



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 134 • NUMBER 047 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, May 15, 1996

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

The House of Commons Debates are also available on the
Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

<http://www.parl.gc.ca>

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, May 15, 1996

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

The Speaker: As is our practice on Wednesdays, we will now sing O Canada, which will be led by the hon. member for Fraser Valley West.

[Editor's Note: Whereupon members sang the national anthem.]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

MINING INDUSTRY

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian mining industry consists of very dedicated people.

Each day however this industry generates approximately one million tonnes of waste rock and 950,000 tonnes of tailings; some 650 million tonnes of waste per year. We have approximately 6,000 abandoned tailing sites and over 10,000 abandoned mines resulting in clean-up costs conservatively estimated at \$6 billion, costs which will likely be borne by taxpayers.

A sustainable mining industry would ensure that the price paid for its products includes the costs of repairing damage to the environment. To further the implementation of sustainable development the government could ensure the efficient use of minerals and metals through the removal of tax barriers favouring the use of virgin material over recycled material.

* * *

[Translation]

MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. Bernard Deshaies (Abitibi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, nearly one million people are directly or indirectly involved in the mining sector. This week, national mining week, offers us an opportunity to draw attention to their contribution to the economies of Quebec and of Canada.

The men and women of the mining sector toil long and hard, often putting their lives and their health at risk. They deserve our admiration and respect. Their work is essential, for it contributes to our quality of life and our collective wealth.

The mining industry provides us with the raw materials that are transformed into high technology products we find in many items used in our daily lives.

The federal government has promised to hand full responsibility for mines back to the provinces. It will then be the Government of Quebec's responsibility to help the mining industry to develop, and we are confident that Quebec will be equal to that task.

In the meantime, we are asking the federal government to live up to its promises, for once.

* * *

[English]

MOTHERS

Mr. Garry Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Sunday was Mother's Day. Who are the most influential people in this nation? They are the parents who teach and train the next generation, especially mothers who nurture and shape the values and direction of our children during the time of their lives that determines to the greatest extent what each child will grow up to be.

Mothers have a tremendous influence on the future of a nation. Families are the basic building block of society. Children that are free to grow and develop in contact with loving caring parents are the healthiest with the greatest potential to contribute to those around them at the community, national and international levels.

All government programs need to be evaluated by a standard that seeks to determine whether it will encourage mothers and fathers to establish healthy lifelong relationships with their children.

I thank god for the mothers of the nation that faithfully serve in circumstances that often go unrecognized. Thanks, Mom.

* * *

[Translation]

OIL INDUSTRY

Mr. Gilles Bernier (Beauce, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to express the anger of the people of Beauce at the latest increase in

S. O. 31

the price of gasoline. How can the government allow oil companies to exploit us in this way, especially with the profits they are already making?

I am calling upon the government, and the minister responsible, to take the necessary steps to put an end to this abuse, to condemn this unjust and unacceptable increase. Must we assume that the oil producers are exploiting those with cars by plotting together to fix prices at a high level?

The industry's retail price setting mechanisms must be examined to ensure there has been no collusion. The people feel they are being exploited.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL PALLIATIVE CARE WEEK

Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the members of the House that May 12 to 19 is National Palliative Care Week.

Canadians are proud of their health care system. As a compassionate society we expect that care and support will be available for those most in need. Part of this need which concerns us all is palliative care.

The Canadian Palliative Care Association is to be commended for its excellent work. The association provides important leadership in the pursuit of excellence for terminally ill persons and their families. Last year Health Canada contributed \$70,000 to the Canadian Palliative Care Association to assist with further developments of the association's structure and national services.

Death is a natural part of the life cycle. We need to understand and address the health care needs of those who have terminal diseases.

* * *

[Translation]

SIR WILFRID LAURIER

Mr. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the electoral campaign is in full swing. It is vigorous and exciting from one end of the country to the other.

This was one hundred years ago. Wilfrid Laurier was going back and forth from Victoriaville, on his way to becoming the first Quebecer to be elected Prime Minister of Canada.

In the region of Victoriaville—Arthabaska, one hundred years later, people are gathering to make a multi kilometre bicycle path, on the right of way of the railroad Wilfrid Laurier used to use. This project will be completed thanks to federal-provincial-municipal financial co-operation and regional fundraising activities.

Today, like yesterday, people look to their elected representatives at all political levels for co-operation.

* * *

[English]

SAVE THE CHILDREN

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Guelph—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, May 19 marks the 75th anniversary of Save the Children-Canada. Its supporters have included Prime Ministers and Canadians from every walk of life.

● (1405)

Today, Save the Children through its partners in 24 countries and its volunteers across Canada assists in improving life for children throughout the world, including Canada. Furthermore, Save the Children programs are managed by its country directors working with local partners on local needs.

As a founder of the rights of the child, Save the Children is a key player in helping young people build a future that includes education, love and protection from neglect and disease.

I thank Save the Children and its volunteers, especially in Guelph—Wellington, for their valuable contribution to all of our children.

Happy anniversary.

* * *

IMPORT-EXPORT LINK

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in Canada exports are the most important vehicle upon which we create jobs, economic growth and maintain our standard of living. We must continually be aggressive in trying to find new markets and devising better ways to compete internationally.

In an effort to aid this process I have created an import-export link on my web site on the Internet. This page will assist companies in gaining valuable information on import-export opportunities abroad, government contracts and other trade related information.

The goal of this site is to provide our companies with a temporal advantage over companies in other countries that wish to compete with us. I hope Canadian companies will use this information to their competitive advantage in order to secure valuable contracts for Canadians, thereby creating jobs and increasing economic growth.

I share this with all members of the House. I hope that they will visit this site at www.reform.ca/martin.

* * *

THE LATE JOHN PATTON

Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Wellington—Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that we learned of the death of

one of Canada's most highly decorated second world war veterans, John Patton, who died yesterday at the age of 80.

He served in the 1st Battalion of the Royal Canadian Engineers. He was one of only three Canadians awarded the George Cross for bravery. This medal, which is almost in every way equivalent to the Victoria Cross, is awarded for acts of the greatest heroism or of the most conspicuous circumstances of extreme danger.

After a daylight raid on an aircraft factory in the United Kingdom, John Patton, with no thought for his own safety or any knowledge of German bombs, volunteered to remove an unexploded bomb from the site and so ensured that essential wartime production could be maintained.

We offer our condolences to the members of his family and the deepest respect for a Canadian who was a true hero.

* * *

[Translation]

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. Nick Discepolo (Vaudreuil, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week we are celebrating national police week in Canada with the theme "Partners in public security". Its aim is to bring the police and the public closer together and have people learn about what the police do every day.

It is also an opportunity for all Canadians to salute the men and women who have chosen to dedicate their life to serving and protecting the public, often at the risk of their own safety. If we want to ensure order effectively in Canada, we must ensure that relations among all involved are solid.

[English]

Police men and women in Canada are doing a tremendous job and their accomplishments must not go unnoticed. I know that I have the support of this House when I say we in government recognize the dedication of our police forces across the country. We pledge our continued support and gratitude for the work they accomplish daily.

* * *

SCIENCE FAIR

Mr. Bob Wood (Nipissing, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week two young science students from Ecole Secondaire Algonquin in North Bay were named the grand winners for the most innovative and ingenious project of the entire International Science and Engineering Fair in Tucson, Arizona. This fair has been described as the Olympics of science fairs with over 1,000 competitors from 35 countries.

S. O. 31

Brother and sister Stéfane and Renée Filion returned home to North Bay on Sunday just as we welcomed over 1,000 participants to our city for the Canada-wide science fair. Stéfane and Renée are veterans of the science fair movement having won gold medals at the past four Canada-wide science fairs. This is a scientific accomplishment that underlines the excellence of our science students in Canada. Stéfane and Renée have represented our country well.

I wish all the Canada-wide science fair participants the very best during this important week in North Bay. To Stéfane and Renée, congratulations. Canada is proud of your accomplishment.

* * *

● (1410)

[Translation]

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General of Canada, Denis Desautels, tabled his report last week. Once again, this report clearly shows that Canadians and Quebecers have every reason to be unhappy with the way the Liberal government is spending their taxes.

Two cases in point are the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency's inadequate monitoring of the closure of CFB Cornwallis, in Nova Scotia, and the equipment wasted by the Department of National Defence during peacekeeping missions.

How can we accept the fact that the architects' fees for the building housing the Canadian Security Intelligence Service headquarters were twice as high as originally estimated?

Even the auditor general is concerned about the way the Income Tax Act is applied to family trusts and capital gains.

How can we trust a government that appears more eager to cut benefits for the disadvantaged and the unemployed than to end waste and abuse of all kinds?

* * *

[English]

CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is enamoured with page 22 of the red face book, but I would like to refer him to page 91: "The people are irritated with governments that do not consult them or that disregard their views".

I want to inform the Prime Minister that the people are hopping mad. This government jammed through Bill C-33 without giving time for consultation. The democratic process was trampled on

Oral Questions

with closure at all stages of the bill. There was no time for the minister or MPs to receive letters.

Phone calls, faxes and letters that did get through were ignored. Very thoughtful presentations in committee by organizations which represent millions of Canadians were ignored. Over 110,000 names on petitions were ignored. That is shameful.

The words of the red face book are for election purposes only. What the Liberals say and what they do cannot be harmonized. The voters have been—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DIRECTOR GENERAL OF ELECTIONS IN QUEBEC

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the director general of elections in Quebec harshly condemned federal authorities for their involvement in organizing the federalist rally held in Montreal on October 27, 1995. This involvement undermined Quebec's democratic process by upsetting the balance that must exist between expenditures on both sides.

The Liberal and former Liberal members accused by the director general of elections not only refused to co-operate with investigators, but some of them even went further, like current Newfoundland premier Brian Tobin, the main organizer of the Montreal rally, who said he would not hesitate to do it again.

I condemn the attitude of all those who violate Quebec's democratic rules. I remind them that, in a democracy, it is one voter, one vote, not one voter, one dollar. The people of Quebec will never be fooled by their fraudulent tactics and their money. Our fellow citizens will remember this in the next referendum.

* * *

DEPUTY PREMIER OF QUEBEC

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Quebec Deputy Premier Bernard Landry described the Canadian government's behaviour as more authoritarian, intolerant and close-minded than the former totalitarian communist governments.

Such remarks are completely thoughtless, inappropriate and indicative of a total lack of knowledge of the global geopolitical reality.

This man who, when defeat became imminent, deserted his post as "second in command of the light brigade", leaving his commanding officer to die alone in action, should take note that our government recognizes, promotes and respects the democratic values of our society.

In light of the ongoing bloodshed in Chechnya, I ask that Bernard Landry withdraw forthwith his remarks, which misrepresent the Canadian federation and constitute a thinly veiled incitement to the taking of illegal means to effect Quebec's secession.

[*English*]

The Speaker: The hon. member for Carleton—Gloucester. Welcome back, Eugène.

* * *

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is nice to be back in the House of Commons. I wish to thank all my colleagues on both sides of the House and my constituents for their kind words of encouragement following my open heart surgery.

[*Translation*]

I also wish to thank Dr. Keon and his team at the Ottawa University cardiology center for the great care I received.

I assure you that I greatly appreciate Canada's health system and I am proud to serve in a government that does such a fine job of preserving it.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

• (1415)

[*Translation*]

REFERENDUMS

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on October 24 in Verdun, the Prime Minister intimated to Quebecers that a yes vote in the referendum was irreversible. Finally, yesterday, the Prime Minister said that the federal government would certainly not permit Quebec to declare sovereignty unilaterally, thereby denying Quebecers' right to decide their future. Today, the Prime Minister has to qualify his position, because the path he chose was a dead end.

Would the Prime Minister acknowledge that, by taking a legal route to resolve the constitutional issue, which pleases the other Canadians temporarily, he is heading down a cul de sac, which he will have to get out of sooner or later, having once again falsely lulled the rest of Canada?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have gone to court for a very simple reason: the Quebec government lawyers, in the presentation they made before going to court, alleged in their documents that the Canadian Constitution would no longer apply to one of the provinces of Canada at a given point in time, thus forcing the attorney general for Canada to defend the Constitution.

Oral Questions

I was very happy this morning to see in the newspapers that the Quebec government lawyer said before the courts yesterday that a referendum was nothing more than a popular vote and posed no risk of taking away anyone's rights.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, how does the Prime Minister explain the subtle changes he made this morning on "Good Morning America" to his statement of yesterday that there was no question of permitting Quebec to unilaterally choose sovereignty following a referendum?

[*English*]

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I spoke with the program before I came to the House. There is no contradiction. Everything has to be done according to the international and national systems of law. I said that in Canada nobody wants to use violence to keep people in Canada.

I repeat what I said before. Everything has to be done according to the Canadian Constitution and international law. I hope the Bloc Québécois is not advocating that it does not want to respect the law of the land.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said this morning on "Good Morning America" that Quebec's right to decide its future was not enshrined in the Constitution, but that Canada was a democratic country and if the people of Quebec expressed their wishes clearly they would be respected.

Will the Prime Minister acknowledge that, in the light of these remarks this morning, he went much too far yesterday in the House when he said that Quebec could not unilaterally declare its independence following a democratic referendum?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have spent weeks saying in this House that 50 per cent of the votes plus one was not enough. I think this is perfectly reasonable. The desire must be clear and the question clear, and the question must take the needs of the other partner into consideration as well. It is totally logical. That is what I said yesterday on the program.

However, when people try to come up with ways to say things that are not clear and say they are going to separate but remain Canadian, and keep Canadian passports and currency and maintain economic and political partnership with Canada and remain Canadian citizens for ever more—listen, you have to be clear.

These will be matters for negotiations, if there is ever another referendum, so we make sure everyone is very clear on the issue, the result and the consequences.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, once again the Prime Minister has cast doubt—and once

again we in this House have heard him do so—on one of the fundamental rules of democracy, one that is universally recognized. According to him, the rule of the absolute majority, 50 per cent plus 1, is not sufficient for the verdict of the people of Quebec to be accepted.

• (1420)

My question is a very simple one. Since the Prime Minister—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Bellehumeur: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the government does not want to hear our questions, but hon. members could perhaps listen.

The Speaker: Your question please, dear colleague.

Mr. Bellehumeur: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Since the Prime Minister is dismissing out of hand the 50 plus 1 rule, what percentage does he have in mind?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to see it clearly established that the rule of democracy must be respected. Two referendums were held in Quebec, and both were won by those who wish to remain within Canada.

Yesterday, in the National Assembly, Bloc Québécois Central refused to vote in favour of an opposition resolution calling for recognition of the outcome of the last referendum. So who is it that is refusing to recognize democracy?

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, are we to understand from the words of the Prime Minister that, in June, he intends to discuss with his provincial counterparts the percentage which the rest of Canada would deem acceptable to impose on Quebec for the next referendum?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): No, Mr. Speaker, because in my opinion today's debate arises out of the fact that the Government of Quebec has tabled a motion stating that, under certain circumstances, the Constitution of Canada would not apply. In this connection, the Minister of Justice was absolutely right. Not only was he right, but his mandate obliged him to come to the defence of the Constitution of Canada. We are not the ones who triggered the debate, the Government of Quebec did.

As for me, I have no intention of continuing it. My hope is to have a federal-provincial conference where we will be able to make a great deal of progress toward improved federalism. I hope to be able to meet with Mr. Bouchard as soon as possible, in order to discuss job creation and real problems, the real problems that exist in Montreal at this time. I was prepared to do so at his convenience, and still am, because the economic future of Quebecers is the issue closest to the heart of this government.

Oral Questions

[English]

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, at long last the Prime Minister has made it clear that the Constitution, the rule of law and the rights of all Canadians must be respected in any future attempt at secession.

If the Prime Minister had made that position crystal clear before the last referendum we probably would not be discussing it today. It is imperative that Quebecers and all Canadians know the ground rules and the stakes before another secession attempt.

Is the Prime Minister prepared to back up his statements yesterday with a motion in the House specifying the government's position on a unilateral declaration of independence and on the rules governing any future secession attempt?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member of the third party said that right now the national unity thing is coming back.

He was the one in the House in September who told me one vote was enough to split Canada. I heard him many times. I want to say to the House of Commons that the rule of law will prevail in Canada. Canadian laws will be respected and international laws will be respected as well.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if one vote is not enough will the Prime Minister tell the House how many votes are enough?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if ever we have a referendum in any province, I hope there will be discussion beforehand to make sure the rules are known by both sides.

• (1425)

If someone like the leader of the third party comes to me and tells me 50 per cent plus 1 is enough to break up Canada, I will tell him to go back home.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the trouble with the Prime Minister is he is not clear and precise on an issue desperately requiring clarity and precision.

If the Prime Minister says he is to rely on the rule of law in an unprecedented situation, he should translate his position into legislative acts and motions before the House.

Again, will he introduce a motion into the House, a solemn declaration affirming the people of Canada are free to determine

their political destiny and that Parliament will not recognize a unilateral declaration of independence by any province?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the if the hon. member introduced a motion that a 50 per cent plus 1 vote would be enough to split Canada, I would vote against it. That is what he was arguing before.

My view is that at the moment there is no referendum. At the moment we are working to make sure there will be progress with the federation and that there will be no need for a referendum. This is exactly what I am trying to do and what I have been working on. I made it clear there will be a meeting in June to improve the federation.

The Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs has been travelling the land talking with premiers and ministers. I am also talking with them. There is goodwill in Canada to make progress on that, and with the collaboration of everybody we will make progress. However, it is quite evident the leader of the third party has no great interest in keeping Canada together.

* * *

[Translation]

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in 1991, Quebec acted in good faith and complied with the federal government's request to harmonize its sales tax with the GST. It did so without any compensation. By comparison, three maritime provinces will get a gift of \$1 billion from the federal government, including \$250 million paid by Quebec taxpayers.

How can the Minister of Finance explain that Quebec, which set an example of economic efficiency for the rest of Canada by harmonizing its sales tax with the GST, and which contributed to the smooth running of the Canadian economic and trade union, is being penalized, while provinces that had so far refused to harmonize their taxes are being rewarded?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is a formula to compensate provinces that will lose more than 5 per cent of their sales tax revenues. This is not the case for Ontario, British Columbia, or Alberta. It is not currently the case for Quebec either, and it was not in 1990 when it signed the harmonization agreement.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Quebec harmonized its tax with the GST in 1991. Five years later, it is easy to say that it does not meet the requirements for compensation. It is easy to say so after the fact. But let us not forget that it was at the federal government's request that Quebec harmonized its tax. This is like inviting someone to dinner and making him pay, not only his own meal, but also that of the next table, since Quebec's contribution will amount to \$250 million.

Oral Questions

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Loubier: This is the truth. It is terrible.

In order to be fair to Quebec, will the Minister of Finance pledge to pay to the Government of Quebec, as he is being asked by the province's deputy premier and minister of state for economy and finance, a fair compensation for having done its job before everyone else?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we offered a compensation to all the provinces which, based on the formula, will lose money.

• (1430)

Quebec did not lose money this year and did not lose any the year it signed the agreement. It is exactly in the same position as Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia. We will compensate the provinces that lost money.

The compensation formula is a cost sharing formula that will only be in effect for a transition period of four years. Again, Quebec is in the same situation as Ontario, British Columbia and Alberta.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister wants Quebec to respect the results of the last two sovereignty referendums. Will the Prime Minister take a bit of his own advice and accept the defeat of distinct society in the last two constitutional accords?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we voted on this in the House in December.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I guess that is as good an answer as we get. It is obvious the Prime Minister once again has one standard for his actions and another standard for somebody else's; in this case Quebec's.

[Translation]

Yesterday, the Prime Minister told us, and I quote: "This is not a hockey playoff here. It is not three out of five, or four out of seven".

[English]

Is the distinct society clause a three out of five or a four out of seven?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will have to analyse the complexity of the question.

[Translation]

COAST GUARD

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

For several months now, the minister has been referring to the results of an impact study to justify his position on applying user fees to the coast guard. In a letter dated April 23 of this year, Christopher Wright, the author of the study, flatly contradicts the minister's assertions and says that it cannot be concluded from his study that the marine industry will be able to absorb the planned fee structure.

Both of them cannot be right. Either the minister has misinterpreted the study in question, or he has misrepresented the results. In either case, can he inform this House on what he is now basing himself in sticking to his decision?

[English]

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, neither is true. The hon. member has to check his assumptions. I am not sure whether he is referring to the letter or the study, because some of the assumptions are different.

In the impact study the assumptions were the following. Based on 309 million tonnes, which is transhipped in Canada, there would be a fee of \$60 million, with the inclusion of ice breaking services, and there would be absolutely no cap on the amount of cargo that would be charged.

The actual fee structure does not include ice breaking. It is put together at \$20 million. There is a limitation on transshipment. For bulk cargoes we have a limitation of 50,000 tonnes. That is entirely different from the reference made by the author of the article who was, I believe, one of the consultants.

The assumptions are different and therefore the conclusions must be different.

[Translation]

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister could also take the time himself to reread the author's letter, which has been published, because, whatever the case may be, according to the actual study on the 20 million, the author also indicates that he is concerned about traffic being diverted from Canadian to American ports.

Now that it is clearly established that the minister cannot rely on any study, what is he waiting for to scrap his user fees, until some serious and credible impact studies are done?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, perhaps to further instruct the hon. member on the detail of these disagreements, the total volume of cargo the impact study stated as being sensitive to the fees at the \$60 million level was that fees at \$60 million represented 7 million tonnes, which is 2 per cent of the 309 million tonnes in Canadian water borne commerce. Even if the assumption is \$60 million we are still dealing with less than 2 per cent of the total volume.

• (1435)

I would instruct and recommend to the hon. member that he continue to check the figures and the assumptions before we continue in this debate.

* * *

NATIONAL UNITY

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, procrastination seems to be the watchword for the government. It did not come up with a real strategy for the last referendum and now it is putting off developing a plan for national unity at all.

The Prime Minister promised Canadians plan A and plan B, the carrot and stick. So far we have seen a lot of the stick but the only thing vaguely related to the carrot is a national food inspection service.

My question to the Prime Minister is not too complex. Will he quit stalling and present Canadians with the details of the government's plan for national unity now?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has on her desk the speech from the throne, the document we distributed to members of Parliament. If she would just read it in English, in French if she wants, she would see our program.

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I shudder to think where that document ended up—

Some hon. members: On the floor.

The Speaker: Whatever you do, do not throw it on the floor.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Miss Grey: You have my word on that, Mr. Speaker.

The Prime Minister is so reluctant to let his plans be known on national unity. We are facing a crisis here and he must speak up on this. He promised quite clearly, as he just referred to, in the government's throne speech that Canadians, no matter where they live, will have their say in the future of their country.

When will the Prime Minister let Canadians have their say? Will he let them see this national unity plan? If so, will it be before or after he gets together with the premiers behind closed doors?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I repeat we had the speech from the throne and ministers have spoken on the subject. It was debated, approved and voted on in the House of Commons.

We have a list enumerated the day before yesterday in my speech in Montreal. I repeated the list again yesterday and it is all public. I have already discussed that with the provincial governments, and they have read the speech from the throne and have commented on it.

I hope someday the Reform Party reads the speech from the throne. It would then know where we are going.

* * *

*[Translation]***PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES**

Mr. Maurice Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last week as his official response to the unanimous report of the Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Persons with Disabilities, the Minister of Human Resources Development came out with an insipid document offering no concrete measures. After the unemployed, it is now the turn of the handicapped to feel the wrath of the minister.

Can the minister confirm that, besides paying them lip service in his report, the only concrete answer he has for advocacy groups for the handicapped is to cut their funding without warning and in an under-handed way, putting them in jeopardy?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we often have the opportunity in this House to talk about jurisdiction, duplication, overlapping, responsibilities, and various levels of government with regard to individuals or activities.

In the throne speech, we clearly indicated, as a government, that in all areas of shared jurisdiction, we were going to take every possible step to ensure a sound and hopefully fruitful dialogue.

In this particular area, of course, the concerns of people affected by changes, due to either the federal or the provincial governments, are important. We are committed to keeping on talking with the provinces to make sure that people with special needs due to a handicap are well taken care of by the government responsible for their well being.

• (1440)

Mr. Maurice Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about the handicapped themselves, we are talking about associations acting on their behalf. There is a slight difference.

An hon. member: It is the same thing.

Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead): It is the same thing but the letter the department sent to these associations congratulates them for their work and, at the same time, warns

them that they are going to be scrapped. This is what the minister has decided.

Is the minister telling us that the federal government will no longer meet its responsibilities with regard to the handicapped in areas under its jurisdiction, offloading them onto the provinces without any compensation?

[English]

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am always intrigued when members of the official opposition speak about jurisdiction. I often wonder whether their motivation is based on concerns for the people who are affected and who have legitimate anxieties about changes in the way government delivers service or are they just interested in compensation.

I was trying to indicate to the hon. member that if he is interested in taking care of associations and organizations, it is our objective to try to take care of the people who are affected by problems over which they have little or no control.

I believe that handicapped Canadians in every part of the country, regardless of the nature of the handicap, are concerned about how governments will come to their assistance, not necessarily the organizations that purport to represent them. Some of these organizations do very good work. Other organizations are, to say the very least, in a situation where I think we have to look closely at the level of funding we provide for them.

Our commitment is to take care of the people who need help. We will continue to discuss with those organizations that want to assist us in doing that their future and how they will be funded.

* * *

[Translation]

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Roy Cullen (Etobicoke North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

[English]

In my riding and in ridings across Canada are many refugees from Somalia who are held in limbo as they await the determination of their landed immigrant status. In the meantime, they are unable to go on with their lives or to live or work where they wish.

[Translation]

Can the minister tell me what developments there are with respect to the status of the Somali refugees?

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and Acting Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the question raised by my colleague from Etobicoke

Oral Questions

North is a difficult one, as it involves legalizing the status of people without identification papers.

The situation is quite delicate and complex, but I can also tell the House that the situation of the Somali community is rather unique as they have been living in this country for several years. They were granted refugee status under the terms of the Geneva Convention and are currently living among us.

I can assure the hon. member for Etobicoke North that we are now in contact with the Somali community. My parliamentary secretary met with the various leaders and we hope to be able, in the near future, to announce a decision that will allow community members to remain in this country.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has done absolutely nothing with the unity file for the last three years. Yesterday was the first time that he finally summoned up the nerve to tell Canadians that it is not okay for Quebec separatists to mock our Constitution by saying that they will decide if and when they separate.

At every step, the Prime Minister has allowed the separatists to drive the agenda. Now that he has let that happen, what is he going to do to repair the huge damage he has caused? How is he going to get control of the unity agenda?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have replied to that question four times today to members of the Reform Party.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we had a non-answer every time.

The separatists are claiming that the federal government is beating Quebecers over the head with the Constitution of Canada and disregarding any democratic vote that they might hold. Because the Prime Minister refuses to set the parameters by which the government would respect a referendum vote or the mechanics for separation, once again he is taking the jellyfish approach and playing into the hands of the separatist.

Will the Prime Minister repair this damage and lay out the terms and conditions as soon as possible.

• (1445)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I remember in September when we were debating that in the House of Commons, we had the pleasure of seeing members of the Reform Party applauding the Bloc Québécois when they were arguing that 50 plus 1 meant the separation of Canada. They never sided with me when I was defending that. It was a serious question

Oral Questions

that needed to be addressed in a serious way. I guess we will wait to see how they deal with the unity of the Reform Party.

* * *

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment.

On page 70 of the red book, the Liberal Party promised to cut greenhouse gas emissions over the Canadian territory by 20 per cent. Yet, barely a year before the next meeting of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Canada must recognize that it will be unable to achieve this goal.

Beyond the symbolic measures he has just proposed, when will the minister finally decide to put in place a strategy that is both realistic and vigorous in order to launch the fight against greenhouse gas emissions?

[English]

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for her question. It is a very important and appropriate question.

Many of the commitments in the red book on environment and sustainable development have been realized. We are also cognizant of the international commitment that was made at Rio and at Berlin on behalf of Canada and the international community. Climate change is something that we take seriously.

A meeting is coming up some time in November involving all the ministers of the environment and energy from Canada. At that time we will receive the advice from the experts on how we are doing on those commitments.

It is also fair to say that if the targets are not met, then it is important for not only Canada but for all countries to be transparent and open. Only through that transparency will we be able to redouble and renew the commitments that the international community made at Rio, confirmed at Berlin, and that is my intention.

[Translation]

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since the fight against greenhouse gas emissions requires the co-operation of the most polluting provinces, especially Alberta and Ontario, what has the minister done so far to convince these provinces to take serious initiatives in this area?

[English]

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it would be an inappropriate strategy to have a national

commitment to try to divide and conquer based on partisanship or region or geography or province.

The hon. member mentioned two provinces. It takes 10 provinces and 2 territories to make a national strategy. It takes many countries to make the family of nations. We have to move ensemble and that is clearly our intention.

I also plan to raise it later this month at the ministers' meeting on the environment, the CCME in Toronto. I am very pleased that for the first time in two years the minister of the environment for the province of Quebec will attend. I think that is an indication of how important issues on the environment are, not only for Canadians but also for Canadians living in the province of Quebec.

* * *

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I will just summarize what we have learned from the Prime Minister today on the national unity stage. He says that any separation attempt must follow a strict set of criteria but he is not sure what the criteria should be; a referendum result of 50 plus 1 is unacceptable but he does not know what is acceptable; distinct society is okay, even though it was defeated in the Charlottetown accord.

Canadians are wondering if he has a plan or is he just going to roll the dice and take a chance in June and see what happens?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we voted on distinct society in this House. During the Charlottetown accord, the House of Commons and the 10 provincial governments voted for distinct society. There was a referendum. The Reform Party voted against it and also voted against an elected Senate.

Reformers should at some time look with some responsibility at the whole package and look at the consequences of what they are doing. For example, when we were in the referendum none of them tried to help. Some of them wished that we had not won.

• (1450)

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister can certainly laugh in the face of the opposition parties, but he is laughing in the faces of the Canadian people when he says that he is not going to listen to the results of the Charlottetown accord.

This introduces a new word into the Canadian dictionary, a new oxymoron called Liberal leadership when it comes to the national unity plan. This is yesterday's man with yesterday's plan. He does not seem to have any of the answers we keep asking for.

Will the Prime Minister give the Canadian people some assurance that he has a plan? Will he table the agenda for the upcoming June conference so that Canadians can be assured he has a handle on this issue?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne is a few months old and the member has not read it yet. It was a big feature in the speech from the throne, yet his party did not read it.

Reform members are trying to find a new way because they are in such disarray that they cannot find anything to talk about. They were elected by telling everybody that there would be free votes in the House of Commons; they have never had a free vote.

They said to the people that they would present a budget before the budget of the Minister of Finance. They could not produce one. They do not talk about the finances of the nation because the finances have never been in such good shape, they have to put up with that.

* * *

BEEF INDUSTRY

Mr. Harold Culbert (Carleton—Charlotte, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

Beef producers in Carleton—Charlotte are very concerned about the low price and the low demand for Canadian beef. These producers suggest that current Canadian import levels may be to blame.

Can the minister confirm today to Canadian beef producers that he will do all possible to encourage the sale of Canadian beef and to assure that any future import levels will not negatively impact on Canadian domestic markets?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for his question. I appreciate the concerns which have been expressed by his constituents.

Since the government came to office, offshore manufacturing beef imports have not gone up. In fact, they have gone down dramatically. In 1993, they amounted to something over 126,000 tonnes. In 1995, that figure had dropped to less than 82,000 tonnes. In 1996, the figure has gone down so far this year by a further 20 per cent.

The reality of low beef prices is a North American phenomenon caused by an oversupply situation in both Canada and the United States. I want to assure the hon. gentleman that we take seriously the matter of promoting our domestic market, and are making very substantial progress in encouraging Canadian processing from Canadian sourced beef.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

AIR TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

Last week, the government refused to hold public hearings on the decision made by the firm Aéroports de Montréal to transfer international traffic from Mirabel to Dorval. While these airports are still public property, the government argued that it did not come under its purview to act in this matter.

Will the minister take his responsibilities and tell us what concrete actions are contemplated to provide a public forum where the various stakeholders will be able to voice their opinions?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, responsibility for Aéroports de Montréal is in the hands of local authorities. This means the cities of Montreal and Laval, the mayors of neighbouring cities, the chambers of commerce, the Mirabel promotion corporation as well as the Montérégie regional economic development corporation and the City of Longueuil. It is therefore up to local authorities.

We entrusted the decision to a regional organization, which has made a quite tenable decision. I have no desire, at the federal level, to make any attempt to interfere with what it has done.

• (1455)

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, is the minister denying at the same time having any responsibility in anything relating to international air traffic, such as international flights? In any case, aircraft require airports to land on.

Are we to understand from the minister's remarks that the federal government is hiding behind Aéroports de Montréal, which is its own creature, to try to play down its own responsibility in the historical fiasco with Montreal airports?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois is always pressuring me in this House to interfere either in the affairs of Quebec or those of some regional organization or another. We, in the federal government, do not want to get involved when it is not our responsibility to step in.

The hon. member should be reminded that my mandate consists in ensuring that issues concerning aircraft and air carrier safety are considered.

Oral Questions

[English]

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the future of our great country is threatened because the government does not have the will or the imagination to come up with a national unity plan to answer the demand for change that I am hearing all over Ontario.

The Prime Minister says that something big will happen at the first ministers' meeting. Ontario and the provinces need to know now whether he will stop delaying and announce whatever that something big is today?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, is there any rule against repetition in the House of Commons?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, talking about a lack of response or repetition, their answers would qualify.

History will show that while Canada was being torn apart, the best this Liberal government could do was send in a lawyer to help with a court challenge. This is nothing short of a disgrace.

The Reform Party had a plan. We made it public months ago. Reformers have shown leadership. Where is this government on leadership? My question is for the Prime Minister.

The first minister's conference is only a few weeks away. Why is he stalling, why is he frustrating federalists across the country and why will he not announce his plan today?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, check *Hansard*: two, three or four will apply.

I replied to this question many times. Members of the third party are preoccupied with unity now when they were all hiding outside Quebec last fall.

* * *

GAS PRICES

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

Using their power to boycott certain service stations, consumers have forced government into action on gas pricing. The public wants more than just a report under the Competition Act which says that prices have gone up. They know that already.

Since it is already clear that the industry is not doing the responsible job of self-regulation that the Minister of Industry promised during consultations on amendments to the Competition

Act, will the government create an energy pricing commission with power to regulate and roll back unjustified price increases?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have a very decentralized federation as members opposite well know.

When it comes to dealing with regulation of retail prices, I am sure the hon. member knows that would fall within the jurisdiction of a federal government if one were to choose to intervene in the market in that way.

The member should also know that regulation of prices creates a certain amount of rigidity and from experience prices tend to be somewhat higher in markets where they have been regulated than in markets where competition is vibrant and vital.

Our objective in this whole gas pricing affair is to ensure that we have a very open marketplace where competition is real. We will do our utmost to enforce the laws, ensuring that there will be real competition. That together with consumers who are diligent will be our best guarantee that prices will come down.

* * *

• (1500)

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. Carolyn Parrish (Mississauga West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of International Co-operation.

While no Canadians can tolerate the acts of terrorism committed by Hamas in Israel, we currently have a human rights concern there with hundreds of thousands of women and children being deprived of medical supplies and food. Is there anything Canada can do to help in this situation?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at the last pledging conference, Canada offered to contribute \$5.5 million to help with the health, education and water supplies in the West Bank and Palestine. That brings the total contributions to about \$70 million since 1993.

Last night in Montreal I attended a meeting of the Canadian, Jewish and Arab communities, where they got together to talk for the first time about what Canada had contributed. What is really important is that the private sector should come together, improving investment, commerce, trade and development. That is the most important way we can give hope to the Palestinian people.

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I wish to draw to the attention of all members, the presence in the gallery of a delegation of parliamentarians from the United Mexican States, led by Senator Fernando Ortiz Arana, President of the Senate.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: My colleagues, I would like also to draw to your attention the presence in the gallery of His Excellency Halldor Asgrimsson, Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Trade of Iceland.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table in both official languages the government's response to two petitions presented during the first session.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

FINANCE

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present in both official languages the first report of the Standing Committee on Finance, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 6, 1996.

* * *

PETITIONS

LABELLING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition from the citizens of Brandon, Manitoba.

The petitioners would like to bring to the attention of the House that the consumption of alcoholic beverages may cause health problems or impair one's ability and specifically that fetal alcohol syndrome and other alcohol related birth defects are 100 per cent preventable by avoiding alcohol consumption during pregnancy.

• (1505)

The petitioners therefore pray and call upon Parliament to enact legislation to require health warning labels to be placed on the

Routine Proceedings

containers of all alcoholic beverages to caution expectant mothers and others of the risks associated with alcohol consumption.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I am pleased to table a petition today signed by several members of the Beaver River constituency from Thorhild and Radway, as well as several individuals from Edmonton.

The petitioners state that the majority of Canadians believe that the privileges which society accords to heterosexual couples should not be extended to same sex relationships, and that societal approval, including the extension of societal privileges, would be given to same sex relationships if any amendment to the Canadian Human Rights Act were to include the undefined phrase of sexual orientation as a ground of discrimination. They therefore pray and request that Parliament not amend the Canadian Human Rights Act or the charter of rights and freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the Canadian Human Rights Act to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase of sexual orientation.

GASOLINE TAXES

Mr. Bernie Collins (Souris—Moose Mountain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present a petition.

A number of my constituents from Welwyn, Saskatchewan pray that the Government of Canada not increase taxes on gasoline.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I would like to present four petitions concerning a bill which was recently passed in the House. Two of the petitions are from the constituency of Port Moody—Coquitlam and two are from Ontario.

All of the petitioners pray and request that Parliament not amend the Canadian Human Rights Act or the charter of rights and freedoms in any way that would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the Canadian Human Rights Act to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase of sexual orientation.

[*Translation*]

TRAN TRIEU QUAN

Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the people of Quebec are extremely upset with the inaction and negligence of the Canadian government in the Tran Trieu Quan case.

The five thousand individuals who signed this petition are outraged by the imprisonment of this Canadian citizen in Vietnam

Routine Proceedings

and they are asking the House of Commons to take responsibility for Mr. Quan's safety and to apply pressure on the government to release him.

[English]

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Lachine—Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition signed by 25 citizens who request that the Prime Minister and the Parliament of Canada declare and confirm immediately: one, that Canada is indivisible; two, that the boundaries of Canada, its provinces, territories and territorial waters may be modified only by (a) a free vote of all Canadian citizens as guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, or (b) through the amending formula as stipulated in the Canadian Constitution.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour to present two petitions signed by hundreds of my constituents who strongly object to the government's recent amendment to the Canadian Human Rights Act.

JUNK MAIL

Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I have the honour to present a petition.

The petitioners draw the attention of the House to the fact that the amount of unsolicited direct mail or junk mail sent to private residences across the country is on the rise. Therefore the petitioners pray and request that Parliament ask Canada Post Corporation to change its guidelines so as to reduce junk mail.

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the petitions I wish to present today are signed by hundreds of people.

The petitioners pray and request that Parliament proceed immediately with amendments to the Criminal Code which will ensure the sentence given to anyone convicted of driving while impaired or causing injury or death while impaired reflects the severity of the crime and reflects a zero tolerance toward this crime by our government.

• (1510)

GASOLINE TAXES

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a large number of petitions which I have put into two groups.

I am pleased to present seven petitions today on the subject of gasoline taxes. The petitioners come from many areas of my riding.

Because the cost of a litre of gasoline is about 52 per cent government taxes and because excise taxes on gasoline have risen by 566 per cent in the past 10 years, the petitioners ask Parliament to not increase taxes on gasoline. They feel that we need to use the natural advantage of a low cost energy source to offset the high cost of transporting our goods over great distances to reach their markets.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second group contains 59 petitions signed by concerned citizens from all across Canada.

They oppose the inclusion of the phrase sexual orientation in the Canadian Human Rights Act. The signatures number 1,471 in total and the petitions are still pouring into my office. These Canadians believe freedom from discrimination is already protected in the human rights act without this amendment. A brief summary of this petition indicates that they feel the inclusion of this category will infringe on the rights and freedoms of Canadians in the areas of religion, conscience, belief, expression and association.

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present today on behalf of the constituents of Simcoe Centre.

The first group of petitioners request that the Government of Canada not amend federal legislation to include the phrase sexual orientation. The petitioners fear that such an inclusion could lead to homosexuals receiving the same benefits and societal privileges as married people.

AGE OF CONSENT

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition concerns the age of consent laws.

The petitioners ask that Parliament set the age of consent at 18 years to protect children from sexual exploitation and abuse.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of presenting three petitions this afternoon, all of which deal with Bill C-33.

The petitioners pray that the Parliament of Canada not pass any legislation which would amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to include the phrase sexual orientation. The petitions are from Cilia Bergsma, the Victory Christian Center and Beulah Alliance Church.

* * *

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 3 could be made an Order for Return, the return would be tabled immediately.

Government Orders

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 3—**Mr. Bretkreuz (Yorkton—Melville):**

How many prisoners incarcerated in federal penitentiaries are infected with Hepatitis C, HIV (human immunodeficiency virus) or have AIDS (acquired immune deficiency syndrome), (a) how is this information determined to be accurate, (b) if a prisoner becomes infected with Hepatitis C, HIV or AIDS while under the care of the federal government will the infected prisoner be able to make a claim for injury, damages or suffering claiming that the government failed to properly protect him or her from the infecting act, (c) what specifically is the government doing to protect federal prisoners and guards from becoming infected with Hepatitis C, HIV or AIDS, and (d) specifically how much has it cost the federal government, so far and annually, to implement each of the measures the government uses to prevent the spread of Hepatitis C, HIV and AIDS and to protect prisoners and guards from becoming infected with Hepatitis C, HIV and AIDS?

Return tabled.

[English]

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1996, I put a question to the government regarding the existence within the Privy Council, or in the federal government, of a special emergency measures co-ordinating unit. Although more than 45 days have passed, I have still not received a reply. I wonder when the government will be good enough to give an answer to a lowly MP. The question was Q-19.

[English]

Mr. Zed: Mr. Speaker, I can respond to the hon. member that the information I have is that the answer is still being prepared.

Mr. Bretkreuz (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the government House leader when I can expect to receive answers to my three questions on the Order Paper, Nos. 2, 3 and 4. These questions first appeared on the Order Paper in the second session of the 35th Parliament on February 27, 1996. I requested an answer from the government within 45 days. As of today, 79 days have passed.

The Speaker: My dear colleague, subject to being corrected I believe that these answers were tabled today. Is that correct?

Mr. Zed: Mr. Speaker, I wish my colleague would take yes for an answer. The member will find that we tabled Question No. 3

today which I believe was the bulk of the member's concern. With regard to Questions Nos. 2 and 4, Question No. 2 is being finalized and Question No. 4 is close to being ready.

* * *

• (1515)

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

WAYS AND MEANS

INCOME TAX ACT

Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.) moved that a ways and means motion to amend the Income Tax Act, the Excise Act, the Excise Tax Act, the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Act, the Old Age Security Act and the Canada Shipping Act, laid upon the table on Thursday, March 28, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen.

The Speaker: Call in the members.

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

Government Orders

(Division No. 88)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anawak
Anderson	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Caccia
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Clancy
Cohen	Collins
Comuzzi	Cowling Crawford
Culbert	Cullen
Discepolo	Dromisky
Duhamel	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Galloway
Gerrard	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harper (Churchill)
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Ifody
Irwin	Jackson
Jordan	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lee
Lincoln	Loney
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Robichaud
Robillard	Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Shepherd
Skoke	Speller
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Terrana	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Verran	Walker
Wappel	Wood
Young	Zed—129

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Bachand
Bélaïr	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Crête	Cummins
Dalphond-Guiral	Daviault
Debien	Deshaies
Dubé	Duceppe
Dumas	Epp
Fillion	Forseth
Frazer	Gagnon (Québec)

Gilmour	Godin
Gouk	Grey (Beaver River)
Guay	Guimond
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Jacob	Jennings
Johnston	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Loubier
Manning	Marchand
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)	Ménard
Mercier	Meredith
Paré	Penson
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Ramsay
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Solberg	Speaker
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wayne	White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)
Williams —75	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bakopanos	Cannis
Canuel	Caron
Collenette	de Savoye
Gaffney	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier	LeFebvre
Leroux (Shefford)	Nunez
Pettigrew	Proud
Sheridan	St-Laurent
Venne	Whelan

● (1530)

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

CIVIL AIR NAVIGATION SERVICES COMMERCIALIZATION ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-20, an act respecting the commercialization of civil air navigation services as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: There are 26 motions in amendment standing on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C-20, an act respecting the commercialization of civil air navigation services.

[*Translation*]

The motions will be grouped for debate as follows:

Group No. 1: Motions Nos. 1, 2 and 3.

Group No. 2: Motions Nos. 4 to 12 and 16 to 24.

Group No. 3: Motions Nos. 13 and 14.

Group No. 4: Motion No. 15.

Group No. 5: Motions Nos. 25 and 26.

[*English*]

The voting patterns for the motions within each group are available at the Table. The Chair will remind the House of each pattern at the time of voting.

I shall now propose Motions No. 1, 2 and 3 to the House.

Government Orders

[Translation]

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ)
moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-20, in the Preamble, be amended by replacing line 1, on page 1, with the following:

“WHEREAS NAV CANADA is a corporation incorporated on May 26, 1995 under Part II of the Canada Corporations Act; and

WHEREAS the safety of passengers, personnel, air carriers and the public has priority over all other considerations in the business decisions taken by NAV CANADA;

THEREFORE, Her Majesty, by and with the advice and”.

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-20, in the Preamble, be amended by replacing line 1, on page 1, with the following:

“WHEREAS NAV CANADA is a corporation incorporated on May 26, 1995 under Part II of the Canada Corporations Act; and

WHEREAS NAV CANADA is committed to ensuring equality of opportunity for small and large carriers in establishing its charges and, in particular, in achieving a balanced representation of small and large carriers on the Board of Directors of the Corporation;

THEREFORE, Her Majesty, by and with the advice and”.

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-20, in the Preamble, be amended by replacing line 1, on page 1, with the following:

“WHEREAS NAV CANADA is a corporation incorporated on May 26, 1995 under Part II of the Canada Corporations Act; and

WHEREAS NAV CANADA recognizes that Canada is a country where air service to northern and remote regions is essential;

THEREFORE, Her Majesty, by and with the advice and”.

● (1535)

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to participate in the debate, which is at the report stage but which is also at the second reading stage as the bill had been referred directly to committee. This bill is about the commercialization of civil air navigation services. Behind this bill is a commendable goal: trying to make air navigation services more efficient, more profitable, by reducing operating costs.

If the bill referred to this goal while recognizing that safety is paramount, the Bloc Québécois, the official opposition, could

support it. We are proposing a number of amendments, and some of the most important ones are in the first group.

What we really want is a preamble to the bill, which would be used as an interpretive clause for the whole bill and would ensure that safety is always paramount. Privatization or the establishment of a non-profit organization in charge of managing air navigation services, strikes a balance in a way.

We have gone from living in an era when everything was managed by the public sector to creating a non-profit organization that must become viable. Along the way, however, we forgot to set aviation safety criteria based on operational requirements in this area, in which errors can have disastrous consequences.

Yes, we must bring excessive costs under control, but without throwing the baby out with the bath water. We want to make sure that safety has priority over all other considerations and that is the purpose of our preamble. We hope the government will pay attention to our arguments.

There is another aspect we regard as important, as essential even, an aspect which, in our opinion, must be approved as an amendment if the bill is to be acceptable to Quebecers, to Canadians, to users and to those who operate the system: small carriers must be given an active role to play.

During consideration of the bill in committee, we realized that the board of directors of Nav Canada, on which will sit representatives of all air navigation stakeholders, did not include enough small carriers. So how will we decide in the future what to charge carriers for air navigation services? There are people who do not have enough of a say.

Among these is the Association québécoise des transporteurs aériens, which was unable to get a guaranteed seat on Nav Canada's board of directors. We all know the importance of this industry as far as the use of the French language in the future is concerned. This is an industry where there have been problems for several years. Today still, it is a daily battle for those working in this industry to ensure French is recognized.

The bill states that the Official Languages Act will apply to Nav Canada. Fine, but we feel that many other aspects of everyday use of French in air travel are insufficiently protected. The use of French is one thing, but there are also many economic considerations.

For example, there is a risk with a fee structure based only on criteria favouring large carriers, should it be established. When the time will come for the board to decide on a pricing system, since the people sitting on the board are there to look after their own interests, naturally they will make sure that the fee structure selected is the one that penalizes them the least.

Government Orders

A decision that impacts only minimally on very large carriers may destroy small carriers.

• (1540)

Very small air navigation companies do not have very high profit margins. The fee structure could make the difference between a given operation being profitable or becoming unprofitable, spelling the death of small carriers in the medium term. This point was made to us in committee by many witnesses, especially those in the tourist transportation industry, such as outfitters and other small carriers operating on lines which are not major commercial lines. These lines are a source of income for them and constitute, among other things, an interesting business activity for remote communities.

The second thing we felt important to include in our preamble is the fact that there should be a balance between small and large carriers in Nav Canada's operations, thus eliminating the need to hold a debate to specifically guarantee a small carrier a seat on Nav Canada's board of directors. Our intention is that the preamble will create a moral obligation, a need for statutory interpretation whereby small carrier representatives will be able to take their cases to the board of directors and have their say.

The third subject covered in the proposed preamble, which we hope to see the government add to its bill, is northern and remote communities. It must be realized that, while the bill changes the air traffic control system and allows a non profit corporation to take over this system, it does not oblige the corporation to take the economic impact of its decisions on the regions into account.

For example, in the case of the airport in Mont-Joli, or any other regional airport with air navigation equipment, Nav Canada will have to decide, when trying to determine future equipment needs, whether to buy new equipment, and what to install for safety purposes at the airport.

Senior public servants told the committee that, under the bill, the corporation is under no obligation to take the economic impact of a regional airport into account. If equipment required to meet safety requirements represent a major investment in terms of the volume of traffic at the airport, the equipment might not be bought, thus reducing the impact of the airport and resulting, in the long term, in its closure.

Nothing is provided in this bill to allow those concerned by the region's economic development to express their views. Several other amendments will therefore be moved so that, when changes are anticipated, the regional community will have to be informed through the media and all other suitable means to ensure that

decisions are not made without consideration of their impact on the region. Decisions must not be made without the knowledge of interested local parties, to ensure they do not lead to a crisis. This is the third element of our proposed preamble to the bill.

We could consider the bill to be acceptable if the government included these three points in a preamble, namely to consider safety as a paramount concern, to provide an adequate role for small carriers, to protect airports in northern and remote regions, and to guarantee that interested parties have a say when Nav Canada makes decisions regarding equipment in regional airports.

The system could probably be changed effectively if such elements were included to ensure an adequate balance regarding the issues of safety, regions and small carriers.

Under the current system, costs were somewhat out of control and the expected level of satisfaction was not necessarily met. There would now be a return to private activity.

The government must analyse the situation, find a balance and come up with a solution ensuring the paramountcy of safety. After all, safety is the primary responsibility of Nav Canada.

• (1545)

[English]

Mr. Stan Keyes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to respond to the amendments the hon. member put to the House. A great deal of work has been done by the Standing Committee on Transport, which I had the privilege to chair in my previous incarnation.

In this situation we have witnessed an agreement that transfers Canada's air navigation system to the private sector. This is by no means an easy task with all the nuances and all the negotiations that must take place between the two sides for a move from essentially a crown corporation, a government entity, to a not for profit corporation. Imagine all the legalities involved in such an undertaking.

This change was made with a minimal number of bumps in the road. There was agreement on almost all the nuances that took place between both the federal government and the not for profit corporation, Nav Canada.

Nav Canada came to the federal government with this proposal. It was not that the federal government went out looking, but the proposal was made and it was a solid proposal. As I have just heard, the proposal was endorsed by the member opposite from the Bloc. We on this side of the House agreed with the hon. member when he said Bill C-20 is good legislation.

Government Orders

As with any legislation there is some discussion on the ability to see clearly each clause in a piece of legislation to ensure that each one of these clauses is accurate and does what is in the best interests of the travelling public and Canadians at large.

Priority number one for Transport Canada and for Nav Canada has been safety. The hon. member opposite raised three issues in the first group of amendments which I will speak to. The insertion in the preamble is in our opinion unnecessary. The legal effect of a preamble is to assist in the interpretation of other sections of legislation. The three issues dealt with in this motion by the hon. member, as well as Motions Nos. 2 and 3 which I will address separately, are specifically addressed within the legislation already. The value of the preamble is doubtful at best.

A preamble on safety is definitely unnecessary. For example, clause 5 clearly establishes the supremacy of the Aeronautics Act, the legislation that governs safety. We all know safety is the most important aspect of any mode of transportation, in particular this mode of transportation.

Members opposite have alleged the bill does not adequately address safety. Bill C-20 is intended to deal only with the transfer of Transport Canada's air navigation services to a single not for profit company and with the commercial and economic regulatory arrangements for the continued operation of those services.

Clearly Bill C-20 establishes the supremacy of the Aeronautics Act. Section 5 states that nothing in this act affects the application of the Aeronautics Act. Section 14 states that changes in services and facilities must be subject to the Aeronautics Act, including any regulations made under the act that relate to aviation safety or the safety of the public.

• (1550)

The preamble proposed by the hon. member opposite is bound to overlook some important matter that otherwise would be dealt with in the legislation. In the preamble proposed in Motion No. 1 there is no mention of the safety of private and recreational aviation. We do not want to put forward a preamble that might be void of critical and important aspects that would affect the rest of the bill. We feel that is covered in clause 5, which states the supremacy of the Aeronautics Act.

The Bloc member who proposed the second motion is a new member on the Standing Committee on Transport. He is well versed on the matters of transportation and has been a hard working member of the committee. We can tell the differences between members who bother to care about anything in committee work. This hon. member surely does.

On this motion, an insertion in the preamble, given the three issues dealt with in the motion as well as Motions Nos. 2 and 3 are addressed in the legislation, again we are not convinced of the usefulness or value of this motion.

It is about charging and it is completely unnecessary. The charging principles contained in clause 35 and the associated opportunity to appeal charges to the National Transportation Agency as well as the diversity of interests represented on the Nav Canada board remove the need for a preamble dealing with equality of opportunity and charging for large and small carriers.

Rather than clarify the charging principles, the proposed language in the preamble may well confuse matters. In this case it is the expression "equality of opportunity". I am not sure what that means. It is ambiguous. It is certainly less clear than the charging principles outlined in clause 35 of this legislation.

The final representation by the member, Motion No. 3, requests that Nav Canada recognize Canada is a country in which air services to the north and remote regions are necessary. Clauses 18 to 22 and the charging principles contained in clause 35(1)(g) take care of the concerns of the hon. member about services to remote regions of the country.

Clauses 18 to 22 establish a special process for designated current air navigation services in northern and remote parts of the country. This designation means that if Nav Canada, the new private not for profit company, wishes to terminate or reduce any of these services in a way likely to affect a significant group of users or residents in any material way, it first must give public notice and then must have the concurrence of all the affected provincial or territorial governments and a quorum of users or the approval of the Minister of Transport. Clauses 18 through 22 certainly make the addition of a preamble in this area unnecessary as well.

Ms. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, to expedite the business of the House I think you would find unanimous consent that all the motions on the Order Paper be deemed to have been read and moved.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the hon. member's proposal?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

• (1555)

Mr. Mercier: Mr. Speaker, I did not fully understand what we are doing.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member has asked that the House agree to a proposal she put forward. I asked if we agreed that she could make that proposal. The House agreed. I also asked if it could be considered that the proposal had been agreed to by the House.

Ms. Catterall: Perhaps I could explain once again what my proposal is.

The Deputy Speaker: The member can perhaps give her explanation in French if she wishes.

Government Orders

Ms. Catterall: It is simply to ask the House if there is unanimous consent that all the motions, resolutions and amendments be deemed to have been read and moved.

The Deputy Speaker: The clerk has just explained to me that we do not need the consent of the House to accept this proposal. We may say that, with the unanimous consent of the House, the proposal is accepted by all members of the House.

Mr. Mercier: Mr. Speaker, I do not fully understand. It is obvious that we will shortly be voting on the motions group by group. For the moment, we are looking at Motions Nos. 1, 2 and 3. Of course, we are going to read them and comment on them, group by group, and, if I have understood correctly, go on to the vote. I presume that it is not a question of forgoing a vote by accepting in advance to the motions as presented.

The Deputy Speaker: The member is quite right. The Chair is in agreement with what the member has said. All the groups of motions will be debated, but the deputy government whip has merely asked that the Chair dispense with reading all the motions. That is all.

Is there consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[English]

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased the parliamentary secretary spoke before I did. It was my understanding that it was to be Bloc, Liberal and Reform. At least that is the normal rotation. That is why I assumed that was what we were doing.

The parliamentary secretary in essence said many of the things I would have said. I thank him for saving me from digging through all of that.

The consideration for Nav Canada is to run a business guided by economic and financial considerations, with safety of paramount importance, regulated by the government.

However, one thing the parliamentary secretary said which I find exceedingly interesting was that he thought it inappropriate to list certain types of operators, small and large, and not address other groups such as private and recreational users, leaving them off the list. I find it interesting that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport feels it is bad to create lists if some people are to be left off.

I suggest he review the blues on what he said and then read Bill C-33, which the government has just passed and which I believe he voted in favour of. That was the principal argument of the Reform Party.

Likewise, I suggest the Prime Minister of Canada read that list because now with this action dealing with the referendum question in Quebec he is stating how important it is to uphold the rule of law, as is the Minister of Justice. I would ask them why they did not think the same way when they brought in the bill on Pearson airport where the rule of law was clearly subverted.

We will not be supporting the Bloc motions on this for reasons that have been adequately stated by the hon. parliamentary secretary.

In essence, we feel these would politicize the mandate of Nav Canada, and that is clearly not the intent of the bill.

• (1600)

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Mercier (Blainville—Deux-Montagnes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as my colleague for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup has said, we agree with privatization in principle, but we have considerable reservations about its key mechanisms, so much so that, should the amendments we will be presenting not be accepted, we will find ourselves forced to vote against this bill.

For the moment, we are talking about the motions in Group No. 1, which address the preamble we wish to see at the beginning of the bill, and which we see as important in expressing the ultimate purpose of the bill.

Nav Canada is a private body, but one that provides a public service. Because of that private status, perhaps the public will not have the guarantees and services it would otherwise, if the body had not been privatized.

The essence of our opposition to certain aspects of the bill therefore lies with that point, that a private body providing a public service must deliver the same quality and quantity of services as would be provided without privatization.

For an overview of our position, I shall digress a little to list the points covered in the motions of Group No. 1.

There are six applications to the principle I have just set out. The first addresses safety. Public safety may be reduced by privatization. I think that this is a perfectly obvious principle, and one that must be set out explicitly in the preamble.

The second point is that Nav Canada's concern for profits must not, either now or later, lead to the reduction of services to northern and isolated regions. In terms of its viability, service in these regions might be considered less profitable, but we feel that this ought not to be a reason for Nav Canada's cutting back on services. We therefore insist that the preamble explicitly include the principle of maintaining services to northern and isolated regions.

This is also the case for the necessity of protecting the interests of the small shippers, whose profit margin is very slim and who

could run into rate problems if their interests were neglected in favour of the large companies which, we feel, were the source of most of the influence on the government around this proposed bill.

These three points I have listed are the ones covered in the motions of Group No. 1. We will have an opportunity very soon—I am stating them here to establish our overall position—in Group No. 2, to talk about the need for sufficient local dissemination of the changes Nav Canada would propose to charges or to the quality or quantity of services.

We will also have to intervene to prevent private clients from having to pay indirectly for services provided to public clients such as organizations designated by National Defence; then, and this is extremely important, we will have—and this concludes the overview of our objections to the bill—to protect the personal information on clients and personnel held by Nav Canada.

Generally speaking, this leads me to say that, when the federal government delegates its power to an organization it has created, services to the public must not be cut.

● (1605)

This sort of delegation must not—and this applies to ADM as well—result in the organization created serving as a screen between the public and the government so that, as the Minister of Transport has just said, the government cannot say: “It is ADM; or, it is Nav Canada. We are innocent of the blood of this just person”, in the words of Pontius Pilate.

There is no way we will accept this surreptitious dropping of a hot potato, under the guise of decentralization, with the blame being directed elsewhere: “It is not me, it is Nav Canada; or, it is not me, it is ADM”. We totally object to this handy way to fob off responsibilities.

This summarizes my position on these three aspects of block 1. I will no doubt have occasion to rise again on the other aspects I have spoken to briefly.

Mr. Stéphan Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, I am not on the transport committee, but I was in the aviation field for a number of years, and when I caught wind of this issue, I saw there were some things not right about the bill.

As my colleagues have said, we are not against the bill, but there are certain things that are slipping past the public, and in some respects the issue is such a complex one that people are not reacting.

We are in agreement with the privatization of air navigation services. It is a good idea. We have reached the point where we must pay. The problem is the manner in which the government is going about it. They have created an agency called Nav Canada to examine ways of privatizing air navigation services.

Government Orders

The first problem is that in the group of 15 people making up the board there are very few, if any, representatives of small carriers. It is for this reason that I wished to speak on Motion No. 2. When Nav Canada has to decide on fees for users and carriers, will it take small carriers into consideration?

I come from a remote area, Lac-Saint-Jean, where the air link between Montreal and Alma is very important, and small carriers like Air Alma are essential. A study has been done showing that if the price of an airline ticket goes up by one dollar, there are losses of one dollar on this same ticket as a result of this bill. Each time airfares go up, there are some very negative repercussions for airline companies.

What I find fascinating is that the only reactions come from Quebec. There is very little reaction from other air carriers. We were told that Nav Canada's board includes representatives of small carriers such as Air B.C. Air B.C. has BA-146s, which can carry 146 passengers; this, in my book, does not make it a small carrier.

What is interesting and important is that, first of all, this board should include Quebec members so that French language air navigation services are always well represented. We are also proposing that AQTA, the Association québécoise des transporteurs aériens, be represented.

At a recent committee meeting, we were told that the president of AQTA had refused. I have here a letter from ATAC, the Air Transportation Association of Canada, which refers to the invitation to the president of AQTA to sit on the Nav Canada board. I have a second letter in which the president agrees to sit on the board. I have a third letter saying that, unfortunately, the president of AQTA will not be able to sit on the board. This is a major disappointment because AQTA represents both Quebec and small carriers.

● (1610)

Within Nav Canada small carriers are represented by the president of ATAC, Mr. Crichton, who also represents ATAC. The problem is that some 70 per cent of ATAC's funding comes from large carriers. One therefore has good reason to fear that the way air services are taxed may hurt small carriers.

You may argue that small carriers are not happy because the price of their tickets will go up a little. This could have a very negative impact, even on chambers of commerce. I think it was the Matane chamber of commerce that sent the Prime Minister a letter saying: “It is about time to lower the price of tickets”. This goes to show how important this is, because the prices have to be reasonable for the representatives of chambers of commerce routinely doing business with Montreal to be able to get to Montreal regularly.

Government Orders

Not only are air carriers adversely affected, but employment in regional airlines, chambers of commerce and any company doing business with Montreal and across Canada are also adversely affected.

This may look like nothing, but I think it could have serious consequences not only in Quebec but also across Canada. Some will say: "Why is Quebec the only province griping about this?" That is because, in Quebec, we have a permanent organization known as the Association québécoise des transporteurs aériens. I say "we" because I worked in that field for three years. Our purpose in having a permanent organization is to ensure that all small carriers are represented by an association capable of analysing the issues concerning them.

Another problem I can see with the Nav Canada committee is the fact that Nav Canada is not accountable to the people. After the committee has been established, it is very important to understand that small carriers must have a say. If they disagree with something—because of the lack of representation I mentioned earlier—will they be heard, even if they take to the streets? There is cause to be very sceptical.

As my hon. colleague indicated, the same kinds of problems were encountered with ADM. Nav Canada then acts as a shield behind which the government can hide by saying: "This is no longer our responsibility. Blame Nav Canada". Except that Nav Canada was created by the government. Again, we realize that the system is flawed in that regard. We have every reason to examine a consideration that could have very serious consequences.

It is also important, in considering this bill, to take a look at the various forms of taxation. At present, three separate methods of taxation could be contemplated. There is, however, reason to believe that only one of them would work to the benefit of small carriers, but that Nav Canada is not considering that particular one.

I will sum up by saying that I really hope that the government will be able to revise its bill at least to include small carriers and an AQTA representative, so that small carriers can have a say about the method of taxation. It would be much too complicated to get into the various methods, although I touched on the subject, but all I really want is for the minister to allow an AQTA representative to sit on his committee. I am not asking for anything complicated. In fact, it is quite simple, yet it would be very important.

Mr. Guimond: Mr. Speaker, is this still debate, or are we now at questions and comments?

The Deputy Speaker: This is the period for ten-minute speeches, without questions or comments.

• (1615)

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in the debate on Bill C-20 which, among others, establishes a corporation called Nav Canada.

I want to stress the importance of the Bloc Québécois' first motion. The motion proposes that the preamble of the bill includes a mention that the safety of passengers, personnel, air carriers and the public has priority over all other considerations in the decisions taken by Nav Canada. This motion seeks to have the government and Nav Canada recognize that public safety and interest take precedence over money considerations.

I have been the Bloc Québécois critic on this issue since the last election, two and a half years ago. Our party did not oppose the privatization or, rather, the commercialization of civil air navigation services. We did, however, have some reservations and we still do.

For example, we know that, given modern technology and satellites, air traffic control services for all of Canada could be provided from a single location, for example a mall in Mississauga or North Vancouver. One of the Bloc Québécois' concerns was the preservation of French in this area.

As members of the official opposition, we have a duty to be vigilant. In the years 1975-76, a battle took place in Quebec regarding the use of French by air traffic controllers. This episode turned out to be a determining factor in the Parti Québécois' victory on November 15, 1976. Thanks to these efforts, a French speaking pilot and a French speaking air traffic controller could now communicate in French. This was not the case before. Until then, two francophones were forced to speak English to each other, seemingly for safety reasons.

We do not want such gains, including those of the Association des gens de l'air du Québec, to have been made in vain and to simply be forgotten. This is why I just mentioned that modern technology makes it possible to set up, in a Mississauga mall, a national air traffic control centre that would include Quebec's airspace. This is particularly true now that a corporation primarily interested in making profits will have responsibility over this sector. We are not talking about a charity or a non profit corporation. Consequently, profits might take precedence over the requirement to provide services in French in Quebec's airspace.

Despite the victory won by the Association des gens de l'air in 1976, still today, on the Lower North Shore, still today, in the Magdalen Islands—and we in the Bloc Québécois have regularly asked questions about this—pilots tell us that they have trouble being served in French in some sectors, including the one covered by the Moncton area control centre, which is apparently supposed to be bilingual.

I also wanted to speak to Motion No. 2, because we realize that there is a certain common denominator in the composition of Nav Canada's board of directors, and that the large airline companies are very well represented.

Our new colleague from Lac-Saint-Jean has, I believe, his pilot's licence and therefore knows whereof he speaks, and did so most eloquently a moment ago, in my opinion. Where I find fault, as does my colleague, is with the composition of Nav Canada's board of directors. It is unfortunate that this government did not respect the wish of small carriers to be represented, to be listened to.

So this will be just large carriers, and regional carriers will not be heard from. Is it acceptable, for example, that the Association québécoise des transporteurs aériens cannot sit on Nav Canada's board of directors? Is that realistic?

• (1620)

What were we told in the Standing Committee on Transport? That the association was a member of the Canadian council, and will therefore be indirectly represented. I am sorry, but this does not really meet the expectations of the aviation sector, in any event, not those of Quebec carriers.

The bottom line is that if all the seats are held by representatives of large carriers, the priorities set regarding cost per passenger could also give them an advantage over small carriers. Because we know that what matters is who gets in there first. If someone in the family makes a big chocolate cake and the first person to come along helps himself to a great big piece, the others will have nothing but the crumbs that are left to divide up among them.

Human nature being what it is, the big companies will not want to assume the lion's share of the bill, so they will arrange to pay just a bit of it and to pass the rest on to the small regional carriers, who will not be able to afford it. And who will the small carriers pass the buck to, since their profit margins are so slim? To the passengers.

When I was in the Saguenay, I recall being told that flying from Bagotville to Montreal costs more than from Montreal to Miami and, in certain seasons, more than a round trip ticket Montreal—Paris. They used Bagotville—Montreal as an example, but it could as easily have been Val-d'Or—Montreal, Sept-Îles—Montreal, or Gaspé—Montreal. This is aberrant. Once again, the people in the regions are the ones to be penalized by such a decision.

The Bloc Québécois is concerned about the potential impact of Bill C-120 in this area. We are proposing, and this is the purpose of our motions, that an addition be made to the preamble stipulating that Nav Canada must commit to maintaining equality of opportunity between small and large carriers when imposing all the charges.

I will conclude on this point, because time is running out. The third and final motion I wish to comment on attempts to include in

Government Orders

the preamble the fact Nav Canada must recognize that Canada is a country where air service to northern and remote regions is essential. A tour of Dorval airport reveals that it is not only the people of Dorval who fly out of it. People in transit at Dorval come from the regions and are on their way to another destination, such as the south, Europe or other provinces in Canada. They are people from the regions, and we must take this into consideration with respect to air services.

The aim with this provision is to establish a parameter for interpretation purposes, drawing attention to the fact that one of Nav Canada's prime objectives is to serve the regions.

In conclusion, we must remember that it is true Quebec has Montreal and Canada has Toronto, Vancouver and Calgary, but we must not forget that Quebec and Canada are made up of regions as well. Sometimes decisions made centrally here in Ottawa by bureaucrats do not take the regions into account.

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues, I too am happy to speak to Bill C-20 on the commercialization of civil air navigation services. In the final analysis, what we are discussing today is the establishment of a private air navigation corporation.

I think that the Bloc Québécois has a duty to review the bill before us very carefully. After looking at the motions to be debated, I asked to speak. Although I was not on the committee, I asked to speak because I was a long time member of SOPRAM, the organization promoting the Montreal airports, which revolves around ADM and the Montreal airports. I asked to speak because I thought we had done a good job, especially on the motions before us today in Group No. 1, including the motions saying that safety must take precedence over commercial considerations.

• (1625)

Of course, the private corporation being formed will try to make a profit. I remember that, for ADM, this was often an area of concern. We often looked at safety versus deregulation, versus privatization, as there is a tendency to confuse deregulation with privatization.

We also realize that setting up a commercial, for-profit corporation is often done at the expense of safety. Even our American friends are asking questions about this whole issue, as we saw with the crash of a ValuJet DC-9. Investigators in the U.S. are asking if Americans are safe when these companies may be cutting corners on safety to make a little more profit.

We may wonder if, in Nav Canada's decisions, people's safety will take precedence over making a little more profit. As far as the safety of passengers, personnel and the public is concerned, it seems quite logical and right that the preamble to the bill should provide that safety take precedence over Nav Canada's profits.

Government Orders

I often like to give examples from my riding. In Saint-Jean, we have an airport with a control tower paid for by Transport Canada. What will happen the day after Nav Canada takes over? I made some enquiries today. Naturally, officials at Transport Canada are telling me: "Do not worry, Mr. Bachand. In any case, Nav Canada will take perhaps a year or more to consider what it should divest itself of, what it should keep and what to do with what it keeps".

There are about 50,000 aircraft movements per year at the Saint-Jean airport. Dynamair, a flying school, is responsible for the majority of these movements. Of course, teaching students to fly a plane means many takeoffs and landings. The same is true of the gliding school where air cadets attend glider training every summer. You will understand that the bill before us has an impact on my riding as a region.

I must admit that we are somewhat concerned about what would happen if, a year from now, Nav Canada said: "We have decided to make changes at the control tower in Saint-Jean. Air traffic will no longer be controlled by air controllers, but by people like those of the UNICOM project, for example". A single individual mans the tower and directs traffic. That is a bit on the lean side. These are not professionals like air controllers. They will have to call upon the services of the airport in Saint-Hubert.

This raises serious questions in my mind and in the minds of my constituents about the impact this bill here today will have.

What will happen to the flying school for instance if we no longer have air controllers at our airport? This is rather serious, considering that there are often three, four or five aircraft taking off and landing, not to mention the possibility of a plane from another airport entering the school's airspace.

We are right to warn the government. We agree on the issue of profits for Nav Canada, but these profits should not jeopardize safety. We also wonder about the other side of the issue, the introduction of user fees. Some of my colleagues just gave the example of large carriers versus small ones. This is the object of Motion No. 2. Industry officials in Quebec told me that the Association québécoise des transporteurs aériens would have liked to be represented on Nav Canada's board.

The minister at the time, who is now the Minister of Human Resources Development, said: "You are only a regional association". I happen to think that Quebec is larger than a region.

• (1630)

This was not good enough for the minister. He added: "See if you can form a group". A council of air carrier associations was set up. It included the Quebec association and several other associations in Canada. Some 800 companies were represented by the council.

After forming the council, these people asked again for a seat on Nav Canada's board, but the minister told them they could not be represented, because the work was already too advanced. People were upset that they had taken the time to form a council, only to be told by the minister that, as small carriers, they would be excluded from Nav Canada, that only Air Canada, Canadian and all the large carriers would be represented. The danger exists that Air Canada and Canadian will say that they want preferential rates, and that if Nav Canada wants more money it has only to turn to the small carriers.

This has an effect both on privatization and on control towers. There are also repercussions for users, such as the pilots' school I mentioned earlier, and the air cadets, who might be slapped with user fees. Right now, there are no user fees at Saint-Jean. Airplanes landing and taking off from Saint-Jean pay no fees.

This could have major consequences for an industry such as Dynamair, which could find itself paying fees for each landing and take off. These are the negative consequences. This is why the motion before us today says that safety must take precedence over business considerations.

In conclusion, I would be remiss if I neglected to mention remote areas. You know that, as Indian affairs critic, I am often required to travel to remote areas. These people are worried also, because air services are absolutely essential to them. I think that the bill before us does is neither satisfactory nor sufficiently reassuring for these areas.

The motions moved by my colleagues in the Bloc Québécois add the necessary amendments and safety for remote areas. I thought this needed to be said. I invite the government to join us and agree to these motions, which will increase safety and take account of remote areas in Quebec and in Canada.

Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take my turn in speaking to Bill C-20. First of all, I would like to remind you that, in July 1994, when the former Minister of Transport, now Minister of Human Resources Development, released the policy for commercializing airports and air navigation, the Bloc Québécois came out in favour of the principle.

At that time, however, we did not know how this new policy would take shape, and so we voiced some reservations on its application.

Today we are starting to have a somewhat clearer idea of how the government plans to put into practice the principle made known in July 1994. Why did we agree with the principle at that time? It struck us as reasonable, and more efficient, to make local administrators who are familiar with their region, its resources, its strengths and its weaknesses, responsible for the way their local airport developed.

Government Orders

Nevertheless, even then, we had some concerns about what would become of the regions. My colleague has just spoken of this. There are 26 major airports in Canada, and there is very little doubt in our minds that management of those major airports by the private sector is more dynamic than management by public servants in Ottawa.

• (1635)

However, we must also remember that there are over 500 or 600 airports in Canada. This raises the question of what fate is in store for the small local and regional airports. Things are not moving along very quickly, because, at the moment, some 20 local and regional airports have been transferred to municipalities.

My remarks apply primarily to three elements of the first block of motions. The first concerns safety. In recent years, I have been involved in the issue of safety because there is an airport in my riding, Jean Lesage international airport, and we have watched how the government—Transport Canada—has dealt with this issue over the past few years. While we supported the principle of commercialization of airports and air navigation services, it is still possible now for us to have serious reservations. Increasingly, the government's motives are becoming clear, transparent.

It is not out of generosity. It is not because the government places greater faith in local managers that it is withdrawing. No, it is doing so strictly in order to pull out and to save money. Therefore this bill must be considered in the light of this.

May I remind the House of some cases that show how relevant my comments are. A little over a year ago, almost two years ago in fact, Transport Canada decided to close a number of terminal control units at five or six airports, the last one being the one at Jean-Lesage airport.

We then waged a major fight to try to convince and show Transport Canada that there was still a ray of hope. The system that had been put in place to monitor all of Quebec did not always work properly. I remember in particular that, on April 9, 1995, a Quebec City terminal control unit that was following a plane suddenly realized that the plane had done a 180-degree turn. What was going on? Very simply, the radar allowing controllers to monitor the plane suddenly focused on a flight of Canada geese going in the opposite direction.

Every time we asked the Minister of Transport a question, he told us: "The most important thing is the safety of passengers". Allow me to question how safe they are.

We were also told, to justify closing the terminal control unit in Quebec City, that the emergency control unit at Dorval airport was fully operational, which was not true. When we went to the airport, we saw that the equipment that was supposed to be there did not

exist and, what is more, that it took exactly 20 minutes to move crews to the regional control centre.

That is the first point. So, when government members come and tell us: "Our primary concern is safety", we do not believe them.

Let give you another example, still in connection with safety. In the interest of economy, always, Transport Canada discontinued the security services normally provided by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police at a number of Canadian airports. Again, Jean-Lesage airport was one of those affected. RCMP officers were replaced with veterans, I think. Granted, they can perform some functions, but I does not seem to me that they can do the same job as the RCMP officers.

Further evidence of the fact that the government, through Transport Canada, does not care about safety can be found in the length of aircraft allowed to land in Canadian airports. Of course, it is regulated.

• (1640)

The applicable regulations take into account, among other things, runway length of course, but also firefighting services available at the airport.

Given the number of firefighters on duty at the airport in Quebec City, the number of fire trucks available and the type of trucks used, it was clear that Transport Canada was not abiding by its own regulations. What did the government and Transport Canada do? They took one more truck away and reduced the number of firefighters, departing even further from their own regulations.

This government has decided to decentralize to the regions only to save some money. We have seen what it has done with Canadian National Railways. You might say I am getting sidetracked, but I am not. I am still discussing the same theme. The government is withdrawing from this area, not out of generosity towards the provinces, but to avoid fulfilling its financial obligations. Transport Canada neglected the Quebec City bridge for 15 years. And no sooner was CN privatized last year, what did the federal government do? It started saying: "Yes, the Quebec City bridge is in bad shape, but like Pontius Pilate, we are washing our hands of the whole thing. CN is now a private corporation. Consequently, we have nothing to do with the maintenance of the bridge". Yet, it is because of CN's negligence, and Transport Canada's negligence, that the bridge is in its current state of disrepair.

The issue of navigational aids in the St. Lawrence River, which we raised on numerous occasions in recent weeks, is another example of government withdrawal. The reason is always the same: to save money. Safety is hardly a consideration. Without first conducting a real economic impact study, Canada was divided in three zones and the government is telling users of the St. Lawrence Seaway, to the Great Lakes, that they will now have to pay for services provided to them. The decision was made without even

Government Orders

bothering to see if it will impact on the volume of traffic and if it will result in ships using American ports instead.

ADM is another example of the government's quickness to say it is no longer its responsibility, when it withdraws from an area. ADM was established and we agree with the underlying principle. Now there is a problem, and the government, instead of requiring a public examination of the effects of transferring flights from Mirabel to Dorval, said, instead: "No, no, this is no longer our concern. We are no longer involved and have passed the responsibility for the Montreal airports on to a private firm".

I would also like to talk a bit in this context about Nav Canada's representativeness. Colleagues have already spoken on this. Nav Canada's board of directors does not represent the Canadian reality. Only the Transportation Association of Canada has been authorized to appoint representatives to the board. And where do these representatives come from? Two are from British Columbia and two are from the Ottawa region. This composition of the board they claim represents Canada. There is no one from Quebec.

Two groups in particular have been very involved in navigation in Quebec over the past 20 or 30 years: the Association québécoise des transporteurs aériens and the Association des gens de l'air. They had a special place in air transportation and were dismissed with a wave of the hand, simply because, as they were told: "You do not represent a national association. You are regional". So there is no one from Quebec.

When the criticism is made to the Minister of Transport that there is no one from Quebec, his response is very smooth.

• (1645)

He says: "Well, we appointed someone from Quebec to represent you: Michel Vennat, the president of the Council for Canadian Unity". He is representing the interests of Quebec aviation with Nav Canada. What does Mr. Vennat know about air transportation? Probably nothing. I am not criticizing him. I am criticizing the government for appointing him.

It refuses to appoint people from the industry and appoints a political person, someone who plays a very dubious role in constitutional discussions, to the board of Nav Canada to represent Quebec's interests.

We should be having serious doubts about this bill. Agreeing with the principle is one thing, but accepting the bill as written is another.

In another vein, I would like to return to the matter of French. I do not consider the guarantees at all satisfactory. The minister says: "We will ensure that the Official Languages Act applies", but while Transport Canada was managing air control, it took no steps to ensure that the Official Languages Act was being complied with.

Why should we trust a private company to do so? I will come back to this a little later.

Mr. Bernard Deshaies (Abitibi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise immediately after my colleague from the riding of Louis-Hébert, in Quebec, to speak to Bill C-20, which the Bloc Québécois has introduced motions to amend. This bill is of particular concern to my riding, the riding of Abitibi, which is definitely a remote area relying heavily on air services. I think that these motions should be given serious consideration.

One of the motions is to add to the preamble that Nav Canada recognizes that Canada is a country where air service to northern and remote regions is essential. We are seeking, in this way, to lay down a parameter that would help prevent areas such as ours from being frequently left out of the equation.

In my area, Val-d'Or, an airport is affected by this bill. Right now, the city, or the chamber of commerce, whichever is working on the question, is required to know whether Val-d'Or will keep its airport when the Department of Transport cuts off its dwindling grants. Will the city of Val-d'Or have the money to run this airport?

For five years now, the policy of the Department of Transport has been to reduce the size of airports. It is obvious that, in the past, airports had practically the same services. The regions did not always ask to have all the fancy services available at Dorval, Toronto, or even Vancouver. It is not necessary to have moving walkways, the sophisticated checking systems of major airports, but areas such as ours must receive essential and equitable service.

Why do people in regions like ours, as my colleague has said in the speech prior to the last one, pay two or three times more per kilometre to fly than people who go from Montreal to Toronto, for example, which is almost the same distance? Why can they get seat sales at \$149, while we have to pay \$550 for a regular fare between Val-d'Or and Montreal?

What about the air fare between Val-d'Or and Quebec City? It is \$650, which makes it expensive for people from Abitibi to get to Montreal or Quebec City—usually not for pleasure, but for business. Pleasure trips are also possible, as they are for people who fly from Montreal to Miami, but people with average incomes find it almost impossible to fly from Val-d'Or to Montreal or Quebec City.

• (1650)

This has, I feel, become impossibly expensive. Some months ago, when I spoke on decentralization and deregulation of transportation services, I called for recognition of equal rights for the people in the regions, whether my region or some other region in Canada, to receive quality service. Not necessarily the plush service there might be in Toronto or Montreal, but service which would allow people to get quickly from place to place as needed. Often trips of more than 700 kilometres are required, to get to

Toronto, Montreal, Quebec City or beyond. These services are necessary, I believe, for sometimes trips have to be made on an emergency basis because of illness or death or the like, and sometimes there is no choice between driving and flying.

But now Val-d'Or is faced with a choice: Will we continue to maintain our airport? Will we have the \$500,000 or \$600,000 needed to put into it yearly? Will the taxpayers have to foot the bill? I do not feel it should be necessary to ask such questions.

People in regions like Val-d'Or ought to have access to an real operating airport, so that, for instance, if there is a health emergency, a government plane can land quickly and rush the patient to hospital in Montreal or Quebec City.

The Val-d'Or region also serves a vast area of nearly 1,500 kilometres north of Val-d'Or: the Inuit and Cree territories of the Far North. It is from Val-d'Or that the goods intended for these people are shipped.

All the goods sent to the Inuit and the Cree go through Val-d'Or. Shipping may cost less than a third of what it would if the goods were sent from Montreal. It is easy to understand, as an air mile costs much more than a road mile. But, if the Val-d'Or airport closes, shipping costs for the Inuit and the Cree may increase even further, while the people of Val-d'Or would come out even.

I used Val-d'Or as an example, but I am sure there are other airports in the northern regions of Saskatchewan and Manitoba that serve Native communities living further north who also need services at fair and realistic prices.

A few years ago, during the air service decentralization process, the air traffic controllers in Val-d'Or lost their jobs. They had uncovered documents proving that keeping them in Val-d'Or did not cost more than sending them to Toronto or Montreal, where air traffic is monitored. They could also control air traffic over a rather large territory, and there was less of a safety risk.

One of the things the Bloc Quebecois wants to find out about Nav Canada is if the safety level of the people in those areas is not as high as that of the people in Montreal or Toronto. Why are they seen as being candidates for reduced service? Because they live in outlying areas? I think that most of the people in the Abitibi—Témiscamingue region work in the natural resources sector, that is to say, in the forestry and mining industries. These people generate a lot of money for those who live further south.

As my colleague was saying, when I hop on a plane in Val-d'Or or Rouyn-Noranda to fly to Montreal, Quebec City or Toronto, I pay money to those national airports. If we could get only half the

Government Orders

taxes collected on the cost of plane tickets, we could finance our own airports and control our own destiny.

We also wanted Bill C-20 to say that Nav Canada should let small carriers have a say, as they would like to. That is the wish representatives of the Association québécoise des transporteurs aériens, or AQTA, have expressed to the Air Transport Association of Canada, and people listened to what they had to say. With the support of the Canadian council of air carrier associations, the Association québécoise des transporteurs aériens made representations to be fully represented on the board.

• (1655)

How can your interests be defended when you are not even represented on the board? If Quebec's small carriers serving our regions have no control or say, how will we go about ensuring any degree of protection? Quebec users have received only a negative answer.

When the airport decentralization and air transport system devolution policy was introduced in the latter part of 1993 and early 1994, we were promised that the system would be more cost-effective and deliver the same level of service at a lower cost.

The letter from the Association des transporteurs aériens du Québec makes us wonder what services are to be expected. What can we do, if we are not even given the right to know what goes on at the board?

I take a strong interest in this matter, because in deciding the future of their airport, as I indicated earlier, the people of Val-d'Or cannot help but wonder also about future changes Nav Canada could impose on a local civilian authority like the City of Val-d'Or, when people will not have any control over future changes.

At the airport in Val-d'Or, for example, there is an aircraft approach system. This system will be under the control of Nav Canada. What would prevent Nav Canada from sending the City of Val-d'Or a bill for the maintenance of the system three, four or five years from now? This is one of many possibilities that have been raised. Last week, I attended a meeting of the chamber of commerce on the Val-d'Or airport acquisition project. People were wondering how they could be sure that costs would remain constant, if there is no control over any of these elements.

Again, if we include in the bill a motion to ensure the safety of air services in northern regions, it will always be possible to tell the government in the future: "Listen, the municipality cannot absorb the annual costs of \$200,000 or \$100,000. It should be up to Nav Canada to ensure our safety. Aircraft cannot land without an approach system". Then, we, who live in regions, will be protected.

Government Orders

In conclusion, I am asking the government to be receptive to the needs of regions. For too many years now, the government has been making decisions under cover of cuts required by its debt. Regions can absorb part of the deficit. However, the government must realize that if it does not stop depriving us of essential services, people will get discouraged. Sometimes, we cannot help but wonder if the government is trying to shut down regions.

In my estimation, this would be a serious mistake, given what northern regions such as ours provide to other regions, given our great natural resources, which are not even developed here, but taken to southern destinations to increase their worth. Indeed, it would be a serious mistake to conclude, here in Canada, that northern regions generate costs and not profits.

The government should support this motion, so that all regions will feel, even though they do not get additional funding, even though they have to learn to live within their means, that they have some security, that they are respected, and that no forgotten bills will show up in the future.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question is on Motion No. 1.

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Yes.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more that five members having risen:

• (1700)

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 2 and 3.

[English]

Group No. 2. A vote on Motion No. 4 applies to Motions Nos. 5 through 12 and Motions Nos. 16 through 24.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-20, in Clause 15, be amended by replacing lines 32 to 43, on page 10, and lines 1 to 3, on page 11, with the following:

“(3) A copy of the notice shall be

(a) published in every newspaper that primarily serves the regions that, in the opinion of the Corporation, will be affected by the new or revised charge;”.

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-20, in Clause 15, be amended by replacing lines 32 to 43, on page 10, and lines 1 to 3, on page 11, with the following:

“(3) A copy of the notice shall be

(b) sent by mail and by electronic means;”.

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-20, in Clause 15, be amended by replacing lines 32 to 43, on page 10, and lines 1 to 3, on page 11, with the following:

“(3) A copy of the notice shall be

(i) to every band council in every region that, in the opinion of the Corporation, will be affected by the new or revised charge,

(ii) to organizations representing users whose members will, in the opinion of the Corporation, be affected by the new or revised charge, and

(iii) to every user and other person who has, at least 10 days before, notified the Corporation of their desire to receive notices or announcements under this Act;

(c) posted in an electronic version in a location that is generally accessible to persons who have access to what is commonly referred to as the Internet; and

(d) filed with the Agency after subparagraphs (i), (ii) and (iii) and paragraph (c) have been complied with.”

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-20, in Clause 18, be amended by replacing lines 33 to 46, on page 11, and lines 1 to 7, on page 12, with the following:

“(3) A copy of the notice shall be

(a) published in every newspaper that primarily serves the regions that, in the opinion of the Corporation, will be affected by the new or revised charge;”.

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-20, in Clause 18, be amended by replacing lines 33 to 46, on page 11, and lines 1 to 7, on page 12, with the following:

“(3) A copy of the notice shall be

(b) sent by mail and by electronic means”.

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-20, in Clause 18, be amended by replacing lines 33 to 46, on page 11, and lines 1 to 7, on page 12, with the following:

“(3) A copy of the notice shall be

(i) to every band council in every region that, in the opinion of the Corporation, will be affected by the new or revised charge,

(ii) to organizations representing users whose members will, in the opinion of the Corporation, be affected by the new or revised charge, and

(iii) to users and other persons who have, at least 10 days before, notified the Corporation of their desire to receive notices or announcements under this Act;

Government Orders

(c) posted in an electronic version in a location that is generally accessible to persons who have access to what is commonly referred to as the Internet; and

(d) filed with the Agency after subparagraphs (i), (ii) and (iii) and paragraph (c) have been complied with.”

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-20, in Clause 21, be amended by replacing lines 9 to 30, on page 13, with the following:

“(3) A copy of the notice shall be

(a) published in every newspaper that primarily serves the regions that, in the opinion of the Corporation, will be affected by the new or revised charge;”.

Motion No. 11

That Bill C-20, in Clause 21, be amended by replacing lines 9 to 30, on page 13, with the following:

“(3) A copy of the notice shall be

(b) sent by mail and by electronic means”.

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-20, in Clause 21, be amended by replacing lines 9 to 30, on page 13, with the following:

“(3) A copy of the notice shall be

(i) to every band council in every region that, in the opinion of the Corporation, will be affected by the new or revised charge,

(ii) to organizations representing users whose members will, in the opinion of the Corporation, be affected by the new or revised charge, and

(iii) to users and other persons who have, at least 10 days before, notified the Corporation of their desire to receive notices or announcements under this Act;

(c) posted in an electronic version in a location that is generally accessible to persons who have access to what is commonly referred to as the Internet; and

(d) filed with the Agency after subparagraphs (i), (ii) and (iii) and paragraph (c) have been complied with.”

Motion No. 16

That Bill C-20, in Clause 36, be amended by replacing lines 28 to 43, on page 20, and lines 1 and 2, on page 21, with the following:

“(3) A copy of the notice shall be

(a) published in every newspaper that primarily serves the regions that, in the opinion of the Corporation, will be affected by the new or revised charge;”.

Motion No. 17

That Bill C-20, in Clause 36, be amended by replacing lines 28 to 43, on page 20, and lines 1 and 2, on page 21, with the following:

“(3) A copy of the notice shall be

(b) sent by mail and by electronic means”.

Motion No. 18

That Bill C-20, in Clause 36, be amended by replacing lines 28 to 43, on page 20, and lines 1 and 2, on page 21, with the following:

“(3) A copy of the notice shall be

(i) to every band council in every region that, in the opinion of the Corporation, will be affected by the new or revised charge,

(ii) to organizations representing users whose members will, in the opinion of the Corporation, be affected by the new or revised charge, and

(iii) to users and other persons who have, at least 10 days before, notified the Corporation of their desire to receive notices or announcements under this Act;

(c) posted in an electronic version in a location that is generally accessible to persons who have access to what is commonly referred to as the Internet; and

(d) filed with the Agency after subparagraphs (i), (ii) and (iii) and paragraph (c) have been complied with.”

Motion No. 19

That Bill C-20, in Clause 37, be amended by replacing lines 41 to 43, on page 21, and lines 1 to 17, on page 22, with the following:

“(3) A copy of the notice shall be

(a) published in every newspaper that primarily serves the regions that, in the opinion of the Corporation, will be affected by the new or revised charge;”.

Motion No. 20

That Bill C-20, in Clause 37, be amended by replacing lines 41 to 43, on page 21, and lines 1 to 17, on page 22, with the following:

“(3) A copy of the notice shall be

(b) sent by mail and by electronic means”.

Motion No. 21

That Bill C-20, in Clause 37, be amended by replacing lines 41 to 43, on page 21, and lines 1 to 17, on page 22, with the following:

“(3) A copy of the notice shall be

(i) to every band council in every region that, in the opinion of the Corporation, will be affected by the new or revised charge,

(ii) to organizations representing users whose members will, in the opinion of the Corporation, be affected by the new or revised charge, and

(iii) to users and other persons who have, at least 10 days before, notified the Corporation of their desire to receive notices or announcements under this Act;

(c) posted in an electronic version in a location that is generally accessible to persons who have access to what is commonly referred to as the Internet; and

(d) filed with the Agency after subparagraphs (i), (ii) and (iii) and paragraph (c) have been complied with.”

Motion No. 22

That Bill C-20, in Clause 40, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 20, on page 24, with the following:

“(3) A copy of the notice shall be

Government Orders

(a) published in every news paper that primarily serves the regions that, in the opinion of the Corporation, will be affected by the new or revised charge;”.

Motion No. 23

That Bill C-20, in Clause 40, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 20, on page 24, with the following:

“(3) A copy of the notice shall be

(b) sent by mail and by electronic means”.

Motion No. 24

That Bill C-20, in Clause 40, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 20, on page 24, with the following:

“(3) A copy of the notice shall be

(i) to every band council in every region that, in the opinion of the Corporation, will be affected by the new or revised charge,

(ii) to organizations representing users whose members will, in the opinion of the Corporation, be affected by the new or revised charge, and

(iii) to users and other persons who have, at least 10 days before, notified the Corporation of their desire to receive notices or announcements under this Act;

(c) posted in an electronic version in a location that is generally accessible to persons who have access to what is commonly referred to as the Internet; and

(d) filed with the Agency after subparagraphs (i), (ii) and (iii) and paragraph (c) have been complied with.”

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Mercier (Blainville—Deux-Montagnes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the motions in Group No. 2 deal with clauses 15, 18, 21, 36, 37 and 40. We put forward 18 motions on these six clauses, which goes to show how important this group of motions are.

The main objective of these motions—which is also why they were grouped together—is to ensure broader distribution of the notices Nav Canada has to give in some instances stipulated in the act. The main instances where Nav Canada has to give such notices to the regions and the organizations concerned are the following. It has to do with the notices Nav Canada has to give when it wants to increase or reduce the services it provides.

Another specific clause deals with the instances where Nav Canada wants to increase, reduce or modify designated northern or remote services.

Lastly, Nav Canada must give notices when it wants to establish a new charge or revise an existing charge or review the organizations that have to pay those charges.

Those are the three instances where Nav Canada must give notices. In these three cases, the current legislation provides for notices to be given to the organizations concerned. However, the problem we have with this, and which deserves our attention, is that the list of organizations that may be concerned is too vague, as are the means to be used to reach these organizations.

All our motions propose, in the three cases I just mentioned—changes in services, changes in northern or remote services, changes in user charges—that advance notice be served first to all local daily newspapers. Obviously people must be advised of such important changes as those to the services provided by Nav Canada.

We also think that, if need be, the band council or councils concerned should be informed. Generally, these notices should be sent as much as possible not only by mail but also by E-mail.

We also want the large and small organizations representing the users to be advised of changes to the user charges and services. Finally, since individuals should not be forgotten, anyone who has expressed an interest in the previous ten days should be informed. This, then, covers the cases in which we want notices to be sent and the type of notices to be sent.

● (1705)

We do not think these provisions are useless. We just want to specify the means that must be used. Let us not forget that, since Nav Canada necessarily has a commercial purpose, we, as legislators, must protect ourselves and protect users against the tendency Nav Canada could have, for financial reasons, not to announce widely the measures it intends to take, or to save money in the way it makes these announcements.

We want to avoid anything arbitrary in the way Nav Canada provides information concerning the measures it intends to take. Again, these amendments are based on the general principle that even though Ottawa delegates some of its powers to a private organization that has to provide a public service, it does not mean that this service must be reduced in terms of quality and quantity. In this second group of motions, this service is the provision of information.

Since we are talking about information, I will take this opportunity to draw a parallel between this and another creation of the federal government, namely Aéroports de Montréal. ADM is another example of the government's unfortunate tendency to delegate responsibilities to an organization in a way that allows it to use this organization to avoid providing services that it had an obligation to provide before this delegation of responsibilities took place.

The parallel being drawn here, with respect to information, is justified by the fact that ADM has just taken a decision that is extremely important for the region and even, I would say, for Quebec and for Canada, because it involves international airports. With respect to the measure taken by ADM, my office asked for copies of the studies on which ADM is basing its decision. If you can believe it, we were told that ADM is subject to the requirements of the Access to Information Act and that therefore they do

Government Orders

not have to provide us with the studies on which they are basing their decision. We therefore have here another federal creature, which, thanks to the delegation of authority, may decline to justify in a manner satisfactory to the public the decisions it wants to take.

We therefore see that there is a risk that the federal government will create agencies in order not to have to provide the public with the information it has a responsibility to provide and which it must provide when there is no delegation of authority to an intermediate agency, which, under the label of private service, may decline to give out information that, in this case, one is entitled to expect from an agency providing a service to the public.

The point is that the ADM precedent is an indication that we should be very wary that Nav Canada does not become a convenient screen that the government can use to shirk certain of its obligations. In this case, the obligations that we want to be sure Nav Canada assumes concern the distribution of notices in the cases provided for in the bill in the manner and according to the terms regarding the media that we have mentioned.

[*English*]

Mr. Stan Keyes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to respond to the motions being put forward by members of the Bloc. Talk about latitude. I do not know how we got on to the issue of the ADM, or Aéroports de Montreal.

I want to remind members of this place and the hon. member opposite that ADM, or Aéroports de Montreal, is the body which looks after the operations of Mirabel and Dorval airports.

• (1710)

It has been charged with responsibilities that are no longer under federal jurisdiction. It is the working group that will manage the two airports in that area. The government's intent is to split off the business of running business away from the federal government and let the communities take control of their destinies. It is the communities, on many levels, municipal, provincial, et cetera, that are represented on this local airport authority called ADM and are charged with these responsibilities.

It is a measure that has been put forward by the government which has been overwhelmingly endorsed by Canadians from coast to coast to coast. It is producing very dramatic, very appreciable and well supported, far reaching opportunities for all the airports, including my airport in Hamilton, Ontario.

I must respond to and strongly disagree with the concerns outlined by the hon. member for Beauport—Montmorency—Or-

léans and others in the Bloc who allege that the regions are not fully represented on the Nav Canada board.

On the subject of the request by Bloc members in their motions for representation for large and small carriers on the board of directors of Nav Canada, this request is entirely unnecessary. This request was debated in committee. I am not sure how a lot of these motions got put in at report stage. Exactly the same motions were dealt with in committee, but that is a matter for another day.

Why is it completely unnecessary? This matter is already taken care of by the bylaws of the corporation. Four directors are appointed by ATAC, which is the Air Transport Association of Canada. It is the largest trade association, representing carriers of all sizes and from all regions of the country.

ATAC membership includes major national and international carriers, regional air carriers, and I stress the word regional, local service carriers and even flying clubs.

On the specific issue of regional representation, Nav Canada's bylaws require the corporation to consult with bona fide regional trade associations in the appointment of its directors. It is worth noting that one of the four directors appointed by ATAC is the former president and chief executive officer of a regional air carrier.

Organizations representing smaller air carriers also have an opportunity to influence Nav Canada's decision making process through an advisory committee provided for in the Nav Canada bylaws.

At Nav Canada's first annual general meeting held last April 10, 15 individuals were elected to the advisory committee. Among these individuals were representatives of several regional associations, typically consisting of smaller commercial operators such as the British Columbia Aviation Council and Mr. Jenner at the Association québécoise des transporteurs aériens. Therefore, the representation is there and the Bloc's concerns that the regions are not represented are entirely unfounded.

Moving to the next group and in response to the hon. member's motions, particularly Motion No. 4, can anyone imagine the impracticality of giving notice in every newspaper serving the regions to be affected by a proposal, whether in respect of changes in services or changes in charges?

If one carries that logic to the logical extension, in the case of an en route charge where one is taking it right across the country, that would impose a requirement on the new not for profit corporation called Nav Canada to publish in every newspaper across the entire country. Can you just imagine the fees and charges that would entail in making notice on a change in charges, for example?

Government Orders

• (1715)

Incidentally, the motion also contains an error. Clause 15 deals with changes in services and facilities, not charges. The notification requirement established in clause 15(3) already ensures that all interested persons will know about a Nav Canada proposal. It is there.

In addition, the Nav Canada bylaws require that notice be given in the two largest national circulation newspapers in each of the official languages of our country.

In Motion No. 5 presented by the Bloc members, the requirement to send by mail and electronic means would clearly represent an unproductive duplication of effort. The Bloc motion refers to mail and electronic means.

What if an individual, organization or group was not equipped to receive a notice by electronic means? There must be a few of them in Canada. Nav Canada could be in breach of its obligation to provide notice if it did not send a notice electronically to such a person or a group because, and I remind the hon. member opposite, the motion refers to mail and electronic means. Nav Canada should be allowed to use either mail or electronic means, which makes the most sense in terms of the specific interested individual.

On Motion No. 6, Bill C-20 identifies only one group of persons specifically, that is, the users. This does not mean that only users have a role. Everyone else is covered by the expression "other person". The reference to "other person" is in Bill C-20. To single out, as the Bloc requests to do in this motion, band councils from all other interested persons seems rather inappropriate.

The association of commercial pilots which appeared before the Standing Committee on Transport would be one group that might expect explicit recognition. Airport operators would be another group that might feel this way.

The expression "representative organization of users" seems pretty clear. It is clear enough that a change to "organizations representing users" is entirely unnecessary.

On Motion No. 7, the reference is incorrect. It should be clause 18, not clause 15. It would be impractical to give notice in every newspaper primarily serving the regions to be affected by a proposal, whether we are talking about changes in northern or remote services or changes in charges. In the case of an en route service where one is taking it right across the country, this proposal could impose a requirement on Nav Canada to publish in every newspaper in outlying regions of the entire country. This is not very practical.

Motion No. 8 contains a reference which appears to be incorrect. It should be clause 18 and not clause 15. The requirement to send by mail and electronic means would represent that unproductive duplication of effort we spoke about earlier.

Motion No. 9 contains an incorrect reference. It should be clause 18, not clause 15. I repeat that Bill C-20 identifies only one group of persons specifically, that is, the users. That does not mean that only users have a role. Of course everyone else is covered by the expression "other persons".

The remaining Motions Nos. 10 to 12 and Motions Nos. 16 to 24 are amendments which repeat all the impracticalities put forward by the Bloc. They are impractical and unproductive amendments which I addressed in the first nine motions of this group.

In the closing remarks of the last group the Bloc raised its concerns about safety. I cannot stress enough to hon. members opposite that Transport Canada prides itself, whether it is the Minister of Transport, members on this side of the House or all the men and women who work for Transport Canada, on the safety record in transportation in this country. Transportation safety is always priority one in that department.

• (1720)

When the hon. members speak I dare say politically on the issue of safety and their concerns, I recognize they have concerns. However I want to remind them and I must remind them that where safety is concerned, the supremacy of safety in Bill C-20 is clearly established through references to the Aeronautics Act within the body of Bill C-20 and regulations made pursuant to the act.

We cannot do a better job putting those requirements or preambles to motions within the body of Bill C-20. We cannot do a better job than referring to the Aeronautics Act. It is the best instrument to address safety, better than anything the Bloc might want to move motions on.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with a couple of little housekeeping items first. Both the Bloc member and the parliamentary secretary mentioned a couple of areas.

Bloc members were concerned that the Quebec transport association was not getting a proper voice. For the record, Mr. Jenner of that organization was offered a seat on the board of directors and turned it down. He acknowledged this right in committee. I am not quite sure where the Bloc is coming from on that. He was offered exactly what they say he should have got and he turned it down.

Also Bloc members talked about ADM. As the parliamentary secretary said, I do not know how that found its way into this discussion. I have one point for clarification. What they are asking for is the Montreal authority be ruled by the federal government.

Government Orders

If Bloc members are saying that rather than having local authorities in Quebec rule on things, they want the federal government to rule on it instead, they had better re-evaluate their entire mandate as separatists. What they want is to come away from the federal government and take control but when they have it, they are saying they want the federal government to take it back. They should clarify why they are really here in the first place.

With regard to the variety of motions in Group No. 2 dealing with information and the process of advertising that information, I talked with the Bloc members on this in committee where it had been brought up by them. I did not support them at the committee level because while they had a good concept, it went too far. It was far too onerous.

I said that they should come down with something simple. They were telling me they wanted better notification for changes in services or deletion of services particularly in northern areas where there may not be good information dissemination. I said I could support that if they could word it in such a way that they did not get into all those other areas. That is still a great concept, to have a better type of advertisement in some of the more remote and hard to reach areas. However instead of simplifying their motion, if anything, they have made it more complex.

The parliamentary secretary correctly pointed out that if a general change were made in the fee structure, which obviously will happen from time to time—God knows I would love it if I were still paying the same for food, a haircut or gasoline that I paid in 1970 but that is not the case. And it is not going to happen with Nav Canada neither. From time to time its fees are going to change. The way it reads for most of the motions is that every time Nav Canada changes its fee structure, as it will do, it must advertise in every newspaper in this country. That is so onerous and makes it absolutely impossible.

It seems ironic that the government, correctly though it may have been, speaking against better dissemination of information mainly because it was too onerous should turn around in another area and try to promote the dissemination of information that probably should not be going out.

At committee we dealt with a motion by Reform which actually added to the bill a requirement that Nav Canada meet the same parameters of the Privacy Act as was done when it was a government organization. It follows exactly the same format the government used for the official languages bill. In fact, it was a subclause to that same section of the bill. This is not something which the privacy commissioner, who has the responsibility for this, spoke against. In fact, he came to committee to see if we would please put it in. Nav Canada did not have any objection and was basically going to do this anyway.

• (1725)

It put in an assurance to the users that it was going to be taken care of and it passed. Reform, who put it in, voted for it. The Bloc, who had a similar amendment, voted for it as did some Liberals.

As the parliamentary secretary is fond of saying, a committee is master of its own destiny. If we ignore what the committee does and overrule it by Liberals only, then why bother even having the committee? If the Liberals are going to pass only the things they like and overrule things that get passed in spite of them, then why do we bother having these committees in the first place? The government might as well write out its four year agenda, pass it and that is the end of it.

I am very shocked and disappointed to see the Liberals trying to take out a clause that their own Liberal dominated committee passed. It is astounding.

Reform will not be supporting the motions brought forward by the Bloc in Group No. 2. The only area we support are some technical motions that are going to be discussed later in Group No. 3 brought forward by the Liberal Party. We do not have a problem with that. Because of what I would have to say is a rather deceitful motion by the government, we will probably also support the Bloc motion to try to put it back in, even though it is by a somewhat convoluted method.

It is a good bill. It is unfortunate that we get into these debates on various types of changes, some of which are political. The bill has been drawn up out of eight possibilities that were looked at early on which were quickly narrowed down to two and soon focused in on one. The users, the employees, the service providers are all working together to provide a not for profit organization so that somebody is not going to try to get rich from this.

Could the bill have been better? I doubt there is a bill that is ever passed that could not perhaps be slightly better. Maybe we will find some improvements to make on it as we watch it unfold. We may find there are some corrections we could make.

On the whole it has the support of the industry, albeit some people are a little nervous because it is new and change is always a little scary for a lot of people. It has the support of the users. It has the support of the people who work in the industry. It will have the support of the Reform Party as well.

Mr. Keyes: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. To assist the chair, if we have completed debate on this group, maybe we could call for the question and move on to the next group.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I am sure the hon. parliamentary secretary is being very co-operative but unless I am

Private Members' Business

mistaken I think there are members from other parties who still want to speak to these motions in Group No. 2.

My hesitation was more on the basis of the clock. I do not know of too many members who would seek the floor to speak for 30 seconds or one minute. However, that is not a subject of concern to any of us any more.

It being 5.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-243, an act to amend the Canada Elections Act (reimbursement of election expenses), as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.) moved that Bill C-243, an act to amend the Canada Elections Act (reimbursement of election expenses), as amended, be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. McClelland: moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I thank members in the House and in particular in the committee that dealt with the bill for their assistance. I also thank the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada and Elections Canada for their assistance in putting the bill together.

The idea behind the bill was that election expenses, money paid by the government, by the taxpayers of Canada, to registered political parties is done so for good reason. There are some who say there should be none paid and there are others who say it should be paid differently. Today the country reimburses political parties and candidates a certain amount of the expenses they incur in their political activities.

In the case of individuals running for political office federally there must be a hurdle to be met. That hurdle is that in addition to whatever else one does one must get 15 per cent of the total votes cast in one's constituency in order to qualify for reimbursement of election expenses, which amounts to 22.5 per cent of whatever qualifies.

The case with registered political parties federally was that all that was required was that a minimum threshold be met in

spending. It seemed reasonable that if members had to receive a minimum amount of popular support in their constituencies, registered political parties should also receive some popular support.

When the bill was examined in committee the question was raised of what the threshold should be. There were those among us who said the threshold should be fairly high and there were those who said it should be fairly low.

The compromise of a 5 per cent threshold of a political party's having to garner either 2 per cent of the votes nationally or 5 per cent of the votes in the constituencies in which a political party fielded candidates was a compromise between those who wanted a lower number, say 2 per cent, and those who wanted a higher number, say 8 per cent or 9 per cent.

In committee we determined that 5 per cent was a compromise and that is how we arrived at 2 per cent of the total votes cast nationally or 5 per cent of the votes in the constituencies in which a political party ran candidates.

I want very much to thank all of the members who participated in committee who helped give consideration to the bill. It does not have a particularly large effect in the scheme of things on the pocket book of the nation, although it is over \$1 million we are talking about, and that is not small change in anybody's lexicon.

• (1735)

Most important, it brings into the body politic the necessity to be accountable for what we do as citizens and how we spend the nation's treasury.

I welcome the debate that will follow and I thank everyone for their participation and consideration of the bill. I thank Elections Canada and affirm to everyone in the Chamber today this measure fits exactly with the report of the Chief Electoral Officer submitted to Parliament in February.

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak to Bill C-243, sponsored by the member for Edmonton Southwest.

Bill C-243 is a short bill which proposes amendments to only one subsection of the Canada Elections Act. However, it touches on the important issue of financial controls for the electoral process. I believe this is fundamental to representative democracy.

We on this side of the House support Bill C-243. We do so for three main reasons. Bill C-243 would promote both fiscal restraint and fairness in the electoral system. With respect to fiscal restraint there is a need to ensure that the scarce tax dollars are not directed to electoral activities that receive marginal or trivial voter support. With respect to fairness, there is a need to ensure the system for financing electoral campaigns does not unduly restrict the electoral choices of Canadians.

Private Members' Business

The bill, we believe, represents a good balance between these often conflicting goals. Let me explain this balance in greater detail.

A registered political party is required to field candidates in at least 50 electoral districts in order to obtain and maintain its registration. Section 322(1) of the Canada Elections Act sets out the conditions that allow registered political parties to receive 22.5 per cent reimbursement of eligible electoral expenses. In order to claim reimbursement a registered political party must spend more than 10 per cent of its election expenses limit as determined under section 39(1) of the act.

Registered political parties become entitled to the reimbursement no matter how few or how many votes they receive. This reimbursement is tied in part to the political party's ability to spend.

There has been criticism of this reimbursement regime. It follows no logical except perhaps to reward the ability to spend, which no electoral system should encourage.

We are familiar with the abuses of the last general election. We noted in the House in May last year the platform of certain political parties whose ideas did not seem to follow the national debate; the Rhinoceros Party and the Yogic Flyers are two that come to mind. Many Canadians perceived their campaigns perhaps as a humorous interlude in the midst of a very serious electoral event. Others were not amused.

We also noted at that time that although most of these registered organizations received marginal public support, less than 1 per cent of the total votes cast, Canadian taxpayers, as my hon. colleague has already pointed out, were required to spend in excess of \$1 million in eligible reimbursements. That did not sit well with many Canadians. Questions were asked and Canadians wanted to know why their government handed over such sums to subsidize organizations whose objective did not appear to be one of a political party.

I am not saying these organizations should not exist or that they should not have the right to speak out or to field candidates in any electoral event. That is their right. That is any Canadian's right.

• (1740)

Rather, this debate focuses on the need to apply some fiscal restraint. Moreover, this restraint should be applied in a logical and fair manner.

We believe and agree with our hon. colleague that Bill C-243 would drop the current requirement that a political party spend at least 10 per cent of its allowable election expenses to be eligible for reimbursement. That makes sense.

The basis for reimbursement should not be a political party's ability to spend. Instead, eligibility for reimbursement would be

limited to registered political parties which receive either 2 per cent or more of the number of valid votes cast at the election or 5 per cent of the number of valid votes cast in the electoral districts in which the registered party endorsed a candidate. In other words, reimbursement would be voter based. Political parties would be rewarded for their efforts in convincing the electorate of the validity of their principles and their overall platform. That makes sense. The bill also ensures the deck is not stacked against the establishment of new national or regionally based parties.

The royal commission on electoral reform and party financing noted Canadians wanted a broader choice in the selection of their electoral representatives. The bill is in keeping with that viewpoint. In doing so it also supports the fundamental charter right of freedom of expression.

The bill in our opinion is also in keeping with the red book commitments of electoral financing. That is the second reason we as Liberals rise in support of the bill. The red book noted the need to limit the role of special interest groups in campaigns, the need to impose tougher spending limits and the need to close certain loopholes in election spending. Bill C-243 makes an important contribution toward these objectives.

The third and final reason for our support concerns the comprehensive manner in which the bill was developed. The Canada Elections Act is a complex piece of legislation. In general its provisions must not be considered independently from one another. Piecemeal amendments to the act are usually discouraged. However, in this case we can all point to the in depth review conducted by the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs last fall.

The original proposal of the hon. member for Edmonton Southwest was amended, with his concurrence and support, to take into account the concerns of all committee members. There was a consensus that the bill, as amended, was worthwhile and would not impact inadvertently on the other provisions of the act. It shows what can be accomplished when members work together.

The government's support of the bill today is tangible proof of its belief in the importance and the relevance of private members' bills.

[*Translation*]

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am a bit out of breath, having rushed here from a meeting of the national security committee, where we would have greatly appreciated the presence of the hon. member for Scarborough West. Oh well, maybe next time.

I took part in the examination of the bill known during the first session of this Parliament as C-319, and now with reprinting and Motion No. 1 it has become Bill C-243. As the hon. member for Fundy—Royal has said, this is a compromise, reached after many

Private Members' Business

efforts on all sides by all of the parties represented on the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

I would like to commend the hon. member for Edmonton Southwest, if I may, for all the energy he has devoted to this entire process, first of all, in having managed to get his bill into the works, then in having defended it before the Sub-committee on Private Members' Business, and then in having defended it brilliantly before the procedure and House affairs committee.

My congratulations, not just to the hon. member for Edmonton Southwest, but also to the colleagues who contributed to this compromise: the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands, of course, who chaired the committee, the hon. member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie, who shared his experience with us, and the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, who, as usual, helped us draw up a better bill.

• (1745)

As has been mentioned, but I will take the liberty of repeating it, we focused on one thing: avoiding having public funds, the public purse, used to support marginal groups, which, through sometimes contorted interpretations of the law, manage to register as political parties and, by spending an amount of money, manage to recover certain amounts.

The aim was simply to eliminate the flakey. In no way did we question the political programs or options of any party. That was far from our intention. We set minimum criteria that enable parties with some popular support to develop in a democracy. It was certainly not our idea to limit access to Parliament, in practical terms, to existing parties or to parties that had existed in the past.

The criterion we chose was that a party, to obtain reimbursement from the public purse, had to have 2 per cent of national votes or 5 per cent of votes in ridings where they ran a candidate. With the elections act requiring a party to have at least 50 candidates in order to register, we felt this standard was high enough to eliminate the completely flakey organizations while allowing the development of political parties that failed to gather 30 or 35 per cent of votes in an initial election.

It is a tricky balance to strike, but it was feasible with everyone's patience and co-operation. Credit here must be given to the member for Edmonton Southwest for endlessly contributing, with constructive suggestions, to the improvement of the bill and successfully creating a consensus on the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

Of course we have to come back to the funding of political parties by looking at other aspects of the question. This does not end the debate. An important point has been reached, however, and unanimously I assume. But, we must not stop here. One day we

have to deal with the funding of political parties. In this case, we are only dealing with reimbursement. But how are parties funded?

We had proposed in a motion which was voted down by this House by only a few votes—members of both opposition parties had overwhelmingly voted in favour of it—that contributions to political party election funds at the federal level be subject to the same rules as in Quebec. Contributions to political parties registered in Quebec can only be made by individual voters and cannot exceed \$3,000 per party, a reasonable limit in a free and democratic country.

This House came very close to passing such a measure and having a bill to this effect. If I remember right, motion M-150 moved by the member for Richelieu dealt with this issue. We will have to resurrect it some day because Canadians have the right to know who is funding political parties in this country.

The rule is simple: "Tell me who is funding you and I will tell you whom you are serving". The Bloc Quebecois has nothing to hide, we are entirely funded by our own members. We went way beyond the Canada Elections Act by choosing to accept contributions only from our members who could vote and by limiting contributions to \$5,000. I must say that this maximum is rarely reached, contributions are often more modest.

As most Canadians know, in Quebec, we raise money for our party through all kinds of events, giving us the opportunity to have a good time while holding more in-depth political debates, and ensuring grassroots funding. By using this form of funding, the Bloc Quebecois makes sure it is its own creature.

• (1750)

We are only accountable to those who elected us. If a contributor were to insist too much, it would be easy to say: "Listen, I will write you a cheque—in this case it would be an Air Canada passenger coupon more than a cheque—I will write you a cheque, here is your refund". But there are no such situations.

If I had received \$50,000 or \$60,000 from the Royal Bank, I could perhaps write the first cheque, but as things stand, I am not sure my bank or *caisse populaire* would honour it. I would have a hard time paying it back.

That is the problem they have on the other side. I hope the problem has not yet reached the Reform Party, because they seem unable to define their position on this.

Our friends on the other side have a problem: they get their funds from large corporations, big business, and they are first and foremost accountable to those who provide those funds. Tell me who pays your way, I will tell you who you serve.

Of course, the president of a large corporation who contributed to an election fund to the tune of a five or six-figure amount will

probably get some private telephone numbers or cellular phone numbers that will give him access to influential people.

In our party, it is very easy, our numbers are in the phone book. All voters are welcome, whatever their political colours, blue, red, multicolored or any other colour you want. Reformers are a bit on the green side, I would say, but they are welcome too. When we are elected, we are, as yourselves, here to represent everyone. We are here to serve not only Bloc party members, but also Liberals, former Conservatives and NDP members who need our support.

In conclusion, it is with this in mind that I send this message, so we can debate the financing of political parties in the near future. This would be a major reform, one of the great reforms of Canadian parliamentary process, as it was in Quebec.

If we had to choose the most important piece of legislation in Quebec in the past 50 years, the first prize would go to the political party financing legislation, which only allows persons qualified to vote, ordinary citizens, to finance political parties, not unions, corporations or body corporates. This measure has revolutionized parliamentary customs.

And if we were to adopt it here, of course, it is more difficult to build up campaign funds with \$20, \$50 or \$100 here and there, although tax provisions allow for a generous refund of up to 75 per cent on the first hundred dollars, which may help sometimes.

So, it is not so difficult, but we have to take the trouble to do it. Of course, it is always easier to make a phone call and receive a big cheque, but we stay in touch with the grassroots when we go from town to town in our ridings, to see our constituents and ask them for a contribution to a fund raising campaign. They are able to give us the message, to tell us what they want us to do in the House of Commons and which issues they want us to deal with first. This is a wonderful way for us to keep in mind we are accountable first and foremost to those who have given us, for a limited time, the seats we are sitting in so that we can rise from time to time and make some interventions such as this one, which is coming to an end.

[English]

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in reference to the comments of the member for Bellechasse, in my case and I hope in the case of every other member of this House, we are here to serve our constituents no matter what their political stripes may be. Whether they are NDP, Bloc, Liberal, Conservative or Reform, I feel it is my obligation to serve my constituents to the best of my ability. I am sure other members of the House feel likewise.

I want to be on record as saying that given my druthers I would advocate doing away with all taxpayer financial support to political election campaigns. I would put the onus on political parties or

Private Members' Business

individual politicians to convince their constituents that their political viewpoints or the capability of a specific candidate are such that citizens would be willing to provide financial backing to put forward those views or to support that candidate.

Because this view does not now seem to be accepted by the current Canadian political establishment and because it is a step in the right direction, I am pleased to address at third reading Bill C-243 which will amend the Canada Elections Act and clamp down on federal election refunds to fringe parties.

• (1755)

In 1974, section 322 of the Canada Elections Act was adopted, establishing an expense related system that allowed any registered party to receive a 22.5 per cent refund if it spent at least 10 per cent of its eligible expenses on its election campaign. At the same time, the new law imposed election campaign spending limits on parties and qualified candidates who received at least 15 per cent of the votes in their electoral district to receive a 50 per cent rebate on their actual campaign expenses.

These reforms were important because they enabled greater public scrutiny and assisted in restoring public confidence in the political and electoral system.

At that time, the face of the Canadian multi-party system was quite different than it is today. Those legislators did not foresee the emergence of multiple fringe parties that have very limited public support, but because of the money they spend during their campaign have under current regulations become eligible for a taxpayer subsidy.

Last fall, as a new member of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, I took part in the study of Bill C-319 which has been reintroduced in the new session of Parliament as Bill C-243. During that study, modifications were adopted to ensure that this amendment to the Canada Elections Act will not impede the democratic process nor the ability of concerned citizens to organize and put forward candidates to run on any set platform.

The goal of the amendment is to eliminate federal subsidies to fringe groups that have little or no significant degree of public support. Not only a matter of principle, it is in the interest of effecting greater fiscal responsibility for the taxpayer.

I wish to reaffirm that Reform remains committed to the elimination of all political subsidies. Our party, on forming a government, will eliminate those political subsidies in keeping with our commitment to party policies and principles born through consultation with Canadians.

For more than 20 years now, Canadian taxpayers have paid large election expense reimbursements and tax credits, thus directly

Private Members' Business

supporting election campaigns and indirectly topping up political war chests between election periods.

Canadian taxpayers object to being forced to finance and thus support political parties they do not wish to support. This is particularly true at a time when it is increasingly obvious that political parties are able to raise the money required to run campaigns.

Would they still be able to raise these funds, particularly the fringe parties, if there were no political contribution income tax deduction available? After the 1993 election, candidates eligible for the Elections Canada reimbursement held an average surplus of \$1,518 in their accounts, without the federal subsidy.

Again, in 1993 the top five political parties reported a total income of \$63 million in campaign contributions but only actually spent \$31 million on the campaign. From these figures, it is evident that the taxpayer could easily have been spared more than \$7 million in reimbursements to the top five parties.

Further, knowing a 22.5 per cent reward will be paid based solely on their election expenses, there is little incentive for registered parties to be fiscally responsible in their campaign spending.

Initially, the purpose of the national campaign refund was to ensure national or regional parties were kept alive and well between elections. With new fund raising techniques, these seed funds are no longer necessary. Current statistics indicate all parties could well function without them. The grants are simply not required to obtain voter support.

While it is undoubtedly difficult for political parties to give up what has become a crutch, if the voter support is there the money will follow. Campaigns can be run with less glitz and still be effective.

Clearly, the total elimination of election reimbursements would prove to be the most effective means to level the election playing field. Moving back to the issue at hand, the official registration of an organized political party gives it the right to issue tax receipts for donations and affords that privilege at rates well in excess of those granted to charitable organizations. I think it is unconscionable that contributions to a political party should exceed those given to an organization that is in direct support of people who need that help.

The participation of fringe parties during the last two federal elections has prompted a growing public concern that some groups have used election campaigns as springboards for causes or issues that are largely dismissed by the general population as irrelevant to the political debate.

• (1800)

In proposing the bill, the member for Edmonton Southwest is attempting to gain the consensus of the House in agreeing to take

one small step toward an important electoral reform, a reform which will not deny the ability of individuals to form new parties and run candidates in even a relatively small number of ridings but will put an end to one of the identified flagrant abuses of the public purse.

The bill will amend section 322 of the Canada Elections Act by imposing a minimum level of voter support as a condition to receive a refund for election expenses. This will be achieved by eliminating election refunds for registered regional parties which fail to receive at least 5 per cent of the valid votes in the electoral districts in which they run candidates, or authorizing refunds only for registered national parties which receive a minimum of 2 per cent of the total number of valid votes cast in that election. All reimbursement requirements will remain the same.

The bill is of importance to all Canadians and of interest to parties of all political stripes. It will save taxpayers an unnecessary expense. Had it been law in the last general election, about \$1 million in election refunds would have been saved. It will not adversely effect regional parties geared to expressing the concerns and representing the interests of that region. It will allow a smaller faction to form a party, field candidates and promote a platform specific to that constituency.

Politicians of all stripes must have the courage to lead by example. This bill represents only a small step in the right direction, but it is an important step because it is clear there is substantial support for the concept of eliminating election subsidies to political fringe groups.

It is my hope, and I have been given reassurance, that the House will today give unanimous support to this important private member's initiative. I am pleased to congratulate hon. members on their sensible reaction to it.

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

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.) moved that Bill C-205, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Copyright Act (profit from authorship respecting a crime), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I ask you and all listening to imagine a country in which serial killers, child rapists, murderers and violent criminals can, from their jail cells, write stories of their crimes, sell the books to the citizens of the country within which they wreaked such havoc and bank the money anywhere in the world.

Imagine a country in which these same heinous criminals can collaborate with movie producers, sell the stories of their crimes, be technical advisors to the creation of movies of their infamous activities and bank their ill gotten profits anywhere in the world.

Private Members' Business

Many Canadians would be shocked to know that country is Canada. This is despite the fact that the common law of the country has held for centuries that a criminal may not profit from his or her crime. That is why a person who murders their spouse cannot collect the victim's life insurance even as the named beneficiary.

• (1805)

Should the murderer write a book about their crime, about how they plotted to kill their spouse in order to get the insurance proceeds, and thereby make a profit from the sale of that book, surely that is as much profiting from the crime as collecting the insurance. Yet there is no prohibition of this in Canadian law.

A few might argue these miscreants have a right under our charter to sell their stories in whatever form and pocket the profits. The vast majority of Canadians, I included, do not share this view.

How can we prevent such a perversion of the most fundamental principles of crime and punishment, indeed of justice? My private member's Bill C-205 is an attempt to insure that no criminal may profit from writing about or selling the story of their sordid activities.

The idea for the bill was born in the summer of 1993 when I read a news report that Karla Homolka was reported to be considering selling her story for a profit. There may be some who do not remember the name Karla Homolka. Let it simply be said she pleaded guilty to manslaughter in the murder of two young girls in southern Ontario, together with her spouse who was charged with first degree murder, Paul Bernardo, who was subsequently convicted.

In July 1993 I read a newspaper article. I quote two paragraphs from it. I am sure most Canadians would not believe what they were reading. The title of the article is "Teale Free to Profit on Story". The House may remember that Bernardo and his wife changed their name to Teale at one point: "Karla Teale is free to get rich by selling the story of her guilt in the sex slayings of two teenaged girls, federal legal experts say. Officials in both the justice ministry and corrections Canada said yesterday there is no law barring Teale from selling her tale to the U.S. media networks or to book publishers". That is a shock to most Canadians.

At the time there was a publication ban on the case because Bernardo had not yet been brought to trial. That publication ban is now over. We know all the sordid details of the case. Yet she is by the admission of the justice department and by the admission of corrections Canada free to pander her story to whomever will buy it, to take that money, put it in the bank and use it for her own purposes, whatever they may be. There has to be something wrong with a country and with a system of justice that would allow that. That simply does not make sense.

How do we do something about it? Let us ask a rhetorical question. If Karla Homolka is free to write a book or to sell her story and collaborate on a screenplay, free to open up a Swiss bank account, free to make whatever deals she wishes to make with whatever producer is wanting to make some money from her story, then why not Paul Bernardo? Why not Clifford Olson or Denis Lortie or any of the other heinous criminals we can think of, including the torturer murderers of Toronto shoe shine boy Emmanuel Jacques, which shocked my community a few years back?

In the summer of 1993 when I read this article I could not believe it. Being a lawyer, the first thing I did was realize I must never believe what is in the media without checking it. I looked in the Criminal Code. Sure enough, there is no prohibition in the Criminal Code. There is no prohibition anywhere for criminals selling their stories. That was then.

• (1810)

Since then Ontario has passed a bill to prevent this kind of thing. However, this is an extremely piecemeal approach, which I will talk about later, because what we are basically saying is that if a criminal happens to be housed for a period of time in Ontario they cannot do something, but the minute they are housed in another institution in another province they can do it.

The Criminal Code applies all across Canada. We are not the United States with 50 separate Criminal Codes. Canada has only one Criminal Code. Surely we should be able to tell criminals they must not profit from telling the story of what they did. If they want to clear their conscience by writing about it, fine. This bill does not prevent anybody from telling their story or writing a book about their story, but it does try to prevent them from selling their story and making money on it.

I then consulted with colleagues of mine in the legal community in Ottawa, in particular general lawyers. I thank in particular Mr. Frank Brown. I also consulted copyright lawyers. I thank Mr. John Macera from the Copyright Bar of Ontario for helping me and working with me in formulating this bill.

I reiterate very clearly what this bill is and what it is not and on what principles it is based. It is based really on two principles. First, no criminal should ever profit from telling the story of their crimes. Second, criminals need not be prevented from telling their stories provided they do not profit from the telling.

This bill is a nutshell bill as it has only three sections. It is very simple. It includes in the Criminal Code definition of proceeds of crime any profit or benefit gained by a person or his family from the creation of a work based on the indictable offence for which the person was convicted.

Private Members' Business

Thus we would be able to seize such profits under the current Criminal Code provisions dealing with proceeds of crime. This is clearly criminal law jurisdiction under our Constitution.

I underscore there is no difference in my view, as I said earlier, with a criminal killing their spouse and then trying to collect the proceeds of the insurance. The insurance has nothing to do with the crime. The insurance is a private contract made under provincial laws between the insured and the insurance company. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the actual crime. The insurance policy may have been taken out 10 or 15 years earlier when the couple were on their honeymoon perhaps. Therefore there is no direct relationship between the insurance policy and the proceeds of the insurance policy and the crime.

However, it is obvious no civilized society can convict someone for the murder of their spouse, put them in jail and then force an insurance company to pay a million dollar policy to the person who killed his spouse. Even though the insurance policy is not directly related to the actual murder, common law has always stated one cannot profit from one's crime.

The same analysis can be made to either writing a book or selling one's story. Obviously it is not directly related to the crime because it clearly must occur after the crime. The crime has to be committed first, otherwise there is nothing to write a book about or sell the story. However, it is just as related in terms of the principle of profiting from one's crime as an insurance policy is.

It does not make any sense to permit Paul Bernardo to sell a screenplay of what he did to some American producer and then have that money banked in Switzerland and used for whatever purposes he wants. There has to be a way of dealing with this. For reasons I will expand on in a moment, this bill will enable us to deal with virtually the entire civilized world and not just Canada.

• (1815)

The Criminal Code provision would be changed to include in the definition of proceeds of crime a work created by someone who has committed a crime. This alone would not help us if the story or book were sold outside Canada. It would only help us inside Canada. I will take members through the sentencing procedures in a moment.

We still want to be able to go extraterritorially to prevent a Bernardo or Olson from making a deal outside Canada and banking the money outside Canada. How can that be achieved? We could look to the Copyright Act, which again is federal jurisdiction. There can be no question or debate about that.

The bill amends the Copyright Act to provide, first, that the sentence for an indictable offence is deemed to include an order that any work based on the offence is subject to a new section in

the Copyright Act, which is in Bill C-205 and, second, to provide in the new section that in such a work the copyright that would otherwise belong to the convicted person becomes and remains the property of the crown forever.

This would permit Canada to bring legal action in any country that is a signatory to the Berne convention on copyright to enforce its rights of copyright, including seizure of funds paid to the criminal or injunctions to halt the sale of books, movies, videos, et cetera.

In three little sections of a bill criminals would be prevented from profiting from their crimes and would vest the copyright of any such story in the Government of Canada which could then enforce its rights to prevent the sale in any country to which the Berne convention applies, which is approximately 180 countries.

Let me use someone like Paul Bernardo as an example. What would happen if this bill was in place? In addition to being sentenced to life in prison, on conviction there would be a new section in the Criminal Code which would automatically deem as part of his sentence "an order that the convicted person and any work related to the offence be subject to section 12.1 of the Copyright Act".

Section 12.1 of the Copyright Act, which is also part of this bill, provides that any work which is principally based on an offence or the circumstances of its commission—the copyright of that work which would otherwise belong to the offender—would belong to Canada and would never revert to the offender. The work is a very technical legal question defined in the Copyright Act.

If Mr. Bernardo wrote a book or screen play or collaborated on a book or a screen play and was paid for so doing, he would be unable to earn any money. He would have no copyright to sell because the only copyright available is in the Government of Canada which, of course, would seize the funds. That is how the bill would work.

I want to stress how important it is that this be done on a national level. It is ludicrous to suggest that this be done on a patchwork or provincial basis. Ten different laws would be required. Even if there were 12 different laws, one for each province and a law for each of the territories, that were all identical and covered the prisoner in Canada, it would not stop the prisoner from selling the story anywhere else in the world, including the United States, and putting the money in a Swiss bank account to use for any purpose.

• (1820)

It is not an answer, with great respect, to say it should be done by the provinces. That is patchwork at best. If nothing else, it guarantees that the story would be sold in the United States, West Germany, Great Britain or wherever there is someone who is

Private Members' Business

prepared to pay for the story in order to make money from it. We all know that there have been some pretty gruesome movies made.

The bill would not stop criminals from writing a story and asking that the crown send the profits to the victims. It would not stop criminals from writing a story simply to purge their conscience. The bill asks only one thing and that is to ensure criminals do not receive money for telling their story.

I would like to advise the House that the bill has the endorsement of the following organizations: the Canadian Police Association, the Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime, Families Against Crime Today Society, End Violence Against Children, Citizens United for Safety and Justice, Victims for Justice, Emotional Support for Victims of Violence and their Family, Canadians Against Violence Everywhere Advocating its Termination, known as CAVEAT, Victims for Justice, and Canadians Taking Action Against Violence.

I would like to read a few quotations from some of the organizations that support the bill. I will begin with the Canadian Police Association, which stated:

The Canadian Police Association is pleased to announce its support for Mr. Tom Wappel in his efforts to prevent criminals from profiting from their crimes. Mr. Wappel's Private Member's Bill will ensure that convicted criminals will not be permitted to profit financially through writing a book or selling their story. This bill will provide much needed protection for victims of crime, and ensure that their pain and suffering is not exploited.

The Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime stated:

The Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime is pleased to announce our support for Mr. Tom Wappel's Private Member's Bill concerning the proceeds of crime. If successful, this Bill would prevent criminals from profiting from their crimes if, for example, they write a book detailing their criminal activities.

This kind of legislation has been a long time coming, and will go a long way in ensuring that crime does not pay. That principle is a longstanding value entrenched in the Canadian justice system and Canadian society.

The letter from CAVEAT reads:

We would like to thank you for this Private Member's Bill which addresses the spectre of convicted offenders who stand to profit by exploiting their crimes—

Public confidence in a just and safe society depends on societal values being reflected by the Justice System. Canadian society views violent offences, in particular, with revulsion and distaste. Criminals and their families should never be allowed to accrue rich rewards for their offences anywhere, anytime, any place.

To that I say amen.

In closing, I want to, in advance, thank any and all members and parties that choose to support this bill. I know there have been discussions, but I do not wish to presume anything. I want to remind members that we are at second reading. When this bill is voted on we will be asked to approve the principle behind the bill.

It can then go to the justice and legal affairs committee. The experts can look at it, fix whatever needs fixing and strengthen it by perhaps putting in a section directing that the money must go to the victims, for example. I am open to any reasonable proposal which would strengthen the bill and which would meet its fundamental principle, which is that no criminal should make a dime for committing a crime.

• (1825)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate on Bill C-205. The purpose of this bill, which was introduced by the hon. member for Scarborough West, is to prevent a convicted offender from benefiting from his crime by creating a work, a book or a video for example, describing part or all of the crime. This bill amends both the Criminal Code and the Copyright Act.

According to the popular saying, crime does not pay. Yet, an individual convicted of an offence could now benefit from his crime. I agree, for several reasons, with the hon. member for Scarborough West that it is unacceptable and immoral for anyone to profit from his or her crime.

First of all, profiting from one's crime in this case is no more acceptable than letting a thief keep the money it has stolen or a drug dealer keep the proceeds of his trafficking. Under this new measure, conviction for an indictable offence, that is to say a major crime, will automatically entail the forfeiture of the intellectual proceeds of crime, namely royalties on the story.

Forfeiture of the proceeds of crime is ordered by the courts as a matter of normal practice. This bill merely extends the power to seize in order to prevent a person who has committed a crime to get rich as a result. Not only would the offender be deprived of any profit gained from the creation of a work based on the offence, but so would a member of his family or a person dependent on him. Otherwise, the offender might be tempted to create a work that would benefit the members of his family.

The term "family" should be defined so as to include the father, the mother, the children, the brothers and sisters, the current spouse, and the spouse at the time the offence was committed, even in case of a divorce. However, the term "family" should exclude the victim of the criminal act, even if that person is a member of the family of the offender.

Why should the victim, even if a member of the family, not be allowed to tell what he or she went through and gain from it? Publishing a book can be a legitimate means of expressing oneself and sharing one's experience with the public.

Private Members' Business

It would be too bad to punish victims, when we are taking all sorts of steps to encourage them to speak out against crime and to testify in the courts. It could be of benefit to everyone to hear what they have been through.

Everyone remembers the Lortie affair, the corporal in the Canadian army who fired a gun within the Quebec National Assembly. His ex-wife has just put out a book about the events surrounding the slaughter committed by her then husband.

The bill before us does not apply to this situation, because Mrs. Lortie is publishing her book without the participation of her ex-husband. The French text of the bill, for once, is an improvement on the English and reveals clearly the intentions of the member for Scarborough West.

The English text would gain in clarity if the words "from him" were added after "collaboration or cooperation", in order to clearly indicate that the copyright would be confiscated only if the author of the crime either wrote or contributed to the work.

Therefore, family members would be to benefit from the work based on the offence if the author of the crime is not involved in the creation of the work. I therefore support this bill, first of all to prevent the author of a crime or the members of his family from gaining any advantage from it, but also because the proposed measure constitutes a measure of additional protection for the victims. This is an excellent measure for ensuring that victims or witnesses may testify against the author of a crime without losing anonymity.

Why do so many people not speak out? Very often, they fear publicity, fear having their names and what they experienced made public. Without the amendment proposed today, all other sections of the Criminal Code aimed at facilitating the laying of charges and testimony by victims and witnesses during a criminal trial are pointless. If the author of the crime can reveal victims' and witnesses' names, relate in detail what he did to them and how they reacted, do the victims and witnesses have any protection? They have been tricked.

• (1830)

They co-operated with the police, they testified in court. They were led to believe their anonymity was protected by hearings in camera or by a ban on publication. Then, once a conviction has been obtained, the author of the crime writes a book and reveals all. This is how they become victims a second time. We can assume the private life of victims is totally unprotected without this measure.

This bill is in keeping with provisions already made and with others under consideration, all with the aim of encouraging victims of criminal acts to identify their aggressors and helping them testify in court.

The Reform Party introduced a motion in this House on April 29 to have a Canadian declaration of victims' rights proclaimed. We held that it was a provincial matter, but that the federal government could, secondarily, legislate victims' rights under the Criminal Code. The measure proposed today is such an example. We hope it will receive the support of the House.

[English]

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak on Bill C-205. I commend the member from Scarborough for an excellent presentation of his bill.

As legislators there are often times when we find there are loopholes or something missing in our judicial system. Unfortunately it is brought to our attention by the criminal elements in our society. In the past couple of years there have been two such cases which come to mind.

Back in March of this year we were informed that in an agreement with a former warden Clifford Olson had produced a dozen videotapes in prison modestly titled "Motivational Sexual Homicide Patterns of Serial Killer Clifford Robert Olson", recorded by a willing prison staff person. The purpose of the videos was apparently to provide insight into Olson's motives for committing 11 sex murders of children in B.C. before his arrest in 1981. He also agreed to provide new information about unsolved murders.

Then Mr. Olson registered for a copyright on the series of videotapes. This I might add is usually done for material with commercial potential. The fact that Olson would receive copyright protection of these videos was appalling at the time of discovery and it remains so today.

Before the videotapes were exposed however, last fall my hon. colleague from Surrey—White Rock—South Langley received a letter from Olson who claimed to be writing a book for an American publisher. He wanted a picture of her and permission to use documents prepared by her office in his book.

In addition to the tapes and this letter, Mr. Olson registered a copyright in 1989 on a book entitled *Profile of a Serial Killer: The Clifford Olson Case*. He registered a second copyright in 1992 on a volume entitled *Inside the Mind of a Serial Killer: A Profile*. Later in August 1993 it was revealed in *Saturday Night* magazine that Mr. Olson had access to a reporter for 18 months of regular meetings, hundreds of hours of telephone conversations and active correspondence with him. He revealed that he had already made 35 cassette tapes of his autobiography.

As the House can see, Mr. Olson has produced a number of pieces of work with the potential for him to profit from them. In the case of the videotapes, they are the property of Correctional Services Canada and not Olson. He will therefore not profit, not

this time. However we have to prepare for the next time. The threat of him being able to profit from any such material always exists.

Olson has already manipulated the system for personal profit on one occasion. This was back in 1981 when the RCMP made a contract with him which allowed him to benefit financially from the deaths of the children he murdered. In 1982 the parents of Olson's victims sued Olson in civil court to have the money taken away from Olson and his family. The case was taken to the supreme court but unlike the American system, there were no laws in Canada to prevent him from profiting from these crimes. Beyond these frustrations is the fact that it has forced the families of Olson's victims to relive their tragedies again. These families feared all along that Olson would profit from the deaths of their children.

• (1835)

On March 17, 1996 I received a letter from Gary Rosenfeldt, one of the founders of Victims of Violence. He expressed fear that Olson or his lawyer might try to sell the videotapes to an American tabloid television program. It is clear that in the past couple of years he has produced enough work that has the potential to gain profit. This is why it is so important for Bill C-205 to be passed immediately into law.

This issue was once again revived in the wake of the manslaughter conviction of Karla Homolka who was sentenced to 12 years in prison for her part in the killings of teenagers Kristen French and Leslie Mahaffy. There was speculation that Homolka could be offered a television or book deal. Once again we are faced with the situation where there is no law barring Homolka from selling her story to the U.S. media networks or book publishers.

According to the mother of Leslie Mahaffy, the sensationalism began with a book called *Lethal Marriage*. Since that time there have been many articles published and the knowledge that at least three more books, a movie contract, magazine specials, TV specials and talk show offers have given Mrs. Mahaffy no comfort, only apprehension as to whether Homolka or Bernardo will collaborate in any of these productions.

Beyond these two cases we have had two others where the people have profited from their crimes. Roger Caron, a former bank robber, would not have been able to collect royalties on his Governor General's award winning book *Go-boy* which he wrote while still in prison. In the case of Lawrenca Bembenek, she would have had to forgo payment for her book *Woman on Trial* published in 1993. In this case she used the proceeds to help pay Canadian lawyers for the work they did on her case. She probably would not have written the story otherwise.

In all of these cases, Bill C-205 would deny these individuals the opportunity to profit from their crimes. This is a much needed step

Private Members' Business

in the right direction. In today's society there is a tendency to make criminals celebrities with no regard to the moral questions involved. Today we have criminals collaborating on movie deals, becoming technical advisers in the creation of their movies and simply banking the profits.

Sensationalism is at the forefront of most major news stories. The more sensational the story, the more profit there is to be made. It is bad enough when people want to profit from someone else's tragedy but the fact that the criminals themselves can profit from the crimes is outrageous. It is simply hard to believe that Canada would allow serial killers, child rapists, murderers and violent criminals to write their stories of crime and be able to bank the money anywhere in the world.

Criminal acts are now held in such heroic stature that the escalation of these horrible crimes may never be deterred. Now is the time for action and this piece of legislation is the kind of law we need. We have to send a message that crime does not pay.

My hon. colleague for Scarborough West has sought to rectify these situations in his Private Member's Bill C-205. He has attempted to ensure that no criminals will profit from writing about or selling the story of their criminal activities.

Many of the victims of crime have been pushing for this legislation for a long time. The suffering these families endure on a good day is overwhelming, but as Leslie Mahaffy's mother states: "We cannot afford not to stop the sale of violence, profit from crime, especially murder which is obscene. Murder, violence, degradation, dehumanization, pornography are currently being marketed in novels, electronic games, slasher movies, videos and this must be stopped".

All in all, this legislation will ensure that victims and their families are not further victimized by criminals. We must do more for victims of crime and ensure that their rights and freedoms are respected as well. It is only right that the proceeds from such crimes should revert to the crown in order to reimburse society for some of the costs for ensuring safety in our society. Once and for all, the victims of crime must be considered before the criminals themselves.

• (1840)

With these thoughts in mind, I intend to move an amendment in the future which will allow the victims of crime to benefit directly. This is based on a model developed in the province of Ontario. In 1994 legislation was adopted that empowered the Attorney General of Ontario to seize all proceeds earned by criminals selling their stories. Under Bill 85, all money made by criminals would be sent to the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board which would directly help the families of the victims of crime. If this is possible provincially, there is no reason it could not work federally.

Private Members' Business

Therefore, I will be working toward this amendment which will be presented to the justice committee in the weeks to come.

Once again, my congratulations to the member for Scarborough West. May this bill become law.

Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very delighted to participate in the debate on Bill C-205 which was introduced by the hon. member for Scarborough West. I commend the hon. member for all the hard work and detailed research he has done with respect to this bill, as he has done in other cases.

The bill proposes amendments to the Criminal Code and to the Copyright Act. I will take a few minutes to review and comment on the proposed amendments to the Criminal Code.

The bill amends part XII.2 of the Criminal Code so as to include in the definition of proceeds of crime, any profit, benefit or advantage gained by a person convicted of an indictable offence or by any member of his or her family from the creation of a work based on the offence. This amendment would extend to such profits, benefits and advantages the existing provisions of the Criminal Code respecting the search, seizure and restraint of proceeds of crime, as well as the provisions concerning confiscation.

The bill also provides that a sentence for an indictable offence is deemed to include an order that any work based on an offence is subject to a new section which this bill proposes to the Copyright Act. The amendment to the Copyright Act would have the effect of vesting in Her Majesty any copyright in a work that would otherwise belong to the convicted person which is based on the offence for which he or she was convicted.

I would like to state at the outset that I am extremely sympathetic to the motives which lie behind my distinguished colleague's efforts to amend the law in this area and to those who have spoken in favour of this change. The phenomenon of criminals writing or threatening to write accounts of their crimes in exchange for money or for other benefits is a relatively new thing in Canada.

The very idea that a criminal who has committed a violent act or a series of violent acts, such as in the Bernardo case, could actually benefit financially from the recounting of his or her criminal acts is extremely offensive to many. If the victims of those crimes are made to be subject to those accounts, are they not being victimized again?

It is therefore something which I believe should be addressed and I commend my colleague for attempting to do so through this bill. The real question that remains is how to achieve that goal without unduly limiting the expression of ideas in a free and democratic society.

The bill we have before us, and more particularly the amendments which my distinguished colleague proposes to the Criminal Code, contain certain fundamental difficulties. As I mentioned earlier, this bill would amend part XII.2 of the Criminal Code of Canada which deals with the proceeds of crime. It should be noted that part XII.2 of the Criminal Code contains a comprehensive and complex legal regime designed to seize, restrain and ultimately confiscate proceeds from the commission of enterprised crime offences or designated drug offences.

• (1845)

However, the moneys sought to be regulated by my colleague's bill are not derived directly or indirectly from the commission of a crime. On the contrary, they would be derived from a totally legitimate activity, writing a book or some other similarly legitimate activity. The simple act of writing a book is not in and of itself a criminal offence even if that book is a recounting of criminal activities for which the author has been convicted.

On the other hand, part XII.2 is meant to be engaged only when the proceeds are derived from the commission of a crime, which is simply not the case with the writing and publication of a book or selling the rights for a movie.

The proposed amendments to part XII.2 of the Criminal Code would subvert the purpose of this part of the code by enabling the use of the provisions of this part of the code to confiscate moneys earned from a non-criminal act. Even if one were to attempt to characterize moneys derived from the publication of a book written by a convicted person as the proceeds of crime, it would be almost impossible to justify trying to deprive moneys earned by a member of the convicted person's family who has not been convicted of anything and who has written a book about the convicted person's criminal activities.

Any regulation imposed on income earned by an individual from materials such as books, videos, movies or other activities relating to his or her criminal activities raises constitutional concerns, most notably concerns relating to the charter. Section 2(b) of the charter guarantees to all Canadians the freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression, including freedom of the press and other media communication.

It has been suggested this bill's amendment to the Criminal Code does not infringe or restrict freedom of expression. It is argued that the regulation of moneys earned from materials relating to an individual's criminal activity does not impair freedom of expression in any way. The person is always at liberty to publish accounts of his or her crimes, but any money earned from the publication would go to the government.

If this line of argument were followed, regulation of the financial exploitation of criminality would not offend section 2(b) of the charter. However, there is another approach which results in a different conclusion. This approach to the characterization of this

legislative initiative would result in the finding of a prima facie breach of section 2(b) of the charter.

The approach holds that any attempt to regulate the moneys paid to a convicted person for publishing an account of his or her crimes amounts to a content based restriction on freedom of expression. The logic behind this approach rests on the fact that the only basis for depriving an author of any financial benefit from such an account of his or her crime is the content of the publication or expression itself. Typically the courts have found that content based limitations violate section 2(b) of the charter.

This initiative may also raise constitutional division of powers concerns. I mention this because the division of legislative powers established by sections 91 and 92 of the Constitution Act, 1867 assigns responsibility over certain activities to the federal government and other activities to provincial jurisdictions. Section 91(27) gives federal Parliament the exclusive power to enact criminal laws and laws relating to criminal procedure. Sections 92(13) and 92(16) permit provincial legislatures to enact laws affecting civil rights in matters of a private nature.

• (1850)

In the *Queen v. Zelinski* a bare majority of the supreme court held that an accused person could be ordered to compensate victims of crime provided that such an order was an element of the sentencing process in criminal proceedings. This case dates back to 1978. Subsequent jurisprudence suggests the creation of a civil right of action for breach of the criminal law is very likely ultra vires of Parliament. That is, outside the jurisdiction of Parliament.

It has been suggested the laws seeking to attach money earned from publishing accounts of criminal activity do not fit comfortably within section 91(27) of the Constitution Act of 1867, within the federal powers.

Part XXI.2 of the Criminal Code already contains a legal regime designed to assist in confiscating proceeds obtained as a consequence of the commission of certain designated crimes. However, the moneys sought to be regulated here have only the most tenuous relationship to the crimes of which the individual has been convicted.

Numerous publications have made significant literary, historical, criminological, sociological and psychological contributions to society. One such book, *Go Boy* by Roger Caron, which depicts a number of bank robberies the author committed, resulted in the author's receiving the governor general's award for literacy.

The act of writing a book, producing a movie, even when based on a crime, is not criminal. The moneys earned directly from those acts are sought to be taken away from the author. Simply put, it is difficult to characterize these as fruits or proceeds of crime. Rather, the financial exploitation of crime is more accurately characterized as the regulation of contractual rights, that is, within the legislative power of the province. This has been enacted in one

Private Members' Business

province and certainly options are open for other provinces to follow the lead of Ontario.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if I understand the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice correctly, he is saying that if the federal government were to proceed with this bill, some aspects of it would be contrary to the charter.

Yet he is making the recommendation that the provinces have the authority to do this and that they would not be enacting a piece of legislation contrary to the charter of rights and freedoms. I see an inconsistency in this that is a justification for the government not to support the bill.

In other words, if Ontario's Bill 84 is constitutionally sound, I am sure a similar bill passed by the government at the federal level would be constitutionally sound as well. Therefore I do not understand the argument of my colleague across the way.

I rise in support of this bill. It would prohibit a criminal from profiting by selling, authorizing or offering the story of their crimes. I commend the member for Scarborough West for putting forward this bill.

It is unfortunate but not surprising the government he represents does not see fit to initiate a bill of this nature, one which reaffirms the rights of victims, the right not to be revictimized.

We need this bill because no criminal should ever profit from the exploitation of their crime.

• (1855)

During the heart wrenching testimony of the grandmother of murder victim Sylvain Leduc in front of the justice standing committee, we heard the horrible graphic details about that heinous crime.

We heard about Sylvain. We heard how he was taken from his home in the middle of the night, how he was tortured and beaten until he died. We learned about the sadistic mutilation of the two young women who were also held hostage during this night of terror.

We watched as the tears rolled down the cheeks of Sylvain's mother and welled up in the eyes of those in attendance as this horror story was related.

We watched the sadness and the rage surface within Sylvain's grandmother as she relived the nightmare of her grandson's brutal murder. We can only imagine the pain and suffering Sylvain's family has endured and continues to endure.

Hopefully we will never know this kind of anguish. To allow that anguish to keep festering, to allow the wound to be opened and reopened is wrong. If this bill does not pass, if we do not stop thieves, sexual offenders and murderers like those who took the life of Sylvain Leduc from receiving money for telling their story in

Private Members' Business

any form we will simply be adding to those horrendous crimes and to the suffering of those who have been victimized.

In the absence of this bill not only would victims and victims' families have to endure reading or watching the horrific events they lived, they would be watching knowing their sexual attacker or their son or daughter's killer was profiting financially. Criminals and their families should never be allowed to accrue rewards for their criminal offences anywhere, any time or any place.

How a civilized country like ours could and would allow criminals like Paul Bernardo, Karla Homolka or Clifford Olson to reap any kind of reward for their sordid activities is incomprehensible.

The bill from the member for Scarborough West will not prevent a criminal from creating a work or collaborating on a work based on their offence, which many argue is within their charter rights. However, it will prevent those convicted of an indictable offence from profiting from their offence. I am sure it will eliminate the monetary motive for proceeding in the first place.

I support CAVEAT's proposal with regard to this bill that any proceeds from the exploitation of crimes should revert to the crown for restitution to the victims of crime and to recompense society for the enormous financial costs of enforcing the law.

The media reported very accurately and graphically the murder of Sylvain Leduc and the gang torturing of his female cousins. The press also adequately portrayed the shock, rage and sadness of the family, friends and the community. However, what it failed to reveal was the less sensational part of this horror story, the part of the story regarding money. We do not hear much about the financial cost of crimes.

Unbeknownst to the Canadian public which read daily about this crime, Sylvain's single mother on welfare did not have enough money to bury her son. Although Sylvain's mother Carol applied to victims of compensation and qualified for emergency help, she was told it would be years before she receives any money.

Fortunately for her enough money was collected from families and friends to assist her. If this was not bad enough, I would like to mention the wonderful treatment Carol received from our bureaucrats.

Sylvain was killed on October 25. Three days later, October 28, Carol was called by the welfare office to tell her that since her son had died her cheque for the month of November would be reduced.

Bill C-205 is about victims. It is about the rights of victims, rights that are being denied in this country in favour of criminal

rights. I have to stop here for a moment and touch on those individuals who may oppose the bill on the basis that this kind of activity would somehow have a rehabilitative effect on the offenders, that somehow the writing of these stories, the participation in videos or movies is somehow a rehabilitative procedure. I am sure we will hear that if this bill goes before the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. I cannot help but recall those witnesses that have appeared before the standing committee on a number of bills who have cried out for greater rights for those who have been convicted and are serving time in institutions.

• (1900)

I remember reading the report of Madam Louise Arbour on the riot in the Kingston prison for women. She made an enormous effort to support the rights of the inmates who had rioted, had assaulted and had completely disregarded the rights of the guards whom they attacked and the responsibility of the authorities to maintain security and order.

The author of that report even criticized the correctional facility for not ensuring that the six inmates, after they had continued to riot for three or four days before being placed into segregation, had one hour of recreational activity during the period of rioting. It was a shock to me to read that report. It should be mandatory reading for every member of the House.

I would like to read from a letter which Sylvain's grandmother wrote to the Minister of Justice and which she read to the justice committee. If this testimony does not move all members of the House to support Bill C-205 I do not know what will. The letter reads:

The most painful thing in life is to live with the knowledge that your child lies naked and cold in a morgue—

My grandson was in the morgue for three days. I was frozen to death; I could not warm up. I was in a hot tub for three days. I couldn't stand it until I knew that he had clothes on him.

My heart is a pump that keeps blood flowing through my veins. I have a special sacred place situated below my stomach. Some people call this "Intestinal Fortitude"—I call it my soul. It is there that love, hope, hate, courage, faith, humour, anger, compassion, happiness, conscience and God dwell—The horrible murder of my grandson has made my soul very sick. At times it is numb, other days it is like Jello. It has lost its desire for living. It doesn't care much about everyday things anymore. It has lost its desire for food, sex, enjoyment, travel, books, etc. There is an emptiness there, a hole that will never be filled. My grandson left this earth with part of it—

Horror and fear live there also. Sylvain's murderers have done this to me—When all is quiet, I cannot stop my mind from imagining the pain and horror Sylvain suffered before dying. I must take sleeping medication to dull these horrible pictures—

Private Members' Business

I receive psychiatric care but I find it difficult to speak of Sylvain in the past tense. It takes so much energy to get there. I find it all so hopeless. I feel like a dead flower that's been trampled down. I feel like I have been robbed.

Once again I commend the hon. member for Scarborough West for helping to put a stop to the pain and suffering of Sylvain's family, Kristen French's family and Leslie Mahaffy's family and all the families of victims of violent crimes. I support this private member's bill, as I believe the vast majority of Canadians do.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I take notice that the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester has been in the House for

this full hour of debate. Possibly she might lead the next hour of debate on Bill C-205 when it returns to the House.

The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

It being 7.04 p.m., the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24.

(The House adjourned at 7.05 p.m.)

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. PIERRETTE RINGUETTE–MALTAIS

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. GILBERT PARENT (CHAIRMAN)

MR. DON BOUDRIA

MRS. MADELEINE DALPHOND–GUIRAL

MR. GILLES DUCEPPE

HON. ALFONSO GAGLIANO, P.C.

HON. HERB GRAY, P.C.

MR. LEN HOPKINS

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

MR. JIM SILYE

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session – Thirty-fifth Parliament

Abbott, Jim	Kootenay East	British Columbia	Ref.
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary North	Alberta	Ref.
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Ontario	Lib.
Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	Lib.
Allmand, Hon. Warren	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce	Quebec	Lib.
Althouse, Vic	Mackenzie	Saskatchewan	NDP
Anawak, Jack Iyerak	Nunatsiaq	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Transport	Victoria	British Columbia	Lib.
Arseneault, Guy H., Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Restigouche — Chaleur	New Brunswick	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau — La Lièvre	Quebec	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Don Valley North	Ontario	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	Quebec	BQ
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon — Clark's Crossing	Saskatchewan	NDP
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Baker, George S.	Gander — Grand Falls	Newfoundland	Lib.
Bakopanos, Eleni	Saint-Denis	Quebec	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Ontario	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton	Ontario	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Cochrane — Superior	Ontario	Lib.
Bélangier, Mauril	Ottawa — Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bélisle, Richard	La Prairie	Quebec	BQ
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	Quebec	BQ
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton — Gloucester	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon E.	Vegreville	Alberta	Ref.
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Beauce	Quebec	Ind.
Bernier, Maurice	Mégantic — Compton — Stanstead	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Gaspé	Quebec	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Quebec	Lib.
Bethel, Judy	Edmonton East	Alberta	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	York North	Ontario	Lib.
Bhaduria, Jag	Markham — Whitchurch — Stouffville	Ontario	Ind. Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg Transcona	Manitoba	NDP
Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Training and Youth)	Western Arctic	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Bodnar, Morris, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification	Saskatoon — Dundurn	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Ontario	Lib.
Boudria, Don	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Ontario	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Alberta	Ref.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Bridgman, Margaret	Surrey North	British Columbia	Ref.
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	Quebec	BQ
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville — Milton	Ontario	Lib.
Brown, Jan	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	Ind. Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Brushett, Dianne	Cumberland — Colchester	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Bryden, John	Hamilton — Wentworth	Ontario	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Newfoundland	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Wellington — Grey — Dufferin — Simcoe	Ontario	Lib.
Campbell, Barry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane	Quebec	BQ
Caron, André	Jonquière	Quebec	BQ
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West	Ontario	Lib.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec)	Outremont	Quebec	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Richmond	British Columbia	Lib.
Charest, Hon. Jean J.	Sherbrooke	Quebec	PC
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Alberta	Ref.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Quebec	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac	Quebec	BQ
Clancy, Mary	Halifax	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor — St. Clair	Ontario	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Don Valley East	Ontario	Lib.
Collins, Bernie	Souris — Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Nipigon	Ontario	Lib.
Cowling, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Dauphin — Swan River	Manitoba	Lib.
Crawford, Rex	Kent	Ontario	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière-du- Loup	Quebec	BQ
Culbert, Harold	Carleton — Charlotte	New Brunswick	Lib.
Cullen, Roy	Etobicoke North	Ontario	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta	British Columbia	Ref.
Dalphoné-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	Quebec	BQ
Daviault, Michel	Ahuntsic	Quebec	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	Quebec	BQ
de Jong, Simon	Regina — Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	Quebec	BQ
Deshaies, Bernard	Abitibi	Quebec	BQ
DeVillers, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Simcoe North	Ontario	Lib.
Dhaliwal, Harbance Singh	Vancouver South	British Columbia	Lib.
Dingwall, Hon. David, Minister of Health	Cape Breton — East Richmond	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	Quebec	Lib.
Discepola, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil	Quebec	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	Quebec	BQ
Duhamel, Ronald J.	St. Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau	Quebec	BQ
Duncan, John	North Island — Powell River	British Columbia	Ref.
Dupuy, Hon. Michel	Laval West	Quebec	Lib.
Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister for International Trade	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
English, John	Kitchener	Ontario	Lib.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Alberta	Ref.
Fewchuk, Ron	Selkirk — Red River	Manitoba	Lib.
Fillion, Gilbert	Chicoutimi	Quebec	BQ
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Quebec	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Ontario	Lib.
Flis, Jesse	Parkdale — High Park	Ontario	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London East	Ontario	Lib.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Burnaby	British Columbia	Ref.
Frazer, Jack	Saanich — Gulf Islands	British Columbia	Ref.
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gaffney, Beryl	Nepean	Ontario	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Saint-Léonard	Quebec	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Quebec	BQ
Gagnon, Patrick	Bonaventure — Îles-de-la- Madeleine	Quebec	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Ontario	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel, Leader of the Opposition	Roberval	Quebec	BQ
Gerrard, Hon. Jon, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification)	Portage — Interlake	Manitoba	Lib.
Gilmour, Bill	Comox — Alberni	British Columbia	Ref.
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	Quebec	BQ
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Regina — Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay West — Revelstoke	British Columbia	Ref.
Graham, Bill	Rosedale	Ontario	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada	Windsor West	Ontario	Lib.
Grey, Deborah	Beaver River	Alberta	Ref.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Grubel, Herb	Capilano — Howe Sound	British Columbia	Ref.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Orléans	Quebec	BQ
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	Ref.
Hanrahan, Hugh	Edmonton — Strathcona	Alberta	Ref.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Harper, Ed	Simcoe Centre	Ontario	Ref.
Harper, Elijah	Churchill	Manitoba	Lib.
Harper, Stephen	Calgary West	Alberta	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Harris, Dick	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Similkameen — Merritt	British Columbia	Ref.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Winnipeg St. James	Manitoba	Lib.
Hayes, Sharon	Port Moody — Coquitlam	British Columbia	Ref.
Hermanson, Elwin	Kindersley — Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Hickey, Bonnie	St. John's East	Newfoundland	Lib.
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Alberta	Ref.
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	British Columbia	Ref.
Hoeppner, Jake E.	Lisgar — Marquette	Manitoba	Ref.
Hopkins, Leonard	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Ontario	Lib.
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	New Brunswick	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity — Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Iftody, David	Provencher	Manitoba	Lib.
Irwin, Hon. Ron, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Jacob, Jean-Marc	Charlesbourg	Quebec	BQ
Jennings, Daphne	Mission — Coquitlam	British Columbia	Ref.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	Ref.
Jordan, Jim	Leeds — Grenville	Ontario	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Kerpan, Allan	Moose Jaw — Lake Centre	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Stormont — Dundas	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, David, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Kirkby, Gordon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Prince Albert — Churchill River	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin — Norfolk	Ontario	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York — Simcoe	Ontario	Lib.
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	Quebec	BQ
Landry, Jean	Lotbinière	Quebec	BQ
Langlois, François	Bellechasse	Quebec	BQ
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Ontario	Lib.
Laurin, René	Joliette	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Laurent	Beauharnois — Salaberry	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Paul	Quebec	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Quebec	BQ
LeBlanc, Francis G., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Cape Breton Highlands — Canso	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Leblanc, Nic	Longueuil	Quebec	BQ
Lee, Derek	Scarborough — Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	Quebec	BQ
Leroux, Gaston	Richmond — Wolfe	Quebec	BQ
Leroux, Jean H.	Shefford	Quebec	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lachine — Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Loney, John	Edmonton North	Alberta	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Secretary of State (Veterans)(Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island ..	Lib.
MacDonald, Ron, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	Lib.
MacLellan, Russell	Cape Breton — The Sydneys	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton	Ontario	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie	Ontario	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
Manning, Preston	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec-Est	Quebec	BQ
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister of the Environment	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca ..	British Columbia	Ref.
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Quebec	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Hull — Aylmer	Quebec	Lib.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	British Columbia	Ref.
McClelland, Ian	Edmonton Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Ontario	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Prince Edward Island ..	Lib.
McKinnon, Glen	Brandon — Souris	Manitoba	Lib.
McLaughlin, Hon. Audrey	Yukon	Yukon	NDP
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Natural Resources	Edmonton Northwest	Alberta	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Ontario	Ontario	Lib.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve ..	Quebec	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Blainville — Deux-Montagnes	Quebec	BQ
Meredith, Val	Surrey — White Rock — South Langley	British Columbia	Ref.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Newfoundland	Lib.
Milliken, Peter	Kingston and the Islands ..	Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	Ref.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood ..	Ontario	Ind. Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches — Woodbine	Ontario	Lib.
Mitchell, Andy	Parry Sound — Muskoka ..	Ontario	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Swift Current — Maple Creek — Assiniboia	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Murphy, John	Annapolis Valley — Hants ..	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Ontario	Lib.
Nunez, Osvaldo	Bourassa	Quebec	BQ
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Ontario	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence D.	Labrador	Newfoundland	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat	London — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
O'Reilly, John	Victoria — Haliburton	Ontario	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North	Manitoba	Lib.
Paradis, Denis	Brome — Missisquoi	Quebec	Lib.
Paré, Philippe	Louis-Hébert	Quebec	BQ
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Welland — St. Catharines — Thorold	Ontario	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga West	Ontario	Lib.
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Quebec	Lib.
Payne, Jean	St. John's West	Newfoundland	Lib.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Alberta	Ref.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Ontario	Lib.
Peters, Hon. Douglas, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
Peterson, Jim	Willowdale	Ontario	Lib.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Papineau — Saint-Michel	Quebec	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	Quebec	BQ
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Essex — Kent	Ontario	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Ontario	Lib.
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	Quebec	BQ
Pomerleau, Roger	Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies	Quebec	BQ
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Hillsborough	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Alberta	Ref.
Reed, Julian	Halton — Peel	Ontario	Lib.
Regan, Geoff	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Perth — Wellington — Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Rideout, George S.	Moncton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops	British Columbia	NDP
Ringma, Bob	Nanaimo — Cowichan	British Columbia	Ref.
Ringuette-Maltais, Pierrette, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Madawaska — Victoria	New Brunswick	Lib.
Robichaud, Hon. Fernand, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food, Fisheries and Oceans)	Beauséjour	New Brunswick	Lib.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and Acting Minister of Canadian Heritage	Saint-Henri — Westmount	Quebec	Lib.
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Kingsway	British Columbia	NDP
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	Quebec	BQ
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma	Ontario	Lib.
St-Laurent, Bernard	Manicouagan	Quebec	BQ
Sauvageau, Benoît	Terrebonne	Quebec	BQ
Schmidt, Werner	Okanagan Centre	British Columbia	Ref.
Scott, Andy	Fredericton — York — Sunbury	New Brunswick	Lib.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	British Columbia	Ref.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — French River	Ontario	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Ontario	Lib.
Sheridan, Georgette	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Saskatchewan	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Silye, Jim	Calgary Centre	Alberta	Ref.
Simmons, Hon. Roger	Burin — St. George's	Newfoundland	Lib.
Skoke, Roseanne	Central Nova	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Alberta	Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden	Saskatchewan	NDP
Speaker, Ray	Lethbridge	Alberta	Ref.
Speller, Bob	Haldimand — Norfolk	Ontario	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Northumberland	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of National Revenue	Brant	Ontario	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	British Columbia	Ref.
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley East	British Columbia	Ref.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Ontario	Lib.
Taylor, Len	The Battlefords — Meadow Lake	Saskatchewan	NDP
Telegdi, Andrew	Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Terrana, Anna	Vancouver East	British Columbia	Lib.
Thalheimer, Peter	Timmins — Chapleau	Ontario	Lib.
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	Ref.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Tremblay, Benoît	Rosemont	Quebec	BQ
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Témiscouata	Quebec	BQ
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Lincoln	Ontario	Lib.
Vanclief, Lyle	Prince Edward — Hastings	Ontario	Lib.
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Hubert	Quebec	BQ
Verran, Harry	South West Nova	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Eglinton — Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.
Walker, David	Winnipeg North Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough West	Ontario	Lib.
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	New Brunswick	PC
Wells, Derek	South Shore	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex — Windsor	Ontario	Lib.
White, Randy	Fraser Valley West	British Columbia	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	British Columbia	Ref.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Alberta	Ref.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Ontario	Lib.
Young, Hon. Douglas, Minister of Human Resources Development	Acadie — Bathurst	New Brunswick	Lib.
Zed, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Fundy — Royal	New Brunswick	Lib.
VACANCY	Hamilton East	Ontario	

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

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session — Thirty—fifth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALBERTA (26)		
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary North	Ref.
Benoit, Leon E.	Vegreville	Ref.
Bethel, Judy	Edmonton East	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Ref.
Brown, Jan	Calgary Southeast	Ind. Ref.
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Ref.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Ref.
Grey, Deborah	Beaver River	Ref.
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Ref.
Hanrahan, Hugh	Edmonton — Strathcona	Ref.
Harper, Stephen	Calgary West	Ref.
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Ref.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Ref.
Kilgour, David, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southeast	Lib.
Loney, John	Edmonton North	Lib.
Manning, Preston	Calgary Southwest	Ref.
McClelland, Ian	Edmonton Southwest	Ref.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Natural Resources	Edmonton Northwest	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Ref.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Ref.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Ref.
Silye, Jim	Calgary Centre	Ref.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Ref.
Speaker, Ray	Lethbridge	Ref.
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Ref.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Ref.
BRITISH COLUMBIA (32)		
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay East	Ref.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Transport	Victoria	Lib.
Bridgman, Margaret	Surrey North	Ref.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia—Pacific)	Richmond	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta	Ref.
Dhaliwal, Harbance Singh	Vancouver South	Lib.
Duncan, John	North Island — Powell River	Ref.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Burnaby	Ref.
Frazer, Jack	Saanich — Gulf Islands	Ref.
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	Lib.
Gilmour, Bill	Comox — Alberni	Ref.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay West — Revelstoke	Ref.
Grubel, Herb	Capilano — Howe Sound	Ref.
Harris, Dick	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Similkameen — Merritt	Ref.
Hayes, Sharon	Port Moody — Coquitlam	Ref.
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Jennings, Daphne	Mission — Coquitlam	Ref.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	Ref.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	Ref.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Meredith, Val	Surrey — White Rock — South Langley	Ref.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops	NDP
Ringma, Bob	Nanaimo — Cowichan	Ref.
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Kingsway	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Okanagan Centre	Ref.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	Ref.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	Ref.
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley East	Ref.
Terrana, Anna	Vancouver East	Lib.
White, Randy	Fraser Valley West	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	Ref.

MANITOBA (14)

Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg Transcona	NDP
Cowling, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Dauphin — Swan River	Lib.
Duhamel, Ronald J.	St. Boniface	Lib.
Fewchuk, Ron	Selkirk — Red River	Lib.
Gerrard, Hon. Jon, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification)	Portage — Interlake	Lib.
Harper, Elijah	Churchill	Lib.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Winnipeg St. James	Lib.
Hoepfner, Jake E.	Lisgar — Marquette	Ref.
Iftody, David	Provencher	Lib.
McKinnon, Glen	Brandon — Souris	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North	Lib.
Walker, David	Winnipeg North Centre	Lib.

NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

Arseneault, Guy H., Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Restigouche — Chaleur	Lib.
Culbert, Harold	Carleton — Charlotte	Lib.
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	Lib.
Rideout, George S.	Moncton	Lib.
Ringuette-Maltais, Pierrette, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Madawaska — Victoria	Lib.
Robichaud, Hon. Fernand, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food, Fisheries and Oceans)	Beauséjour	Lib.
Scott, Andy	Fredericton — York — Sunbury	Lib.
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	PC
Young, Hon. Douglas, Minister of Human Resources Development	Acadie — Bathurst	Lib.
Zed, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Fundy — Royal	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
NEWFOUNDLAND (7)		
Baker, George S.	Gander — Grand Falls	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Lib.
Hickey, Bonnie	St. John's East	Lib.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence D.	Labrador	Lib.
Payne, Jean	St. John's West	Lib.
Simmons, Hon. Roger	Burin — St. George's	Lib.
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (2)		
Anawak, Jack Iyerak	Nunatsiak	Lib.
Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Training and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brushett, Dianne	Cumberland — Colchester	Lib.
Clancy, Mary	Halifax	Lib.
Dingwall, Hon. David, Minister of Health	Cape Breton — East Richmond	Lib.
LeBlanc, Francis G., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Cape Breton Highlands — Canso	Lib.
MacDonald, Ron, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Dartmouth	Lib.
MacLellan, Russell	Cape Breton — The Sydneys	Lib.
Murphy, John	Annapolis Valley — Hants	Lib.
Regan, Geoff	Halifax West	Lib.
Skoke, Roseanne	Central Nova	Lib.
Verran, Harry	South West Nova	Lib.
Wells, Derek	South Shore	Lib.
ONTARIO (99)		
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Don Valley North	Lib.
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton	Lib.
Bélaïr, Réginald	Cochrane — Superior	Lib.
Bélangier, Mauril	Ottawa — Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton — Gloucester	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	York North	Lib.
Bhaduria, Jag	Markham — Whitchurch — Stouffville	Ind. Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Boudria, Don	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville — Milton	Lib.
Bryden, John	Hamilton — Wentworth	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Wellington — Grey — Dufferin — Simcoe	Lib.
Campbell, Barry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	St. Paul's	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph — Wellington	Lib.
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor — St. Clair	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Don Valley East	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Nipigon	Lib.
Crawford, Rex	Kent	Lib.
Cullen, Roy	Etobicoke North	Lib.
DeVillers, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Simcoe North	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister for International Trade	York Centre	Lib.
English, John	Kitchener	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Lib.
Flis, Jesse	Parkdale — High Park	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London East	Lib.
Gaffney, Beryl	Nepean	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Bill	Rosedale	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada	Windsor West	Lib.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Lib.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Harper, Ed	Simcoe Centre	Ref.
Hopkins, Leonard	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity — Spadina	Lib.
Irwin, Hon. Ron, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Sault Ste. Marie	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce — Grey	Lib.
Jordan, Jim	Leeds — Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Stormont — Dundas	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin — Norfolk	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York — Simcoe	Lib.
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough — Rouge River	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister of the Environment	York West	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Sudbury	Lib.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Ontario	Lib.
Milliken, Peter	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Ind. Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches — Woodbine	Lib.
Mitchell, Andy	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
O'Brien, Pat	London — Middlesex	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Victoria — Haliburton	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Welland — St. Catharines — Thorold	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga West	Lib.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Lib.
Peters, Hon. Douglas, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Scarborough East	Lib.
Peterson, Jim	Willowdale	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Lib.
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Essex — Kent	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Lib.
Reed, Julian	Halton — Peel	Lib.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Perth — Wellington — Waterloo	Lib.
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — French River	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Lib.
Speller, Bob	Haldimand — Norfolk	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Northumberland	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of National Revenue	Brant	Lib.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew	Waterloo	Lib.
Thalheimer, Peter	Timmins — Chapleau	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Lib.
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Middlesex	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Lincoln	Lib.
Vanclief, Lyle	Prince Edward — Hastings	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Eglinton — Lawrence	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough West	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex — Windsor	Lib.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Lib.
VACANCY	Hamilton East	

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)

Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Secretary of State (Veterans)(Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Lib.
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Hillsborough	Lib.

QUEBEC (75)

Allmand, Hon. Warren	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau — La Lièvre	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni	Saint-Denis	Lib.
Bélisle, Richard	La Prairie	BQ
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	BQ
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Beauce	Ind.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bernier, Maurice	Mégantic — Compton — Stanstead	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Gaspé	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Lib.
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	BQ
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane	BQ
Caron, André	Jonquière	BQ
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec)	Outremont	Lib.
Charest, Hon. Jean J.	Sherbrooke	PC
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac	BQ
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière-du-Loup	BQ
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
Daviault, Michel	Ahuntsic	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	BQ
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	BQ
Deshaies, Bernard	Abitibi	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	Lib.
Discepolo, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	BQ
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau	BQ
Dupuy, Hon. Michel	Laval West	Lib.
Fillion, Gilbert	Chicoutimi	BQ
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Saint-Léonard	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gagnon, Patrick	Bonaventure — Îles-de-la-Madeleine	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel, Leader of the Opposition	Roberval	BQ
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Orléans	BQ
Jacob, Jean-Marc	Charlesbourg	BQ
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Landry, Jean	Lotbinière	BQ
Langlois, François	Bellechasse	BQ
Laurin, René	Joliette	BQ
Lavigne, Laurent	Beauharnois — Salaberry	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Paul	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Leblanc, Nic	Longueuil	BQ
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	BQ
Leroux, Gaston	Richmond — Wolfe	BQ
Leroux, Jean H.	Shefford	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lachine — Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec-Est	BQ
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Hull — Aylmer	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Mercier, Paul	Blainville — Deux-Montagnes	BQ
Nunez, Osvaldo	Bourassa	BQ
Paradis, Denis	Brome — Missisquoi	Lib.
Paré, Philippe	Louis-Hébert	BQ
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Lib.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Papineau — Saint-Michel	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	BQ
Pomerleau, Roger	Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies	BQ
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and Acting Minister of Canadian Heritage	Saint-Henri — Westmount	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
St-Laurent, Bernard	Manicouagan	BQ
Sauvageau, Benoît	Terrebonne	BQ
Tremblay, Benoît	Rosemont	BQ
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Témiscouata	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Hubert	BQ

SASKATCHEWAN (14)

Althouse, Vic	Mackenzie	NDP
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon — Clark's Crossing	NDP
Bodnar, Morris, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification	Saskatoon — Dundurn	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Ref.
Collins, Bernie	Souris — Moose Mountain	Lib.
de Jong, Simon	Regina — Qu'Appelle	NDP
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Regina — Wascana	Lib.
Hermanson, Elwin	Kindersley — Lloydminster	Ref.
Kerpan, Allan	Moose Jaw — Lake Centre	Ref.
Kirkby, Gordon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Prince Albert — Churchill River	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Swift Current — Maple Creek — Assiniboia	Ref.
Sheridan, Georgette	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Lib.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden	NDP
Taylor, Len	The Battlefords — Meadow Lake	NDP

YUKON (1)

McLaughlin, Hon. Audrey	Yukon	NDP
-------------------------	-------	-----

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of May 15th, 1996 — 2nd Session, 35th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: Raymond Bonin

Vice-Chairmen: Claude Bachand
John Finlay

Jack Iyerak Anawak Robert Bertrand	Margaret Bridgman Maurice Dumas	John Duncan Elijah Harper	John Murphy Bernard Patry	(11)
---------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	------

Associate Members

John Bryden Marlene Cowling	Paul DeVillers Hedy Fry	Dick Harris Audrey McLaughlin	Len Taylor
--------------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------	------------

SUB-COMMITTEE ON ABORIGINAL EDUCATION

Chairman: Robert Bertrand

Claude Bachand	Raymond Bonin	Margaret Bridgman	John Murphy	(5)
----------------	---------------	-------------------	-------------	-----

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chairman: Lyle Vanelief

Vice-Chairmen: Jean-Guy Chrétien
Glen McKinnon

Mark Assad Cliff Breitzkreuz Murray Calder	Bernie Collins Wayne Easter Elwin Hermanson	Jake E. Hoepfner Jean Landry Réjean Lefebvre	Jerry Pickard Julian Reed Rose-Marie Ur	(15)
--	---	--	---	------

Associate Members

Peter Adams Vic Althouse Leon E. Benoit Morris Bodnar	David Chatters Harold Culbert John Cummins Allan Kerpan	Laurent Lavigne John Maloney Denis Paradis	John Solomon Paul Steckle Len Taylor
--	--	--	--

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chairman: Clifford Lincoln

Vice-Chairmen: Gaston Leroux
Pat O'Brien

Jim Abbott Jack Iyerak Anawak	Guy H. Arseneault Mauril Bélanger	Hugh Hanrahan Jean-Paul Marchand	Janko Perić Beth Phinney	(11)
----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------	------

Associate Members

Robert Bertrand Jan Brown John Bryden	Simon de Jong Pierre de Savoye Stan Dromisky	John English Rey D. Pagtakhan Louis Plamondon	Georgette Sheridan Monte Solberg
---	--	---	-------------------------------------

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chairman: Joe McGuire

**Vice-Chairmen: Yvan Bernier
Derek Wells**

Diane Ablonczy Gerry Byrne	René Canuel Harold Culbert	Ted McWhinney Lawrence D. O'Brien	Mike Scott Harry Verran	(11)
-------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------------	------

Associate Members

Vic Althouse John Cummins	Ron Fewchuk Fred Mifflin	Jean Payne Roger Simmons	Paul Steckle Elsie Wayne
------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chairman: Bill Graham

**Vice-Chairmen: Stéphane Bergeron
John English**

Sarkis Assadourian Colleen Beaumier Michel Dupuy	Jesse Flis David Iftody Francis G. LeBlanc	Bob Mills Lee Morrison Philippe Paré	Charlie Penson Benoît Sauvageau Bob Speller	(15)
--	--	--	---	------

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy Leon E. Benoit Jag Bhaduria Bill Blaikie David Chatters	Maud Debien Jack Frazer Beryl Gaffney John Godfrey Herb Grubel	Jean H. Leroux John Loney Ron MacDonald Gurbax Singh Malhi Keith Martin	Ted McWhinney Val Meredith Rey D. Pagtakhan Janko Perić Paddy Torsney
--	--	---	---

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Chairman: Bill Graham

David Iftody	Bob Mills	Philippe Paré	Paddy Torsney	(5)
--------------	-----------	---------------	---------------	-----

SUB-COMMITTEE ON SUSTAINABLE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: John English

Colleen Beaumier	Maud Debien	John Godfrey	(4)
------------------	-------------	--------------	-----

SUB-COMMITTEE ON TRADE DISPUTES

Chairman: Michel Dupuy

Sarkis Assadourian	Ron MacDonald	Charlie Penson	Benoît Sauvageau	(5)
--------------------	---------------	----------------	------------------	-----

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chair: Albina Guarnieri

**Vice-Chairmen: Eugène Bellemare
Gilbert Fillion**

John Bryden Paul Crête	Bill Gilmour Dick Harris	John Harvard Ovid L. Jackson	Gurbax Singh Malhi Dan McTeague	(11)
---------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------------------	------

Associate Members

Mauril Bélanger Ghislain Lebel Ian McClelland	Carolyn Parrish Janko Perić George Proud	John Solomon Randy White	Ted White John Williams
---	--	-----------------------------	----------------------------

HEALTH**Chairman: Roger Simmons****Vice-Chairs:****Beryl Gaffney
Pauline Picard**Antoine Dubé
Sharon HayesGrant Hill
John MurphyAndy Scott
Georgette SheridanPaul Szabo
Joseph Volpe

(11)

Associate MembersMargaret Bridgman
Jan Brown
Maurice DumasLaurent Lavigne
Keith Martin
Audrey McLaughlinRéal Ménard
Pat O'Brien
Bernard PatrySvend J. Robinson
Roseanne Skoke
Rose-Marie Ur**SUB-COMMITTEE ON BILL C-222 (FORMERLY C-337), AN ACT TO AMEND
THE FOOD AND DRUGS ACT (WARNING ON ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTAINERS)****Chair: Beryl Gaffney**Grant Hill
John Murphy

Pauline Picard

Andy Scott

Paul Szabo

(6)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HIV/AIDS**Chairman: Bernard Patry**Sharon Hayes
Réal MénardPat O'Brien
Svend J. RobinsonPaul Szabo
Rose-Marie Ur

Joseph Volpe

(8)

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**Chairman: Maurizio Bevilacqua****Vice-Chairs:****Jean Augustine
Francine Lalonde**Warren Allmand
Jan Brown
Paul CrêteDaphne Jennings
Dale Johnston
Larry McCormickRobert D. Nault
Pat O'Brien
George ProudGeoff Regan
Anna Terrana
Stéphan Tremblay

(15)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Chris Axworthy
Leon E. Benoit
Bonnie BrownGerry Byrne
John Cannis
Marlene Cowling
Paul DeVillersWayne Easter
Jim Gouk
Herb Grubel
Réal MénardMaria Minna
Svend J. Robinson
Andy Scott**HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE STATUS OF
PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES****Chair: Sheila Finestone****Vice-Chairmen:****Maurice Bernier
Andy Scott**Sarkis Assadourian
Jean AugustineSue Barnes
Jan BrownRussell MacLellan
John MaloneyIan McClelland
Réal Ménard

(11)

Associate MembersChris Axworthy
Robert BertrandSharon Hayes
Audrey McLaughlinPhilippe Paré
Svend J. RobinsonRoseanne Skoke
Myron Thompson

INDUSTRY**Chairman: David Walker****Vice-Chairmen: Nic Leblanc
Tony Valeri**Morris Bodnar
Pierre Brien
Bonnie BrownEd Harper
Tony Ianno
Walt LastewkaPhilip Mayfield
Réal Ménard
Ian MurrayWerner Schmidt
Alex Shepherd
Roseanne Skoke

(15)

Associate MembersPeter Adams
Pierre de Savoye
Nick Discepola
Jay HillKaren Kraft Sloan
Ghislain Lebel
Peter Milliken
Andy MitchellJohn Nunziata
Denis Paradis
Yves Rocheleau
John SolomonDarrel Stinson
Paul Szabo
Len Taylor**JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS****Chair: Shaughnessy Cohen****Vice-Chairs: Paddy Torsney
Pierrette Venne**Diane Ablonczy
Judy Bethel
Pierre de SavoyePaul DeVillers
Nick Discepola
Roger GallawayArt Hanger
Gordon Kirkby
François LangloisJohn Maloney
Jack Ramsay
Derek Wells

(15)

Associate MembersChris Axworthy
Jag Bhaduria
Garry Breitkreuz
Paul Forseth
Patrick GagnonJim Gouk
Stephen Harper
Sharon Hayes
Jay Hill
Gar KnutsonDerek Lee
Val Meredith
Bob Mills
George S. RideoutSvend J. Robinson
Bernard St-Laurent
Myron Thompson
Randy White**SUB-COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY****Chairman: Derek Lee****Vice-Chairman: George S. Rideout**

Nick Discepola

Gar Knutson

François Langlois

Val Meredith

(6)

LIAISON**Chairman: Bill Graham****Vice-Chair: Albina Guarnieri**Reg Alcock
Eleni Bakopanos
Maurizio Bevilacqua
Raymond Bonin
Charles CacciaMary Clancy
Shaughnessy Cohen
Sheila Finestone
Patrick Gagnon
Michel GuimondGhislain Lebel
Clifford Lincoln
Joe McGuire
Andy Mitchell
Jim PetersonRoger Simmons
Lyle Vanclief
David Walker
Paul Zed

(21)

Associate Member

Jack Frazer

SUB-COMMITTEE ON BUDGET**Chairman: Jim Peterson****Vice-Chairman: Paul Zed**Sheila Finestone
Jack Frazer

Bill Graham

Michel Guimond

Andy Mitchell

(7)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chairman: Michel Guimond

Vice-Chairmen: Denis Paradis
Andrew Telegdi

Sue Barnes
Pierre Brien
Rex Crawford

Ivan Grose
Leonard Hopkins

Charles Hubbard
Yves Rocheleau

Jim Silye
John Williams

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Jag Bhaduria

John Bryden
Mac Harb

Ed Harper
René Laurin

Ian McClelland
Alex Shepherd

TRANSPORT

Chairman: Reg Alcock

Vice-Chairmen: André Caron
Joe Comuzzi

Gerry Byrne
David Chatters

Joe Fontana
Jim Gouk

Charles Hubbard
Jim Jordan

Stan Keyes
Paul Mercier

(11)

Associate Members

Vic Althouse
Leon E. Benoit
Ivan Grose

Dick Harris
Jake E. Hoepfner
Ovid L. Jackson

John Maloney
Philippe Paré

Bernard Patry
Elsie Wayne

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chairman:

Vice-Chairman:

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Roch Bolduc
Philippe D. Gigantès
Maurice Riel

Peter Adams
Roger Gallaway
Jim Karygiannis
Philip Mayfield

Paul Mercier
Pat O'Brien
Roseanne Skoke

(10)

Associate Member

Ted White

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joint Chairmen: Sen. Jean-Louis Roux
Patrick Gagnon

Vice-Chairmen: Jean-Paul Marchand
Benoît Serré

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons

Gerald A. Beaudoin
Marie-P. Poulin

Jean-Claude Rivest
Louis J. Robichaud

Warren Allmand
Eugène Bellemare

Cliff Breitzkreuz
John Godfrey

(12)

Associate Members

Gaston Leroux

Bob Ringma

Jim Silye

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairmen: **Sen. P. Derek Lewis**
Ghislain Label

Vice-Chairman: **Derek Lee**

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Doris M. Anderson
Michel Cogger
Normand Grimard
William M. Kelly

Shirley Maheu
Pietro Rizzuto
Nicholas W. Taylor

Gilbert Fillion
Mac Harb
Gar Knutson

Dan McTeague
Tom Wappel
Ted White

(16)

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

A CODE OF CONDUCT

Joint Chairmen: **Sen. Donald H. Oliver**
Peter Milliken

Vice-Chairs: **Sen. Jean-Robert Gauthier**
Suzanne Tremblay

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

W. David Angus
Peter Bosa
Consiglio Di Nino
Mira Spivak
Peter Stollery

Don Boudria
Marlene Catterall
Ken Epp
Ron Fewchuk
François Langlois
René Laurin

John Loney
Rey D. Pagtakhan
Carolyn Parrish
Bob Ringma
Georgette Sheridan
Ray Speaker

(21)

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

Panels of Chairmen of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. PIERRETTE RINGUETTE-MALTAIS

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
The Hon. Herb Gray	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada
The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. David M. Collenette	Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs
The Hon. David Anderson	Minister of Transport
The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
The Hon. David Dingwall	Minister of Health
The Hon. Ron Irwin	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
The Hon. Joyce Fairbairn	Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister with special responsibility for Literacy
The Hon. Sergio Marchi	Minister of the Environment
The Hon. John Manley	Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development – Quebec
The Hon. Diane Marleau	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
The Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
The Hon. Douglas Young	Minister of Human Resources Development
The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton	Minister for International Trade
The Hon. Marcel Massé	President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure
The Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Natural Resources
The Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
The Hon. Alfonso Gagliano	Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. Lucienne Robillard	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and Acting Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. Fred Mifflin	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of National Revenue
The Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
The Hon. Pierre Pettigrew	Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie
The Hon. Fernand Robichaud	Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food, Fisheries and Oceans)
The Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Training and Youth)
The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay	Secretary of State (Veterans) (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
The Hon. Christine Stewart	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)
The Hon. Raymond Chan	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
The Hon. Jon Gerrard	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) (Western Economic Diversification)
The Hon. Douglas Peters	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
The Hon. Martin Cauchon	Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development – Quebec)
The Hon. Hedy Fry	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Rey D. Pagtakhan	to Prime Minister
Paul Zed	to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Nick Discepola	to Solicitor General of Canada
Francis G. LeBlanc	to Minister of Foreign Affairs
John Richardson	to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs
Stan Keyes	to Minister of Transport
Jerry Pickard	to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Joseph Volpe	to Minister of Health
Bernard Patry	to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Guy H. Arseneault	to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage
Karen Kraft Sloan	Minister of the Environment
Morris Bodnar	to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification
John Harvard	to Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Barry Campbell	to Minister of Finance
Robert D. Nault	to Minister of Human Resources Development
Ron MacDonald	to Minister for International Trade
Ovid L. Jackson	to President of the Treasury Board
Marlene Cowling	to Minister of Natural Resources
Gordon Kirkby	to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
George Proud	to Minister of Labour
Maria Minna	to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Ted McWhinney	to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Sue Barnes	to Minister of National Revenue
Paul DeVillers	to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
John Godfrey	to Minister for International Cooperation

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 15, 1996

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Mining Industry	
Mr. Caccia	2803
Mining Industry	
Mr. Deshaies	2803
Mothers	
Mr. Breitreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	2803
Oil Industry	
Mr. Bernier (Beauce)	2803
National Palliative Care Week	
Mrs. Terrana	2804
Sir Wilfrid Laurier	
Mr. Paradis	2804
Save the Children	
Mrs. Chamberlain	2804
Import—Export Link	
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	2804
The Late John Patton	
Mr. Richardson	2804
National Police Week	
Mr. Discepolo	2805
Science Fair	
Mr. Wood	2805
Auditor General's Report	
Mr. Guimond	2805
Canadian Human Rights Act	
Mr. Epp	2805
Director General of Elections in Quebec	
Mr. Pomerleau	2806
Deputy Premier of Quebec	
Mr. Patry	2806
Health Care	
Mr. Bellemare	2806
ORAL QUESTION PERIOD	
Referendums	
Mr. Gauthier	2806
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	2806
Mr. Gauthier	2807
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	2807
Mr. Gauthier	2807
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	2807
Mr. Bellehumeur	2807
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	2807
Mr. Bellehumeur	2807
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	2807
National Unity	
Mr. Manning	2808
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	2808
Mr. Manning	2808

Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	2808
Mr. Manning	2808
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	2808
Goods and Services Tax	
Mr. Loubier	2808
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	2808
Mr. Loubier	2808
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	2809
National Unity	
Mr. Harper (Calgary West)	2809
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	2809
Mr. Harper (Calgary West)	2809
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	2809
Coast Guard	
Mr. Bernier (Gaspé)	2809
Mr. Mifflin	2809
Mr. Bernier (Gaspé)	2809
Mr. Mifflin	2810
National Unity	
Miss Grey	2810
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	2810
Miss Grey	2810
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	2810
Persons With Disabilities	
Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	2810
Mr. Young	2810
Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	2810
Mr. Young	2811
Immigration	
Mr. Cullen	2811
Mrs. Robillard	2811
National Unity	
Mr. Solberg	2811
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	2811
Mr. Solberg	2811
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	2811
The Environment	
Mrs. Guay	2812
Mr. Marchi	2812
Mrs. Guay	2812
Mr. Marchi	2812
National Unity	
Mr. Strahl	2812
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	2812
Mr. Strahl	2812
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	2813
Beef Industry	
Mr. Culbert	2813
Mr. Goodale	2813
Air Transportation	
Mr. Crête	2813
Mr. Anderson	2813
Mr. Crête	2813
Mr. Anderson	2813

National Unity	
Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre)	2814
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	2814
Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre)	2814
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	2814
Gas Prices	
Mr. Althouse	2814
Mr. Manley	2814
Human Rights	
Mrs. Parrish	2814
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	2814
Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	2815
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS	
Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Zed	2815
Committees of the House	
Finance	
Mr. St. Denis	2815
Petitions	
Labelling of Alcoholic Beverages	
Mr. Szabo	2815
Human Rights	
Miss Grey	2815
Gasoline Taxes	
Mr. Collins	2815
Human Rights	
Mrs. Hayes	2815
Tran Trieu Quan	
Mr. Paré	2815
National Unity	
Mr. Lincoln	2816
Human Rights	
Mrs. Ablonczy	2816
Junk Mail	
Mr. Malhi	2816
Impaired Driving	
Mr. Harris	2816
Gasoline Taxes	
Mr. Breitreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	2816
Human Rights	
Mr. Breitreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	2816
Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre)	2816
Age of Consent	
Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre)	2816
Human Rights	
Mr. McClelland	2816
Question Passed as Order for Return	
Mr. Zed	2816

Motions for Papers	
Mr. Zed	2817

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Ways and Means	
Income Tax Act	
Motion for concurrence	2817
Mr. Peters	2817
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 129; Nays, 75	2818
Civil Air Navigation Services Commercialization Act	
Bill C-20. Report stage	2818
Speaker's Ruling	
The Speaker	2818
Motions in Amendment	
Mr. Crête	2819
Motions Nos. 1, 2 and 3	2819
Mr. Keyes	2820
Mr. Gouk	2822
Mr. Mercier	2822
Mr. Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	2823
Mr. Guimond	2824
Mr. Bachand	2825
Mr. Paré	2826
Mr. Deshaies	2828
Division on Motion No. 1 deferred	2830
Motions Nos. 4 through 12 and Motions Nos. 16 through 24	2830
Mr. Crête	2830
Mr. Mercier	2832
Mr. Keyes	2833
Mr. Gouk	2834

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Canada Elections Act	
Bill C-243. Report stage	2836
Motion for concurrence	2836
Mr. McClelland	2836
(Motion agreed to.)	2836
Motion for third reading	2836
Mr. Zed	2836
Mr. Langlois	2837
Mr. Frazer	2839
(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.)	2840
Criminal Code	
Bill C-205. Motion for second reading.	2840
Mr. Wappel	2840
Mrs. Picard	2843
Mr. Thompson	2844
Mr. Kirkby	2846
Mr. Ramsay	2847

Appendix

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**8801320
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canada Communication Group — Publishing

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Groupe Communication Canada — Édition

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :
<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>**

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from the Canada Communication Group — Publishing, Public Works and Government Services Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, at \$1.75 per copy or \$286 per year.

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant au Groupe Communication Canada — Édition, Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada,
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, à 1.75 \$ l'exemplaire ou 286 \$ par année.**