penson
Ramsay	Robinson
Schmidt	Silye
Solberg	Solomon
Speaker	Stinson
Strahl	Taylor
Thompson	Williams—48

**NAYS**

## Members

Adams	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Asselin	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Berger	Bergeron
Bernier (Beauce)	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégaric—Compton—Stanstead)	Bethel
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brien	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélisle
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Cannis
Canuel	Caron
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Clancy	Cohen
Collins	Copps
Cowling	Crête
Culbert	Dalphond—Gural
Debien	Deshaies
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Dromisky
Duceppe	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
English	Fillion
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gagnon (Québec)	Galloway
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harvard
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jacob
Jordan	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Landry	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)	MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchand
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McGuire
McKinnon	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	Nault
Nunez	O'Brien
Pagtakhan	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Proud	Reed
Regan	Rideout
Ringuette—Maltais	Robichaud
Rock	Rompkey
Sauvageau	Serré
Shepherd	Sheridan
Skoke	Speller
St-Laurent	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Szabo	Terrana

*Government Orders*

Thalheimer  
Torsney  
Ur  
Verran  
Walker  
Wayne  
Whelan

Tobin  
Tremblay (Rosemont)  
Vanclief  
Volpe  
Wappel  
Wells  
Zed—174

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Bachand  
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)  
Daviault  
Duhamel  
Gerrard  
Lalonde  
Lefebvre  
Minna  
Ouellet  
Rocheleau  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)  
Venne  
Young

Bouchard  
Collins  
Dubé  
Dumas  
Harper (Churchill)  
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)  
Leroux (Shefford)  
O'Reilly  
Paré  
Telegdi  
Valeri  
Wood  
de Savoye

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 3.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it I think you would find consent to apply the vote taken on report stage Motion No. 3 of Bill C-46 to the motion now before the House.

[*Translation*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 124.*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 7.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I think you would find consent to apply the vote just taken on report stage Motion No. 3 of Bill C-51 to the motion now before the House.

[*Translation*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 124.*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare Motions Nos. 7 and 8 lost.

[*English*]

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.)** moved that the bill be concurred in.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent that we apply the vote just taken on report stage Motion No. 7 in reverse for the concurrence motion on Bill C-51.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Do we have unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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

(*Division No. 130*)

## YEAS

## Members

Adams  
Anderson  
Assad  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)  
Baker  
Barnes  
Bellehumeur  
Berger  
Bernier (Beauce)  
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)  
Blaikie  
Bodnar  
Boudria  
Brown (Oakville—Milton)  
Bryden  
Bélisle  
Calder  
Cannis  
Caron  
Chamberlain  
Chrétien (Frontenac)  
Cohen  
Copps  
Crête  
Dalphond—Guiral  
de Jong  
DeVillers  
Dingwall  
Duceppe  
Easter  
English  
Finestone  
Fiis  
Fry  
Gagliano  
Gagnon (Québec)  
Gauthier (Roberval)  
Godin  
Graham  
Grose  
Guay  
Harb  
Hopkins  
Ianno  
Irwin  
Jordan  
Keyes  
Knutson  
Landry  
Lastewka  
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)  
Leblanc (Longueuil)  
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)  
Loubier  
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marleau  
Massé  
McKinnon  
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)  
Mercier  
Milliken  
Mitchell  
Murray  
Nault  
O'Brien  
Parrish  
Payne

Althouse  
Arseneault  
Asselin  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Bellemare  
Bergeron  
Bernier (Gaspé)  
Bethel  
Blondin—Andrew  
Bonin  
Brien  
Brushett  
Bélair  
Caccia  
Campbell  
Canuel  
Catterall  
Chan  
Clancy  
Collins  
Cowling  
Culbert  
Debien  
Deshaies  
Dhaliwal  
Dromisky  
Dupuy  
Eggleton  
Fillion  
Finlay  
Fontana  
Gaffney  
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)  
Galloway  
Godfrey  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Guarnieri  
Guimond  
Harvard  
Hubbard  
Itody  
Jacob  
Karygiannis  
Kirkby  
Kraft Sloan  
Langlois  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Lee  
Loney  
MacAulay  
MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)  
Maloney  
Marchand  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
McGuire  
McLaughlin  
McWhinney  
Miffin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Murphy  
Ménard  
Nunez  
Pagtakhan  
Patry  
Peters

*Government Orders*

Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Proud
Reed	Regan
Rideout	Ringuette—Maltais
Robichaud	Robinson
Rock	Rompkey
Sauvageau	Serré
Shepherd	Sheridan
Skoke	Solomon
Speller	St-Laurent
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Szabo
Taylor	Terrana
Thalheimer	Tobin
Torsney	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Ur	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wayne	Wells
Whelan	Zed—182

## NAYS

## Members

Abbott	Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Chatters	Cummins
Duncan	Epp
Forseth	Frazer
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Hayes	Hermanson
Hoepfner	Jennings
Kerpan	Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Penson	Ramsay
Schmidt	Silye
Solberg	Speaker
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson	Williams—40

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Bachand	Bouchard
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Collins
Daviault	Dubé
Duhamel	Dumas
Gerrard	Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde	Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Shefford)
Minna	O'Reilly
Ouellet	Paré
Rocheleau	Telegdi
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Valeri
Venne	Wood
Young	de Savoye

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

Pursuant to Standing Order 45(a), the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions on report stage of Bill C-56, an act to amend the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act.

\* \* \*

## CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ACT

The House resumed from December 5 consideration of Bill C-56, an act to amend the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The question is on Motion No. 1.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent to apply the vote taken on Motion No. 4 of the report stage of Bill C-51 to this motion now before the House.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 129.*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** The motion is negated.

The next question is on Motion No. 3.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent to apply the vote just taken on report stage Motion No. 1 to the motion now before the House.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 129.*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** The motion is negated.

The next question is on the amendment to Motion No. 4.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent to apply the vote taken at report stage motion No. 10 of Bill C-46 to the item now before the House.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 125.*]

[*Translation*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the amendment lost.

(1820)

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 4.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent to apply the vote taken on report stage Motion No. 2 of Bill C-51 to the motion now before the House.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 128.]

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.)** moved that the bill be concurred in.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I think you would find consent to apply the vote taken on report stage Motion No. 1 of Bill C-51 in reverse to the motion now before the House.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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

(Division No. 131)

**YEAS**

Members

Adams  
Anderson  
Assad  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Berge  
Bethel  
Blondin—Andrew  
Bonin  
Brown (Oakville—Milton)  
Bryden  
Caccia  
Campbell  
Catterall  
Chan  
Cohen  
Copps  
Culbert  
De Villers  
Dingwall  
Dupuy  
Eggleton  
Finestone  
Flis  
Fry  
Gagliano  
Galloway  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Guarnieri  
Harvard  
Hubbard  
Iftody  
Jordan  
Keyes  
Knutson  
Lastewka  
Loney  
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)  
Malhi  
Manley  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
McGuire  
McLaughlin  
McWhinney  
Milliken  
Mitchell  
Murray  
O'Brien  
Parrish  
Payne  
Peterson  
Pickard (Essex—Kent)  
Proud  
Regan  
Ringuette—Maltais  
Robinson  
Rompkey  
Shepherd  
Skoke  
Speller  
Steckle

Althouse  
Arseneault  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)  
Baker  
Barnes  
Bellemare  
Bernier (Beauce)  
Blaikie  
Bodnar  
Boudria  
Brushett  
Bélair  
Calder  
Cannis  
Chamberlain  
Clancy  
Collins  
Cowling  
de Jong  
Dhaliwal  
Dromisky  
Easter  
English  
Finlay  
Fontana  
Gaffney  
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Grose  
Harb  
Hopkins  
Ianno  
Irwin  
Karygiannis  
Kirkby  
Kraft Sloan  
Lee  
MacAulay  
MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)  
Maloney  
Marleau  
Massé  
McKinnon  
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Murphy  
Nault  
Pagtakhan  
Patry  
Peters  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Reed  
Rideout  
Robichaud  
Rock  
Serré  
Sheridan  
Solomon  
St. Denis  
Stewart (Brant)

Szabo  
Terrana  
Tobin  
Ur  
Verran  
Walker  
Wayne  
Whelan

*Government Orders*

Taylor  
Thalheimer  
Torsney  
Vanclief  
Volpe  
Wappel  
Wells  
Zed—142

**NAYS**

Members

Abbott  
Bellehumeur  
Bergeron  
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Bélisle  
Caron  
Chrétien (Frontenac)  
Cummins  
Debien  
Duceppe  
Epp  
Forseth  
Gagnon (Québec)  
Godin  
Grubel  
Guimond  
Hanrahan  
Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
Hart  
Hermanson  
Jacob  
Kerpan  
Langlois  
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)  
Leblanc (Longueuil)  
Loubier  
Marchand  
Mayfield  
Mercier  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Ménard  
Penson  
Plamondon  
Ramsay  
Schmidt  
Solberg  
St-Laurent  
Strahl  
Tremblay (Rosemont)

Asselin  
Benoit  
Bernier (Gaspé)  
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)  
Brien  
Canuel  
Chatters  
Crête  
Dalphond—Guiral  
Deshaies  
Duncan  
Fillion  
Frazer  
Gauthier (Roberval)  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Guay  
Hanger  
Harper (Calgary West)  
Harris  
Hayes  
Hoepfner  
Jennings  
Landry  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)  
Manning  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)  
Meredith  
Morrison  
Nunez  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pomerleau  
Sauvageau  
Silye  
Speaker  
Stinson  
Thompson  
Williams—80

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Bachand  
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)  
Davialt  
Duhamel  
Gerrard  
Lalonde  
Lefebvre  
Minna  
Ouellet  
Rocheleau  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)  
Venne  
Young

Bouchard  
Collins  
Dubé  
Dumas  
Harper (Churchill)  
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)  
Leroux (Shefford)  
O'Reilly  
Paré  
Telegdi  
Valeri  
Wood  
de Savoye

*Private Members' Business*

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

It being 6.30 p.m. the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business.

---

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

[English]

**UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-216, an act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act (jury service), as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

**Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Hon. members will note on the Order Paper that the recommendation from His Excellency the Governor General has been provided for this bill in order to permit the House to consider its final passage without conflicting with either Standing Order 79(1) or section 54 of the Constitution.

The government is pleased to have this opportunity to take the unusual step of obtaining a recommendation for a private member's initiative, which is entirely within the spirit and the letter of our program of parliamentary reform.

I must caution the House however that this individual case has been examined by the government carefully and it is only because Bill C-216 fits with the existing fiscal framework that the government has been able to take this opportunity.

The House should not consider this case as a precedent. It is highly unlikely that there will be many cases that lend themselves to this kind of accommodation. In order to maintain strict control over expenditure the government will insist on the strict enforcement of this order and in the other place of the constitutional principle that no expenditure may be voted by a parliamentary motion or bill without the explicit recommendation to this House by His Excellency.

**Mr. Guy H. Arseneault (Restigouche—Chaleur, Lib.)** moved that the bill be concurred in.

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.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 130.]

**Mr. Arseneault** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker it gives me pleasure to rise tonight to speak on third reading of this private member's bill.

I would like to commence by thanking all my colleagues from all parties who have supported me. It has been a four-year battle. It started four years ago in December and we are in December again looking at third reading.

I thank my hon. colleagues on this historic occasion. I am looking for their support at third reading. We hope to conclude third reading this evening.

[Translation]

I have the honour and the pleasure to rise in this House to speak on a private member's bill which I sponsored to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act.

As you know, section 14 of this act prevents unemployed people who have to do jury duty from collecting UI benefits.

[English]

I have spoken on this issue for the last four years. I could go on. Other members have spoken on the issue. I think we should put it to rest this evening. I will now rest my case to my colleagues and would ask for their unanimous consent to pass the bill at third reading.

[Translation]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to pass this bill on third reading?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Bellehumeur:** Is this a continuation of the debate, Mr. Speaker?

**The Deputy Speaker:** I thought we were ready to adopt this bill. Is there some misunderstanding with the member who wishes to rise on a point of order?

**Mr. Bellehumeur:** There was an amendment by the Reform Party, but it is not up to me to raise this point of order.

**The Deputy Speaker:** It seems the hon. member for Berthier—Montcalm has the right to make his speech.

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I prepared a few notes because in any case, I was going to support the hon. member on this bill as the Bloc Québécois did when the hon. member for Mercier spoke to this bill. At the time, we agreed with the hon. member's initiative regarding this legislation. I think there was an oversight. Earlier we had comments from the government.

*Private Members' Business*

I think these comments are in line with our own support for the hon. member's bill, in other words, I believe that at the present time, we are penalizing people who would be able to perform a duty that is extremely important in our judicial system, and I am referring to jury duty. A person on unemployment insurance was either penalized, in other words, did his jury duty but was not entitled to receive unemployment insurance benefits, or the judges, considering this particular situation, rejected such people for jury duty.

However, thanks to the hon. member's amendment, and he is to be commended for making this proposal, the situation will be rectified.

I believe that in previous debates, we stressed the usefulness of jury members in our judicial system, and I should add that the jury system is a provincial matter, in other words, the province has jurisdiction over the administration of justice at this level.

I believe that as legislators, in the House, we have helped accelerate and simplify procedures and assist those responsible for the administration of justice. I think that Bill C-216 is entirely in line with this attempt at simplification and helping people fulfil their jury duties.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention something that happened in the judicial district of Joliette, in connection with the selection of jury members. In a murder case, after seeing about 300 to 400 potential jurors, the lawyers had rejected practically everyone, so that the sheriff finally rented a bus and had the bus stop in various streets in the municipality of Joliette, pick up anyone who looked like they were of age and take them by bus to the court house to be selected as jurors.

My point is that people do not exactly go out of their way to do jury duty, and I think that if we can simplify things and help people, if there are people on unemployment insurance who could do jury duty, I think we should let them, and Bill C-216 is a step in the right direction.

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

**Mr. Bellehumeur:** That being said, I will be delighted to support Bill C-216.

[*English*]

**Mr. Hugh Hanrahan (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I stand before my hon. colleagues and my constituents today to discuss Bill C-216, a private member's bill that changes the rules of the unemployment insurance program to allow unemployment insurance claimants to collect unemployment insurance benefits while they are serving on a jury.

Essentially, Bill C-216 if passed would change only six words in the Unemployment Insurance Act. These changes include the

removal of the word "or" in section 14 and include the words "or engaged in jury service" in the same section.

The question that needs to be addressed is why are we spending all this time discussing these six words. The answer to this question is simple. If these six words were changed, the initial intention of the Unemployment Insurance Act would have been pushed even farther from its original purpose.

Section 14 of the Unemployment Insurance Act states clearly: "A claimant is not entitled to receive benefits for any working day for which he or she is unable to prove capability to work and availability for work or is unable to prove incapability because of prescribed illness, injury, or quarantine. A claimant engaged in jury duty is considered unavailable under section 14 of the act and is therefore disentitled from benefits".

This statement makes it indisputably clear that the framers of the original unemployment act saw that the UI system was not to include those individuals who were called to do their civic duty and perform jury duty.

The Reform Party unequivocally supports the return of the Unemployment Insurance Act to its original function, an employer/employee funded and administered program to provide temporary income in the event of unexpected job loss.

This has been our policy since the late 1980s. Canadians are tired of supporting habitual and seasonal abusers of unemployment insurance. Many people would say that Bill C-216 would become another case of abuse of the great Canadian social security system as it could lead to employers laying off employees who must serve jury duty so that these individuals would be able to collect otherwise uncollectable unemployment insurance.

The potential for abuse is alarmingly clear. When the unemployment insurance system is not used as it was initially designed, Canadians suffer because the present inequities in the UI system which have developed permanently lower disposable income of those who hold full time jobs in regions of some economic strength.

It permanently depresses the rate of job creation among all the firms whose costs are increased by the UI payroll tax. It subsidizes the immobility of labour in ways that seriously hurt the younger generations as parents do not face the incentives they should to move to regions where private sector job opportunities are much more numerous and diverse.

According to the figures provided by my hon. colleague for Restigouche—Chaleur, the implementation of this amendment to the Unemployment Insurance Act, the changing of only six words, would add in the neighbourhood of \$2 million to \$3 million to the unemployment insurance claims. A \$2 million to \$3 million tab would be absorbed by employers and employees

*Private Members' Business*

across the country. They are already losing nearly 40 per cent of their pay cheques through one type of taxation or another.

(1835)

I truly question the willingness of Canadians to absorb this sum of money, especially when considering our fiscal situation where we as a nation are nearly \$535 billion in debt and are paying nearly \$40 billion in interest payments annually to service this astronomical debt.

It is for this reason that if employers and employees who pay for the UI program had a say in how their money was being spent, I do not think they would agree to provide benefits to claimants while they are serving on a jury.

The law is simple, clear and concise. If a UI claimant is serving on a jury they are not available for work and therefore not entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. For too long now the fundamental insurance principles have been compromised so that unemployment insurance is seen more like a form of welfare than a form of insurance.

In the words of Tommy Douglas: "We are not interested in paying able bodied people merely because they were not able to find work. We proposed social aid for those who are unable to work because they were crippled, aged or mentally ill. Those who are able to work would participate in public work projects".

Welfare and unemployment insurance are not a right in Canada and furthermore unemployment insurance is exactly what the name indicates. It is an insurance program and not a seasonal employment or special compensation package.

Workers should only be entitled to unemployment insurance provided they qualify and meet certain obligations. One of these obligations is that they are ready, able and willing to work; work immediately, not tomorrow or the next day or the next week, but immediately.

As I mentioned earlier the unemployment insurance program must be returned to a true insurance program. We should look at other insurance programs to see how they operate and perhaps we as a government could learn a lesson or two from the private sector. Perhaps our national unemployment insurance program should indeed be based on a user pay system such as household or automobile insurance where the more we use our insurance the more our premiums increase and, conversely, the less we use our insurance the less our premiums become.

This type of user pay based system is not solely for employees. It would also relate back to employers as those employers who regularly lay off workers would also have to pay higher premiums as well.

It is clear that this bill is taking us down the wrong direction. We should be looking at ways to make the unemployment insurance as well as government programs sustainable and self-sufficient. Bill C-216 is not even close to achieving this goal or even starting us down the right path.

I want to state clearly that while there may be a problem of fair compensation to individuals who serve on a jury regardless of their employment status, we do not believe that minor changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act is the way to accomplish or change this inequity.

We are not the only ones with this view. In fact a few of our supporters include the policy experts at the department of unemployment insurance and research branch of the Library of Parliament. The department of unemployment insurance comments that the problem is not with the UI rules but rather the poor compensation provided for jurors. The Library of Parliament wrote: "The primary issue in this matter seems to be adequate remuneration for jury duty and that is the responsibility of the provinces rather than the employers and employees who contribute to the unemployment insurance program".

Ultimately then, rather than adjusting the Unemployment Insurance Act the Reform Party proposes that judges should use their discretion to excuse UI claimants from jury duty as has been done in the past. Again, I think it is crucial to state the obvious which is those who serve on jury are perhaps not fairly compensated. On this point I am sure all of us in this House can agree.

(1840)

As my hon. colleague from Yorkton—Melville stated in the House it is inexcusable that jurors are asked to work for days, weeks, and in some cases even months for \$15 or \$20 a day. I believe, as does the Reform Party, in equality and fairness and above all common sense. For that reason it is clear that this issue of appropriate compensation for jurors must be addressed.

However, we also believe in decreasing overlap and duplication between governments. Essentially we believe in staying out of the provincial arena and the issue of juror compensation falls 100 per cent under provincial jurisdiction. For these reasons we will be unable to support this bill.

Finally, I would like to move:

That the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following:

"Bill C-216, an act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act (jury service), be not now read a third time and that the order be discharged, the bill withdrawn, and the subject matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The Chair should indicate that the motion is receivable.

*Private Members' Business*

**Mr. Arseneault:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I beg to differ. I do not want to challenge the Chair on that but the matter has already been referred to the resources development committee and it came back without amendment. I would say that the Reform Party is stalling for time with private members' business and I am very concerned with that.

**Mr. Silye:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. That is just a matter of debate.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Colleagues will appreciate that the bill as was indicated by the member for Restigouche has gone to committee, has been gone through clause by clause, and has come back.

To the hon. member for Restigouche, the motion proposes to discharge the bill and refer the subject matter. Therefore the amendment would appear to me to be in order.

(1845)

**Mr. Garry Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, since this private member's bill was first introduced various things have come up which probably would now make it necessary for the bill to be referred to the committee again. One major thing that has come up is that the Minister of Human Resources Development ordered a review of some of the programs under the Department of Human Resources Development including unemployment insurance.

As there are no members of the Human Resources Development committee present since they are presently holding hearings in Quebec and across the country, it is only in order that we allow the bill to be referred to committee again.

The bill is contrary to true insurance principles. The minister made the point that the changes he is proposing would bring the Unemployment Insurance Act back to a true insurance act. It would very much change what we are doing here, and that is why I am supporting the amendment my colleague has made.

If we are to return unemployment insurance to true insurance principles there are various matters in the bill I would like to address that should be referred back to committee to be corrected. If the members opposite would listen to what I have to say, they would agree with that.

If the bill were passed it would be the first time in history that a private member's bill would require the government to spend more money, in the neighbourhood of \$3 million. I think members opposite would agree and would probably oppose it for that reason.

As I have mentioned, the people on the Human Resources Development committee are not here now to present what they are hearing in the consultations across the country. I have been travelling with the committee for three weeks and there have been many presentations that would run contrary to the spirit of

the private member's bill. For that reason we should be delaying it.

They will be going against the wishes of their Minister of Human Resources Development. The report that will come down in February will indicate that. It would be wise to refer this back to the committee and let it have another look at it.

Some of the things we are hearing that would run contrary to the bill are the following. The people who are coming before the committee as witnesses would like to see reduced the duplication that is presently taking place between the federal and provincial government.

The bill actually does the opposite. It infringes on an area of provincial jurisdiction, that is the area of justice. Even as the member who proposed the bill admitted, the problem is not with unemployment insurance. The problem with serving on duty as a juror falls on the justice system. It should not fall on the unemployment insurance system.

Another thing we are hearing is that the unemployment insurance system should be run more as a true insurance system and should be economically viable. It is not. It should be financially sustainable; we are hearing time and again that unemployment insurance should be self-financing.

Many people are telling us that we need to go back and establish it on true insurance principles. The bill is contrary to that and is why it should be referred back to the committee. The committee now has new insights from what it is hearing from Canadians and would like to probably evaluate the bill with regard to them.

I have a couple of more points. The consultations indicate that Canadians should be treated more equally across Canada. The bill does not do that. Self-employed people would be discriminated against under the bill. They would not be eligible to be compensated by unemployment insurance. They could be sitting beside somebody else on a jury and would not have the same access. There is an equality problem in that regard.

(1850)

It will open up the system to more abuse. The Minister of Human Resources Development has stated explicitly that he would like to reduce the amount of abuse. Costs will escalate at a time when we cannot afford it. In fact we would be approving a history making government expenditure of \$3 million because of a private member's bill.

Would it be possible to somehow look at the bill, send it back to committee and see if some of these things could be addressed? I believe it is and for that reason I am supporting the motion. I hope members opposite and members of the Bloc will support it as well.

The people from whom we are hearing in this consultative process are saying that we have to reduce the number of



*Private Members' Business*

opportunities for abuse, not increase them. For that reason I support what my colleague has put forward.

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, originally I did not intend to enter into the debate. It was my intention from the beginning to rise and pay tribute to the member for Restigouche—Chaleur for bringing forward his private member's bill.

However I must admit that I am appalled by the remarks made by the two previous speakers from the Reform Party. I did not think it was possible for members of Parliament to be so meanspirited.

**Mr. Epp:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The words just used characterizing the Reform Party are not parliamentary. I would ask the member to withdraw them.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I have researched the matter. It was a minister who used those words and she was required to withdraw them. I would invite the member for Winnipeg—St. James to withdraw those words immediately.

**Mr. Harvard:** Mr. Speaker, I am more than happy to withdraw them if they are unparliamentary. How do I convey my disgust? Is that unparliamentary as well? I am left absolutely disgusted by the remarks.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member has withdrawn the offending words that have been ruled within the last two weeks as being unparliamentary. I would ask the hon. member to continue his speech.

**Mr. Harvard:** Mr. Speaker, I am more than happy to continue with my speech.

What is the intent of the private member's bill? Its intent is to remove an injustice, to remove a wrong. These people are ready, willing and able to work. They happen to be on unemployment insurance. They have been mandated by the state. They have been mandated by the government. They have been obliged by society to serve jury duty.

It is not their fault. It is not abuse as suggested by the previous speakers from the third party. They are following the duty imposed upon them by the Parliament of Canada. They are not at fault. These are good people. They do not want to violate the Unemployment Insurance Act, but they have benefits owing to them. They are obliged to serve on the jury but in the process they have to give up their benefits, their compensation.

In the name of fairness and justice surely we cannot ask them on one hand to serve on a jury and at the same time to give up their unemployment insurance compensation. It is wrong. It is an injustice. The intent of the bill is to remove that injustice, to correct that wrong.

Do we not have the compassion or the decency to show these people that we care for them? On one hand we want them to follow the law of the land and to serve on juries and at the same time we should not take away their unemployment insurance benefits, their compensation. If parliamentarians cannot under-

stand this simple concept, this simple piece of justice then I do not understand what is going on.

(1855)

In conclusion all I want to say is this piece of legislation is justified in the name of fairness. The arguments brought forward by the previous speakers are red herrings. This has been examined by the committee. There are no more questions. We should be settling this now in the name of justice.

I pay tribute to the member for Restigouche—Chaleur. He has done the right thing. In the name of justice and fairness and in the name of God let us pass this bill now.

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak for long but I hope to speak a little more calmly than the previous speaker did. A number of points he brought forward actually reiterate what my colleagues are trying to do in having this subject matter referred back to committee.

We must view this in light of the review of all of our social programs and proposed reforms to be introduced hopefully later and not that much later in this Parliament. We are going to be looking at the unemployment insurance system and hopefully reviewing it with a view to making it a true insurance program. Also when we are talking about jury duty we may be talking about other jurisdictions such as the provincial jurisdiction as it affects the criminal justice system.

There are so many complications and so many other angles to this whole situation which have not been adequately presented both in this House and to the committee nor for the provinces to have their input. This underscores the fact that before we hastily implement this private member's bill which will cost taxpayers some money and which will broaden the scope of unemployment insurance rather than narrow it to its original function, it would be wise not to bind the hands of the government and the Minister of Human Resources Development on proposals that will have to be undone at a later date.

I speak on behalf of rational Canadians who want to look carefully and make wise decisions rather than rant uncontrollably and emotionally without having put one's facts together ahead of time in order to make smart decisions rather than foolish ones. We have seen past Liberal governments build up the unemployment insurance program and our social safety net to the point that we have to look at reform, restructuring, redirecting them back to their original purposes so that they can help those Canadians they were supposed to help.

Certainly if people are called to jury duty and there are some financial implications, that needs to be looked at. I do not think my colleagues in the Reform Party are saying this is not a valid issue to bring forward in the House. We are saying that perhaps unemployment insurance is not the correct vehicle to deal with this issue. Also a precedent is being set where a private member's bill is going to cost taxpayers dollars. That is why the

*Adjournment Debate*

CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

Secretary of State for Parliamentary Affairs had to get up and make rather an elaborate statement to the House.

This is a precedent setting incident. We need to look a lot more cautiously in the light of the total deficit of \$540 billion. Every penny must be accounted for. This House has to take more responsibility over that expenditure. We should not hasten to make short two minute speeches and try to slip these bills through without proper consultation and without proper debate in the House.

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

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

(1900)

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a) the deputy whip has asked me to defer the vote until tomorrow at which time the bells to call in the members will be sounded for not more than 15 minutes.

**Ms. Catterall:** Mr. Speaker, I think that given the way the votes are planned for this week you might find unanimous consent in the House to further defer the division until Thursday at 5.30 p.m.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Mr. Hermanson:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I think that for the adjournment debate I will give some background to put things in context. On September 20, 1994, I questioned the Solicitor General of Canada regarding everything that had gone on in the Bristow and McInnis affairs, the infiltrations of political parties and unions, the investigations of the Canadian Jewish Congress in Toronto and Montreal. The questions were very clear.

In particular, we asked the government to establish a royal commission of inquiry to shed light on the whole matter. I also asked who controlled the monster that the Canadian Security Intelligence Service seemed to have become, since no one seemed able to control it anymore or to identify those really responsible, the people committing public funds, taking action. There does not seem to be anyone responsible for it in Parliament.

We rarely obtain any answers to this question, as you well know, and so we turned to SIRC, the Security Intelligence Review Committee. Since September 20, there have been discussions in the sub-committee, witnesses have been called, the CSIS inspector is conducting an investigation, the Sub-committee on National Security has heard witnesses, and so on. And now, on December 9, we are told, SIRC will be submitting its report to the Solicitor General of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, you know that we have our reservations about SIRC, stacked as it is with political appointees, the majority being Conservatives who are looking into activities that were conducted in the 1990s by Conservatives. One cannot be judge and jury at the same time. Our reservations notwithstanding, we are looking forward to reading SIRC's report very attentively.

What I am asking the Solicitor General of Canada this evening is that he submit the complete text of this report to the Sub-committee on National Security, with no deletions, in its entirety, so that we ourselves, given our solid representation on the sub-committee, may judge whether the work has been done properly, whether SIRC has carried out its mandate, which is to reassure us that it has looked into what was done in the cases I mentioned earlier, with respect to Bristow and anything to do with infiltration activities by CSIS.

(1905)

What I am requesting, and I hope that we are going to obtain it, is an unaltered copy so that our representative on the Sub-committee on National Security can question people and obtain satisfaction in this matter.

I think that it is extremely important, given that we have not been able to have a royal commission of inquiry established, that we at least be able to examine this report in its entirety.

**Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in 1984, when the CSIS Act

*Adjournment Debate*

became law, Parliament achieved two very important objectives. First, it created a civilian security intelligence agency, accountable through the Solicitor General to Parliament, and ultimately, to the Canadian people.

Second, in support of an additional measure of control and accountability for the activities of this agency, Parliament created an external review body—the Security Intelligence Review Committee, or SIRC.

SIRC has the legislative mandate to perform two kinds of functions. The first is to act as an administrative tribunal to hear complaints against the security service. The second, relevant to the issue before us, is to review the performance and activities of the Service.

Section 38 of the CSIS Act authorizes SIRC to review how CSIS performs all its duties and functions. More specifically, under section 54, SIRC can investigate any matter relating to CSIS's activities and then provide the Solicitor General with a special report of this investigation.

SIRC is entitled to obtain any information, including documents, reports and explanations from CSIS and the Inspector General to carry out its responsibilities. Clearly, SIRC has the authority and enabling powers to properly fulfil its mandate.

In conclusion, it would be in no one's interest, and certainly not the Canadian public's, to establish another review body to do what SIRC is already authorized to do.

Therefore, I would suggest that we put this suggestion of a royal commission to rest and await the report of the Security Intelligence Review Committee.

[*English*]

## TRADE

**Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the question posed to the Minister for International Trade was prompted by concerns expressed from a number of agricultural organizations that Bill C-57, an act to implement the World Trade Organization, was deficient and needed to be amended.

My question focused on one area of concern, namely the issue of tariff levels and supplemental quotas on supply managed commodities. However, there are concerns in other areas as well: clauses referring to the Western Grain Transportation Act and comparisons to the United States implementation legislation.

There is absolutely no question in my mind that the U.S. implementing legislation has more teeth in it and retains a greater degree of political control.

On November 28 the minister responded to my question concerning the issues of tariff levels and supplemental quotas on

supply managed commodities by stating that amendments to the Customs Tariff Act, et cetera, would be introduced "if necessary".

The minister did not respond to my satisfaction or to the industry's satisfaction by either stating that there was no cause for concern or that given these concerns legislation to amend the act would be forthcoming.

According to a paper prepared for the standing committee on agriculture by the research branch of the Library of Parliament on Bill C-57, the issue of supplemental quotas was outlined as follows, and I quote: "Even though this clause 109 of C-57 may appear necessary to allow additional imports in the case of emergencies, it is not clear what the tariff would be on those supplemental imports".

The research document continued further by stating that: "It has been mentioned that artificial shortages can be created that would necessitate supplemental imports that could displace domestic products permanently. So far officials have not been able to give an appropriate answer on the level of the tariffs affecting the supplemental imports".

In testimony before the international trade committee, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture echoed those concerns as well.

(1910)

This point must be addressed. As I said in previous debates, a situation could occur in which a processor shorted the demand. For example, in hatcheries the hatcheries control the purchase of the breeder birds so it is not difficult for them to plan to be short and need supplementals.

As a result of shorting needs, they demand supplementals. The manufacturer would apply for same and would be granted tariff free supplemental import permits and that would go a long way to breaking the supply management system.

The question remains why has the minister not introduced the appropriate amendments to the Customs Tariffs Act to address the concerns expressed. My grave concern as well is that if these amendments are not encompassed in legislation and are just encompassed in regulation it becomes very easy for some minister down the road who does not support supply management to the extent that this government does to allow that little weakening in terms of the legislation to see the supply management system destroyed over time.

The only other point I want to make and question the minister on is that Bill C-57 contains no provisions to ensure that exporters of grain have any warning with respect to when the cap on volume or the cap on expenditures under the WGTA and the new requirements of the GATT will be reached. This result could be that commitments and sales made by the Canadian Wheat

*Adjournment Debate*

Board at a set price could well be negatively impacted if the caps are attained prior to the movement of grain involved.

How will this issue be addressed and what would be the impact on the marketing of the Canadian Wheat Board, its ability to market at top dollar and access supplies? I raise those questions to the minister out of a deeply felt concern.

[Translation]

**Mr. Mac Harb (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of International Trade, Lib):** Mr. Speaker, the government has stated that the new tariff rate quota regime for agricultural products will include provisions for supplementary imports for various purposes. All stakeholders in the supply managed areas have agreed such access is necessary. However, legitimate questions have been raised as to the terms on which access for the specific purpose of preventing a market shortage should be allowed.

On the one hand, it is said that processors are increasingly able to control the level of production, especially in the poultry sectors, and so can artificially create a market shortage if they know they have guaranteed access to supplementary imports in such cases. Since this would reduce returns to primary producers, some argue there should be a higher duty on such supplementary imports than the one provided for within the tariff rate quota, so as to discourage such behaviour.

On the other hand, poultry and egg processors argue that they must guarantee price and supply to their costumers if they are not to lose contracts. They point out that their industries—including producers—face competition from other food products, and irregularities of price or supply will cost everyone market share.

There are also many misunderstandings about what is involved in the supplementary access scheme envisaged in Bill C-57. Perhaps I can dispel some of them.

First, current and prospective provisions of the Export and Import Permits Act enable supplementary imports but do not impose them. The government has no intention of letting in additional quantities at duty rates below the “high” MFN rate where this would be against the Canadian interest.

Second, imports for market shortages are not “within access commitment” under the proposed legislation, and will not result in permanent increases in market access. On the contrary, such imports are and will be let in at the discretion of the government.

Third, nothing in Bill C-57 prevents the government from examining the issue and introducing new rules.

(1915)

In fact, Bill C-57 basically rolls the current system of supplementary access over in order to furnish an immediate

means of allowing supplementary imports for a variety of reasons, including enhancing export competitiveness.

Finally, the situation calls for careful analysis and broad consultation. Should the government determine that additional duties on supplementary imports of supply managed products are advisable, we will take all appropriate measures to institute such a system, including legislation, if necessary. However, changing Bill C-57 to effect this would short-circuit the consultative process, and is not in the government’s plans.

[English]

## VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to elaborate on a previous question that I put to the Minister of Justice on December 1, 1994 in the context of this day being recognized as a national day of remembrance and action to end violence against women. I asked what measures are being implemented to ensure that women are protected from violence.

On this day of solemn commemoration we are invited to recognize the many women who have died as victims of violence and abuse and we are reminded that thousands of others live every day in danger and in fear. For this day to take on its full significance I would like to see this House act even more comprehensively.

Until recently the issue of violence against women was hidden within the private sphere and as such was generally ignored or trivialized. Fortunately we are coming to realize that violence against women is in clear violation of human rights. It robs women of their self-esteem, dignity and in some cases their life.

Since Statistics Canada conducted its first national survey on violence against women in 1993, which is the first one of its kind worldwide, the gravity of the situation has been brought to light. According to the survey, as many as 51 per cent of Canadian women have experienced at least one incident of physical or sexual violence since the age of 16. Almost 45 per cent of all women experience violence by men known to them, their dates, boyfriends, marital partners, friends, family or neighbours. Whereas a woman is shot every six days in Canada, firearms are the weapon of choice for spousal homicides. During the period between 1974 and 1992, 42 per cent of the women killed by their spouses were shot.

As shattering as these statistics are they only account for part of the problem since Statistics Canada defines violence as experience of physical or sexual assault. It does not touch upon the other dimensions of violence to which many women are subject.

Three other areas were identified in the 1993 report, *Changing the Landscape, Ending Violence, Achieving Equality*. They are psychological violence which encompasses various tactics to undermine a woman’s self-confidence; financial violence, whereby a woman’s access to employment or investment opportunities are denied by her partner or family members; and

*Adjournment Debate*

piritual abuse in which the cultural or religious beliefs are destroyed through ridicule or punishment.

A wide range of indicators give evidence that this societal ill is pervasive and systemic. As a result, women from all walks of life are targets of various acts of violence.

Not only are the causes and the forms of violence against women extremely insidious, but so too are their effects. Such violence scars not only women but also the children and the men around them. It marks the body, but it also deeply wounds the mind and the spirit of those affected. As a result of having been abused a woman's physical and/or mental health can be at stake. Her chance of advancement in her working life may be jeopardized and her interpersonal skills generally deteriorate.

As well as having these devastating effects on the women concerned, such violence is proven to seriously destabilize the children who witness it. Boys who are brought up in an abusive household are more likely to become violent fathers and girls are more likely to become victims at the hands of their future partners.

Canada has played a leadership role internationally in initiating the UN declaration on the elimination of violence against women, recognizing the urgent need for the universal application to women of the rights and principles with regard to equality, security, integrity and dignity of all persons.

The red book called for a justice system that will work to ensure safe homes, safe streets. While other ministries of this government will play important roles, I ask the Minister of Justice today, how does he intend to address this very important issue of ending violence against women?

**Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today marks the sad

anniversary of the murder of 14 young women at l'École polytechnique in Montreal.

The government recognizes the devastating effects of violence against women and is striving to improve its response to help victims and to stop the offenders. As examples of the work being done in the Department of Justice to address the issue of violence against women let me mention the following.

The new firearms initiatives will provide a clear and effective response to try and prevent women from being killed by guns. Bill C-42 proposes amendments to the Criminal Code which would allow police and others to apply for a peace bond on behalf of a person at risk. Bill C-41 proposes sentencing reforms and would make abuse of a position of trust or authority in the commission of an offence an aggravating factor in sentencing. Dealing with violence against women remains one of the government's highest priorities in the justice area.

At the end of the week consultations will take place with women's groups on how to respond to the Supreme Court's decision to allow defence of extreme drunkenness, where a man had sexually assaulted a woman while intoxicated. The Minister of Justice has already indicated his intention to respond to the problems arising from the Daviault decision and is looking at a criminal intoxication proposal.

Dealing with violence against women remains one of the government's highest priorities in the justice area.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m. Good evening to all.

(The House adjourned at 7.22 p.m.)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tuesday, December 6, 1994

---

## Points of Order

### Violence Against Women

Mr. Gagliano ..... 8659

## Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Milliken ..... 8659

## Community Stories

Mrs. Finestone ..... 8659

## Violence Against Women

Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) ..... 8660

Miss Grey ..... 8661

Ms. McLaughlin ..... 8662

## Regulatory Efficiency Act

Bill C-62. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted ..... 8662

Mr. Eggleton ..... 8662

## Petitions

### Senior Citizens

Mr. Dumas ..... 8662

### Rights of the Unborn

Mr. Steckle ..... 8663

### Human Rights

Mr. Steckle ..... 8663

### Assisted Suicide

Mr. Chatters ..... 8663

**Rights of the Unborn**

Mr. Bonin ..... 8663

**Assisted Suicide**

Mr. Bonin ..... 8663

**Tobacco**

Ms. McLaughlin ..... 8663

**Human Rights**

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yellowhead) ..... 8663

**Rights of the Unborn**

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yellowhead) ..... 8663

**Assisted Suicide**

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yellowhead) ..... 8663

**Human Rights**

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yellowhead) ..... 8663

**Television Programming**

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yellowhead) ..... 8664

**Questions on the Order Paper**

Mr. Milliken ..... 8664

**Request for Emergency Debate**

**Violence against Women**

Ms. McLaughlin ..... 8664

The Speaker ..... 8664

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Violence against Women**

Motion ..... 8664

Mrs. Finestone ..... 8664

Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	8669
Mr. Ramsay .....	8671
Mr. Szabo .....	8673
Ms. Blondin–Andrew .....	8673
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) .....	8676
Ms. Meredith .....	8677
Mr. Jordan .....	8680
Mr. Crête .....	8680
Ms. McLaughlin .....	8681
Ms. McLaughlin .....	8681
Mr. Hermanson .....	8684
Mr. Hoepfner .....	8684
Mrs. Venne .....	8685
Ms. Catterall .....	8686
Mr. Lebel .....	8688
Mr. Crête .....	8689
Mrs. Dalphond–Guiral .....	8689

## **STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

### **Human Rights**

Mr. O'Brien .....	8690
-------------------	------

### **Social Program Reform**

Mrs. Debien .....	8691
-------------------	------

### **Human Rights**

Mrs. Hayes .....	8691
------------------	------

### **Job Finding Clubs**

Mr. Bernier (Beauce) .....	8691
----------------------------	------

### **Violence against Women**

Ms. Fry .....	8691
---------------	------

### **Violence against Women**

Mr. Arseneault .....	8692
----------------------	------



<b>Violence against Women</b>	
Mrs. Cowling .....	8692
<b>Violence Against Women</b>	
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	8692
<b>Hibernia Project</b>	
Mr. Morrison .....	8692
<b>Banks</b>	
Mr. Solomon .....	8692
<b>Violence against Women</b>	
Mr. Adams .....	8693
<b>Tragedy at the École Polytechnique</b>	
Mrs. Terrana .....	8693
<b>Violence against Women</b>	
Mr. Murphy .....	8693
<b>Referendum on Sovereignty</b>	
Mr. Duceppe .....	8693
<b>Violence against Women</b>	
Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) .....	8694
<b>Tragedy at the École polytechnique</b>	
Mrs. Bakopanos .....	8694
<b>Tragedy at the École polytechnique</b>	
Mr. Berger .....	8694
<b>ORAL QUESTION PERIOD</b>	
<b>Gun Control</b>	
Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) .....	8694

Mr. Rock .....	8694
Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) .....	8695
Mr. Rock .....	8695
Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) .....	8695
Mr. Rock .....	8695
Mrs. Venne .....	8695
Mr. Rock .....	8695
Mrs. Venne .....	8695
Mr. Rock .....	8695

**Province of Quebec**

Mr. Manning .....	8696
Ms. Copps .....	8696
Mr. Manning .....	8696
Ms. Copps .....	8696
Mr. Manning .....	8696
Ms. Copps .....	8696

**Bosnia**

Mr. Jacob .....	8696
Mr. Collenette .....	8696
Mr. Jacob .....	8697
Mr. Collenette .....	8697

**Province of Quebec**

Mr. Harper (Calgary West) .....	8697
Ms. Copps .....	8697
Mr. Harper (Calgary West) .....	8697
Ms. Copps .....	8697

**MIL Davie Shipyard**

Mr. Guimond .....	8697
Mr. Manley .....	8697
Mr. Guimond .....	8698
Mr. Manley .....	8698

**Small Businesses Loans Act**

Mr. McClelland .....	8698
----------------------	------

Mr. Manley .....	8698
Mr. McClelland .....	8698
Mr. Manley .....	8698

**Social Program Reform**

Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	8699
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	8699
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	8699
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	8699

**Violence against Women**

Mrs. Gaffney .....	8699
Mrs. Finestone .....	8699

**Employment Equity**

Mr. Strahl .....	8700
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	8700
Mr. Strahl .....	8700
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	8700

**Bovine Somatotropin**

Mr. Bellehumeur .....	8700
Ms. Marleau .....	8700
Mr. Bellehumeur .....	8700
Ms. Marleau .....	8700

**Canadian Wheat Board**

Mr. Benoit .....	8700
Mr. Goodale .....	8701
Mr. Benoit .....	8701
Mr. Goodale .....	8701

**Pearson International Airport**

Mr. Malhi .....	8701
Mr. Fontana .....	8701

**Fisheries**

Mr. Bernier (Gaspé) .....	8701
---------------------------	------

Mr. Tobin .....	8701
-----------------	------

**Gun Control**

Mr. Abbott .....	8701
Mr. Anderson .....	8702

**Violence Against Women**

Ms. McLaughlin .....	8702
Ms. Copps .....	8702

**Cornwallis Park Development Agency**

Mr. Verran .....	8702
Mr. Collenette .....	8702

**Points of Order**

**Comments during Question Period**

Mr. Abbott .....	8702
Mr. Anderson .....	8702

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Violence Against Women**

Consideration resumed of motion .....	8703
Mrs. Dalphond–Guiral .....	8703
Ms. Clancy .....	8703
Mr. McClelland .....	8705
Mr. Canuel .....	8707
Mr. Rock .....	8708
Mr. Benoit .....	8709
Mr. Harris .....	8710
Mrs. Barnes .....	8710
Mrs. Kraft Sloan .....	8712
Mr. Benoit .....	8713
Mrs. Brushett .....	8714
Mr. Pagtakhan .....	8715

Mr. Crête .....	8715
Mr. Regan .....	8717
Mrs. Brushett .....	8717
Mr. Forseth .....	8717
Ms. Beaumier .....	8719
Mrs. Guay .....	8720
Mr. Kirkby .....	8720
Ms. Cohen .....	8720
Mr. Thompson .....	8721
Mr. Morrison .....	8722
Ms. Cohen .....	8722

**Department of Industry Act**

Bill C-46. Consideration resumed at report stage. ....	8722
Motion negated on division: Yeas, 40; Nays, 182 .....	8722
Motion negated on division: Yeas, 40; Nays, 182 .....	8724
Motion No. 10 negated on division: Yeas, 49; Nays 173 .....	8725
Motion for concurrence .....	8726
Mr. Manley .....	8726
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas 134; Nays 88 .....	8726

**Income Tax Act**

Bill C-59. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading .....	8727
(Bill read the second time and referred to committee.) .....	8727

**Canada Grain Act**

Bill C-51. Consideration resumed of report stage and Motion No. 1 .....	8727
Motion negated on division: Yeas, 80; Nays, 142. ....	8728
Motion negated on division: Yeas, 8; Nays, 214 .....	8729
Motion negated on division: Yeas, 48; Nays, 174 .....	8730
Motion for concurrence .....	8731
Mr. Goodale .....	8731
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas 182; Nays 40 .....	8731

**Canadian Environmental Assessment Act**

Bill C-56. Report stage .....	8732
-------------------------------	------

Motion for concurrence .....	8733
Ms. Copps .....	8733
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas 142; Nays 80 .....	8733

## **PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

### **Unemployment Insurance Act**

Bill C-216. Report stage .....	8734
Mr. Gagliano .....	8734
Motion for concurrence .....	8734
Mr. Arseneault .....	8734
(Motion agreed to.) .....	8734
Mr. Bellehumeur .....	8734
Mr. Hanrahan .....	8735
Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) .....	8737
Mr. Harvard .....	8738
Mr. Hermanson .....	8738
Division deferred .....	8739

## **ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

### **Canadian Security Intelligence Service**

Mr. Bellehumeur .....	8739
Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) .....	8739

### **Trade**

Mr. Easter .....	8740
Mr. Harb .....	8741

### **Violence Against Women**

Mrs. Barnes .....	8741
Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) .....	8742