



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 102 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, May 8, 1998

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

All parliamentary publications are available on the
“Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire” at the following address:

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, May 8, 1998

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1005)

[*English*]

CANADA LABOUR CODE

The House resumed from May 7 consideration of Bill C-19, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and of Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 30.

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to speak to the Group No. 2 amendments to Bill C-19. First I will address one of the most important amendments which has come forward on this bill. It is proposed in the interests of maintaining democracy and protecting the rights of workers.

The Canada Labour Code states that the board may order a representational vote on union certification to satisfy itself that the workers want a union. Our amendment calls for the board to, without exception, hold a representational vote when 35% of the employees sign cards indicating they want union certification. This amendment would ensure that the wishes of the majority of workers in a workplace are upheld.

Closely related to that amendment is our Motion No. 30 which would do away with the intent of Bill C-19 to allow the CIRB to certify a union even when there is no evidence of majority support if the board believes in its wisdom that there is sufficient support to justify certification. This turns democracy and labour relations upside down.

The determination of under what conditions this certification would be allowed would be entirely in the hands of the CIRB. Bureaucrats rule. We have seen in the sovereign province of Ontario what happens when there is this type of labour legislation.

The Wal-Mart case in Windsor is an example of what would happen in federally regulated industries if Bill C-19 were to pass without amendment.

To refresh the memory of hon. members, the Ontario Labour Relations Board ruled that Wal-Mart agreed to certify the union even though the employees at the Windsor store voted 151 to 43 against it. That was in May 1997. The board contended that Wal-Mart had pressured the employees to vote against the union with threats that the store would close if it were unionized. Now the employees are fighting to get rid of their union and a decertification drive is under way. Why should they have to go through that?

That brings up another problem with Bill C-19. There is no provision in the bill for secret ballots. If there were a provision for secret ballots, both in certification and in strike votes, then there would be no problem with questions of pressure being applied to workers because nobody would know how they voted. The people of Canada who send us here have a secret ballot when choosing their representatives.

• (1010)

In the meat and potatoes issue of who is going to represent them at the bargaining table, we do not and will not extend the voting privilege by secret ballot to working people regarding whether or not they want to certify union *A*, union *B* or none of the above. Whatever happened to freedom of association in this country? This is an absurdity.

The bill has another related anti-democratic measure which was partially smoothed over in committee, but not to the extent that it is yet acceptable to the Reform Party, and that is the requirement that employers must provide union organizers during a certification drive not only with the names of their employees, which is certainly fair ball, but also with their phone numbers and addresses.

If someone was bucking union certification in their workplace would they want their phone number or their address to be made public?

We went through this sort of thing in this country about 50 years ago when the Liberal government of the day, in its wisdom, brought Hal Banks into Canada to break the seamen's union and to set up a union more to the satisfaction of the Canadian government.

It got the names and addresses of the members. There were seafarers who had their legs broken. There were even captains of

Government Orders

vessels, who were not directly involved because they did not have to belong to the union, but because they were suspect of having taken the wrong side they were beaten up. The goons knew where everybody could be found.

I know we have come a long way in the last 40 or 50 years. There is not the extent of union goonism now that there was in those days and it is not protected, aided and abetted by our federal government. Nevertheless, it still happens.

Anyone who has worked in forestry, anyone who has had anything to do particularly with the ports of this country, knows that people still have to watch their step if they do not want to get their nose smashed. That is the way it is.

We in this House should be realistic enough to appreciate that the whole world does not live in the little gilded cage that we inhabit on Parliament Hill. Things get rough out there in the real world.

We should not be setting people up to be in a position where they have to step up and say "Yes, we agree" in order to protect themselves and their families. That is nuts.

It is a privacy issue. Even the privacy commissioner, our late, lamented privacy commissioner who is no longer with us, said that this is a very clear invasion of privacy. It is anti-democratic.

Bill C-19 now has been partially ameliorated. It says that the employer does not absolutely have to provide this information because the employee can take the initiative and go to the employer and say "Please don't give them this information".

This in itself sets him up because then, in the workplace, that worker can be fingered. They can say "Hey, he did not want us to know where he lives. He did not want us to know his phone number. Why?" It is a bit of a half-step, but it does not nearly go far enough.

Those are the big problems with certification without majority support. I do not know who on earth came up with that stroke of genius.

I have carried a union card. I imagine there are other members of this House who have carried a union card. I swear to God if I had ever been confronted with a situation like that where a group of bureaucrats said "that union is going to represent you and you have no choice in the matter" I would not have been a happy camper. If we do not get rid of any other bad features of this bill, and they are legion, surely by passing Motion No. 30 we can get rid of that one.

• (1015)

The final thing I would like to mention is final selection arbitration. We have been promoting this very strongly in the debates on this bill and I will not go into the details as I am sure the House is now familiar with them.

We have a strike coming up in the very near future with the air traffic controllers. They are ready to hit the bricks at NavCan. They and NavCan management are so far apart there is absolutely no possibility of reaching an agreement without outside interference. As usual, both sides of the debate are sitting there waiting and hoping the federal government will save their bacon by passing back to work legislation when it happens; the old routine. They can snarl and growl and start the strike but the federal government will come to the rescue.

If we had final offer selection arbitration this sort of thing could not happen, would not happen. The parties could freely negotiate and at the end of the day it would be settled by arbitrators and life would go on without a lot of difficulty.

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I begin by describing some of my background because I believe it helps.

In my life before coming to parliament I worked in the forest industry for 25 years, largely in labour-management situations, the IWA being the major union, but there were other strong union areas. Port Alberni within my riding has been a strong union town for many years. The people there have been well paid. The union has served them extremely well. I can recall approximately 15 years ago when Port Alberni was in the top two and for about five years in the top five per capital income in Canada largely because of the unions.

The unions have served people particularly well. However, this legislation in my view tears some of that down. First and foremost, unions must represent their people. This bill would allow the certification of a union without that representative vote, without 50% of the people within the union saying they want to do this. If we go back to unions 50 or 60 years ago there were a lot of tactics involved.

I recall talking to some of the older people in Alberni when if they were not on the right side of the union a rake could be dragged down the side of their car or their child could come home with a bloody nose because of what dad did. Those were the old style tactics.

But this bill does not address the real issues. With the old bill, the old ways, people had to certify for a vote. The union cards had to go forward, they had to sign and say they want to certify a union. Unfortunately this new bill will bypass that situation where the labour board thinks that there may be a situation, just perception, and then we end up with a union. We end up with a union the workers may not want.

I am baffled. Whose interest is this supposed to serve? In my view unions were to serve the employees they represented. This portion of the bill would undo that because clearly, as in the Wal-Mart case, the majority of the employees did not want to be unionized.

Government Orders

I would also like to address essential services because there are a number of facets in this bill.

• (1020)

One of the issues we always get depends on how vocal the item is. We all are familiar with our local municipal strikes. The first thing that does not get picked up is the garbage.

That is a very good tactic because it is visible, it is right out front. However, if there is an issue that is not visible and not up front, it can be causing the same pain but people do not see it. There has to be some provision for an essential service, and I will go back to my home province of B.C. If the B.C. ferries go on strike for an extended period of time, that is a major disruption in people's lives, particularly on the island. There needs to be some way to address these issues.

Reform Motion No. 7 calls for the board to hold a representative vote when 35% of the employees sign cards indicating they want a union. We believe that is fair and reasonable because it upholds the majority position of the union.

On Motion No. 30, the bill would allow the CIRB to certify a union even if there is no evidence of majority support, and this is if the board believes there would have been support had it not been for unfair labour practice. This is the Wal-Mart case.

The determination of what constitutes an unfair practice is simply left up to the board. Again we have a group of people, somewhat untouchable, deciding the fate. We feel this is wrong.

In the Wal-Mart case we have talked about many times it was 151 to 43 against certifying yet the government certified.

These are a number of areas we will be talking about today. My colleagues and I will push this issue because we feel it is paramount. It indicates the pushiness of this government, the unfeeling nature where it wants to push. It is not just in labour. It is in Senate appointments, it is in the backbench Liberals being told to jump up. It is an attitude of the way people should be represented. The Reform way is distinctly different from the Liberal way.

Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to these amendments on Bill C-19.

My thrust today is going to be from an employer's perspective. There are a lot of people in this House who are concerned about the worker perspective, but what about the employer's perspective? We have heard some comments on that, sort of painting that a bit, but let us go a little further with that for a few moments.

I think a good case to illustrate the danger of some of these amendments is the Wal-Mart case we have been alluding to, but let us take that case and put it in a broader perspective.

In that case a number of employees were working to certify a union and have a union within the Wal-Mart operation. With these amendments the situation that employer finds himself in is that he is now asked by the board if he will potentially shut down the operation if a union is certified.

That employer finds himself in a very difficult situation. He consults with his own legal counsel and he is told if he says yes, there is a problem because he will be perceived to have taken a position that is intimidating the employees and therefore that position will be used to justify certifying a union even when less than the majority of the employees support doing so. So it might not be a good idea to say yes because now no matter what they vote, as long as over 35% of the people are in support of it, there will be a union. If he says yes that will be perceived to be intimidation tactics against the membership or against the employees.

• (1025)

The other option he could be advised to do would be to say he is not in support, he will not shut down the operation. If he takes that position he also runs the risk that should at some point in the future his situation change so that he cannot continue to operate without some sort of temporary closure or a long term closure, he has now opened himself up for all kinds of legal liability, lawsuits and persecution in the courts.

Therefore he cannot say yes, he cannot say no. What can he say? He can say no comment. That is what was said in the Wal-Mart scenario, "we are not going to make any comment, we are not sure what we are going to do". It would seem that would be safe ground, but the amazing thing is that the labour board took that no comment and interpreted that as a statement of intimidation.

When an employer takes the no comment position they are still perceived to be intimidating their employees. This really underlines our concerns about how this section can be misused. This is a perfect example. It is the reason why so many of us are bringing this forward to the House and to Canadians in general. We have a clear case where the employer has no room to move, no matter what position he takes.

Who is this employer really concerned about? Who is he trying to meet the needs of? We paint these employers as if somehow they have some grudge against their employees. That is certainly not the case, in particular with this operation. These are employers who are concerned about the livelihood of their employees, their families. They want to make sure there is a viable operation for years hence.

Yet we have a labour board that puts these employers in an absolutely no win situation. It is that kind of thrust that has concerned Reformers in a variety of arenas, not just this case.

Government Orders

Those who would support this kind of amendment are those people who feel government is going to solve all our problems and if we could just get more government we would solve all our problems. They put their faith in government which is a big mistake.

Here is a micro example of the theme that runs through our current state in Canada again and again of those who say "I trust the government. I trust the labour board. I trust these people to always look after our best interests". That is abdicating our responsibility.

We have been a nation founded on people taking their responsibility and acting on it. These amendments, in particular the ones that say less than the majority of employees can express their will and impose that will on the majority of the employees by not requiring a majority vote, totally usurp the history and tradition we have of Canadians taking responsibility, being able to express their own personal desires, let those desires be reflected in a vote and with the majority of support move ahead on that basis. These amendments are totally counter to that kind of thrust.

That is the basis for a very serious concern on the part of Reformers and will continue to be the concern of Reformers on this bill and any other kind of legislation that comes forward from this government. This party is representing grassroots Canadians who remember their history and who are concerned about having their country hijacked by an overzealous bureaucracy which feels it knows best without listening to grassroots Canadians. These grassroots Canadians have shaped our policies and put us here in the House of Commons. They are fighting to get their country back from an overzealous bureaucracy and the ones I have met and know are not going to give up.

• (1030)

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to engage in the debate on Bill C-19 and the amendments before us.

I listened intently to my hon. colleague. I am in agreement with a number of the comments he made in regard to the Group No. 2 amendments that we are discussing. We are discussing important amendments to an important bill.

I would like to focus first on Motion No. 6. Procedures and scheduling problems needlessly prolong board decisions. Motion No. 6 that the Bloc has put forward relates to that. The bill streamlines the Canada Industrial Relations Board's procedures by allowing it to make decisions without oral hearings.

Often a number of briefs are presented which are quite complicated and have quite a lot of information in them. At this stage it is necessary that individuals have an opportunity to follow up on those briefs, to ask questions and to further explore through an oral

hearing exactly what the information is that is being put forward. Without the opportunity to have an oral hearing and to simply rely on the written word without a chance to follow up, we do not have an opportunity to fully disclose the information available and make a good decision.

We see that in this place in our committee meetings. We receive a written brief. We go through the written brief. Witnesses come before us. We do not simply decide on the written brief. We look at all the information that is presented. Often a witness will read the brief to us and then we have an opportunity to ask the witness questions.

The same kind of situation should apply to the Canada Industrial Relations Board. It is wise to be able to follow up and ask questions on the information presented in those briefs. Without doing that, we are asking people to wade through a mountain of documents and to come to a decision without any input from the individuals who have written the information.

We need the opportunity for an oral hearing. It will help expedite some of the minor cases and will streamline the process. In the end it should save taxpayer dollars. We think that particular amendment by our colleagues in the Bloc goes too far. We need the opportunity for oral hearings.

I want to talk about Motion No. 7 which is a Reform motion, a democracy related motion. The Canada Labour Code states that the board may order a representational vote on union certification to satisfy itself that the workers want the union. Our amendment calls for the board to hold a representational vote when 35% of the employees sign cards indicating they want union certification.

This amendment ensures the wishes of the majority are upheld. We are talking about democracy and a bill that is going to put something in place that affects a great number of workers. As a member of a number of different unions I have had the opportunity to voice my concerns to my union representative and even further than that in a democratic way.

• (1035)

This amendment would certainly ensure that the wishes of the majority are upheld. How can we even argue that upholding the will of the majority is something that would not be a positive? Of course it is a positive and something that definitely needs to be added to the bill. That is why I speak in strong support of Motion No. 7.

In regard to Motion No. 8, there should be a vote of the majority of the members in the employers group before action is taken. Bloc Motion No. 8 would weaken the employers association. It is a common practice for a group of employers to join forces and have one agent represent them in negotiations, which only makes sense.

Government Orders

At the same time, of course, the amendment removes the requirement that the board must satisfy itself that the employer representative is no longer qualified to act in that capacity before revoking the appointment.

The amendment being proposed by our colleagues in the Bloc provides for the automatic removal of the employer rep upon the receipt of an application from one or more of the employers in the group and the appointment of a new representative.

In terms of Motion No. 30, we support this amendment which we are bringing forward. The bill allows the Canada Industrial Relations Board to certify a union even if there is no evidence of majority support if the board believes there would have been support had it not been for the employer's unfair labour practices. The determination of what constitutes an unfair labour practice is left up to the CIRB.

I would like to go back to the issue of democracy and talk a little bit about some of my experiences as a union member. This is an important bill and changes have not been made for I believe 25 years to the act. If the government is intent on making changes, it is imperative that it make changes that are positive. In making those changes it should take the time and effort to ensure that it is a bill that is positive for both employers and employees, that it is fair, democratic and represents the wishes of the majority.

Some of the information related here in these motions under Group No. 2 are of concern. I mentioned this earlier in my speech but I would like to go back to it because it is at the crux of the issue. The most important and crucial part of the bill is democracy. Rather than go on to other points, I would like to continue to focus on the democracy aspect of Motion No. 7.

When I was a union member, on occasion situations arose where there was unrest in terms of labour negotiations, contract settlements and whatnot. Fortunately with every union I was a part of, the employer group that worked with the union was able to resolve the issues it had and was able to go on with a harmonious working relationship. A key thing in any bill having to do with labour relations is that the employee group and the employer are able to work together to solve any disputes they might have in a way that continues on that working relationship with the employee group and the employer.

In many cases we have seen friction which has affected the relationship between the employer group and the employees. If there are going to be changes to the bill, time needs to be taken in order to work out all of the amendments in all parts of the bill so that it works in a very effective way.

I will conclude by saying that democracy is very important and Motion No. 7 addresses that concern. It would allow for the views and wishes of the majority to be represented.

• (1040)

I thank hon. members for their attentiveness to my speech on this important bill, Bill C-19.

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to speak on Bill C-19 which is an act to amend part I of the Canada Labour Code.

We see workers in industry. It is very important for us to look carefully into the industrial relations that are governing the businesses in this country. Many workers feel intimidated and that their rights are not the way they should be.

Whatever we do here in this Chamber should protect the rights of the majority, not the few in society. In the labour force I believe that most of the workers believe that their rights should be preserved. That can be done when they are given some protection such as with secret ballots. If they are not voting by secret ballot, there could be intimidation, there could be some other dangers. Their rights will not be preserved to the extent they should be.

I will be opposing this part of the bill because it does not give freedom to the workers. It does not create the necessary balance which we want in industry.

Some provisions of the bill do not give workers the right to express what they want to express. To create a balance between the majority and a few of the workers, we should give them the freedom to express their views which can only be done by secret ballot.

I do have some experience in talking to workers who belong to unions in my constituency. I am told that some members of the unions are not satisfied with the way they are allowed to express their thoughts, their will.

I say in closing that with Bill C-19, industrial relations are important and the rules to govern workers are very important. Whatever we do in this Chamber we should do to benefit the majority of the people in Canada. To respect the wishes of the majority we should allow the workers to express their wishes by secret ballot.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to speak to Bill C-19, the labour code, and the amendments which are before the House today.

I would like to start off by saying how important the legislation is to the people of Okanagan—Coquihalla and in particular the forest workers in our province. It is interesting to note that this is forestry week in Canada so it is very important that the legislation be debated in the House today.

Government Orders

Other industries are also vital and important for the economy of British Columbia. Ranchers, loggers, people in the mining industry, all of those people have a stake in what is before us in Bill C-19.

• (1045)

Democracy is important to the people who work in those industries that are vital to the economy of British Columbia and all of Canada, the industries that make our country so vibrant. Today I will focus on the importance of Reform Party's motion on democracy. It is important not only to this legislation but to the way the country operates. If we truly want democracy to prevail in Canada, if we want it to be more than just a mere facade or a word we use now and then, we should make sure democracy is reflected in the legislation that goes forward from the House. That is why this is so important.

The Canada Labour Code states that the board may order a representation vote on union certification to satisfy itself that the workers want the union. Our amendment calls for the board to hold a representational vote when 35% of the employees sign cards indicating they want union certification. This amendment ensures the wishes of the majority are upheld. That is a very important part of the legislation. We are putting forward a democratic principle. That is why the bill is so important to the official opposition in Canada. We want to ensure those workers have every democratic tool available to receive the proper consideration when it comes to union certification.

The motion is worthy of the support of the entire House. We should give it our due consideration. Regardless of party, whether the New Democratic Party or the Conservative Party, all members should support the motion, including a few Liberals who might have a democratic bone in their bodies somewhere, although we do not see that demonstrated in much of the legislation that comes before the House. The way they instituted party discipline, for instance, when it came to the hepatitis C vote before the House, there was no democratic bone in anyone's body on that side of the floor.

It is a tool, a principle and a pillar of what we stand for as Canadians. We should have these democratic principles. If we do not, this place certainly is just a theatre for the public to watch from the galleries on occasion just to satisfy themselves that it appears to be a democracy. In true essence it is nothing more than a place where we act out legislation that the government will ram through in any event.

The motion is very important for the workers of Canada. I rose to speak today in particular about workers in British Columbia. They want the ability to join unions. They want to be able to freely choose the union they wish to participate in. They want the democratic tool to do so. It is only reasonable the House would give them the power to ensure they have a vote and are able to use the democratic principle we sometimes enjoy in the House of Commons.

• (1050)

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-19, the bill we are talking about today, is about democracy. That is why I want to speak to Bill C-19, specifically to the motions in Group No. 2.

I have spoken in the House before about how strongly I believe in democracy and freedom, freedom of competition and all these things that we in Canada quite often take for granted. The Reform Party and many other parties in the House are trying to propose amendments to the bill to get back to the freedom, the democracy we so cherish.

As we know, the bill died in the Senate in the last parliament, Bill C-66. It has now been reintroduced in this parliament with minor changes. I do not think very serious changes have been made. That is why we see so many of the opposition parties proposing amendments. It is very important that we take the bill seriously and try to accomplish something.

In this place we often forget that as political parties we have the job of working together to create legislation that is good for the country, and especially in this case good for labour. I am excited to see that many members in many parties are taking the chance to make the legislation better. I hope the Liberals will work with us in doing so.

As I mentioned, I will speak a bit to Motion No. 7. Reform has always been fighting for more democracy, especially in various organizations and particularly in labour organizations.

This is democracy in motion. I think all of us in the House try to work toward it by representing our ridings and the views of our constituents. I know Reform finds this very important. It is something we try to push toward, especially at report stage of Bill C-19.

Specifically on the whole issue of the representational vote when groups of people in labour want union certification, Reform believes, and I think many people agree, that as long as 35% of people in an organization want union certification they should be allowed to have it.

It is in the interest of democracy and in the interest of having labour work effectively. That is one of the things we are pushing for in Motion No. 7. The whole premise behind this motion is that we want the wishes of the majority through a democratic process to be upheld. Quite often we forget that in the daily events of the House.

There are innocent people out there who are trying to work for the common good. They are trying to support their families and their livelihoods. We should be able to put legislation through the House and work toward putting legislation through the House that is in the interest of those people.

The bill also talks about many other things when it comes to labour and arbitration. The core of anything that happens when it comes to labour has to be based around democracy and what is good for the people.

We need to focus on protecting the views, especially in this case, of the majority of people who want to see changes happen in a positive way through labour. We need to allow the democratic process to work. As I mentioned, overall that is something that leads hand in hand to creating more competitive markets.

Unfortunately, as we know, members opposite seem to want to put many obstacles into the process of trying to create an effective markets, trying to create more competitive markets and trying to give Canadian workers the competitive edge they need to compete in a global society. I am upset to see that. I would hope they would put the interests of workers first.

This leads into the whole view of competition, freedom and access to global markets. Many of the changes that have been made in Bill C-19 would affect the way grain is transported and the way we can access foreign markets.

• (1055)

If we take a step back and see the way the world is evolving, we see the way competition has continued to grow and how we have achieved a sense of a global market. We need to give all the advantages to Canadian labour and to Canadian business to be able to compete in foreign markets.

We need to take a step back and see how we can help the process of getting democracy in motion and getting labour legislation to reflect it. We need to do all we can to support it. Overall we will see a much more democratic, much more healthy part of our economy evolve from that. As well labour will reflect that.

Another major point is something we cannot forget. As much as we like to often hear members on the far left talking about restricting globalization, restricting competition among foreign countries, I cannot comprehend that. For me and from my background I feel it is fundamental that we have freedom of competition. That must be reflected in our labour laws.

When we talk about allowing groups in Bill C-19 to have formal certification to unionize, it has to be allowed with that democratic percentage, that vote of 35%. Also we have to move toward a further goal of allowing Canadian labour to compete in foreign markets. We need to give Canadians, Canadian businesses and Canadian labour the competitive advantage. We need to allow them to compete in global markets and we need to support them when they want to achieve those goals.

The House is supposed to uphold these types of visions. It is supposed to uphold the strong convictions of making Canada more democratic, making it a better place to live and giving the advantage to Canadians to provide for themselves. Unfortunately we do not see that applied often in much of the legislation that is produced in the House.

S. O. 31

I urge all hon. members to take a step back and evaluate what we are doing here today. I urge them to ask themselves how we can make this place better, how we can help make legislation better to represent Canadians and labour. Even if it means putting party lines aside, it is a goal we must have as federal legislators to do what is right for the country. That is what we must work toward.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

COLOURING CONTEST

Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, each year I organize a page colouring contest. The rules are quite simple. Each page creates something of interest from their home town on the back of my letterhead paper using only the crayons provided.

Binney and Smith Canada, the only manufacturers of Crayola products in Canada, is located within my riding. It donated the crayons and the prizes for the pages. I thank Binney and Smith for providing a wonderful assortment of prizes for all the pages who competed.

Once all entries have been submitted Helene Monette, a security guard in the House of Commons, judges each entry. This year's winner is Gaelle Halliday from St. John's, Newfoundland. Her creation was a very innovative piece of art. All entries were very well done.

I thank the pages for their hard work and commitment to serving all members of parliament. Once again we have a great group of pages to assist us.

* * *

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS WEEK

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, May 4 to May 10 is Emergency Preparedness Week. The government should use this week to learn about emergency preparedness but the Liberal government never learns. It believes more in Murphy's Law than in preparing for emergencies.

The Liberals did not learn from the Manitoba floods. The Liberals did not learn from the ice storm. They are not learning now from the Alberta fires.

How are the Liberals preparing for the earthquake that will hit B.C. in the future? They closed CFB Chilliwack and have left B.C. without emergency preparedness.

• (1100)

Emergency preparedness is about responding to a crisis. Canadians have seen the poor response by the government to the tainted blood crisis.

S. O. 31

On behalf of British Columbians, I give this government fair warning that now is the time to prepare.

[Translation]

* * *

NATIONAL FOREST WEEK

Mr. John Harvard (Charleswood—Assiniboine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week is National Forest Week and I would like to acknowledge the May 1 signing of the new five-year Canada forest accord which confirms the commitment by over 29 forest stakeholders to implement the new national forest strategy.

The strategy builds on the 1992 forest accord to enhance the long term diversity of our forest ecosystems while providing economic, social and cultural benefits to Canadians.

Canada will be entering the new millennium with a new approach to natural resources management, one that includes a forestry Internet site. The Canadian Forest Service is a major player and will play a fundamental role in the strategy's implementation.

Congratulations to government and industry representatives, First Nations, environmental groups, private woodlot owners and the signatories to the new Canada forest accord.

While I am on my feet, special congratulations to our firefighters who are battling forest fires right across the country.

* * *

MENTAL HEALTH WEEK

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Mental Health Association in Peterborough invites the community to join in recognizing the importance of everyone's mental health during this year's Mental Health Week.

This year's theme, "Making Mental Health Matter for All", emphasizes the importance of making mental health a priority.

Various activities take place during the week, such as the Creative Healing Exhibit, which is open to the public until tomorrow, May 9. Other activities include the groundbreaking ceremony at the Civic Hospital in a garden for patients, family and friends.

CMHA reminds members to renew their memberships in order to remain on the roster of individuals who help direct and set policy that improves the well-being of those suffering from mental illness. CMHA also wishes to encourage the public to help by talking to neighbours. Raising awareness about mental health helps to educate the community and erase stigmas associated with mental illness. Mental health matters.

COMITÉ QUÉBEC-PRINTEMPS 1918

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1918, four people were killed by English Canadian soldiers at a rally against conscription.

After reviewing the events, the coroner's inquest concluded that "the individuals shot on this occasion were innocent victims in no way involved in this riot—and it is the government's duty to pay fair and reasonable compensation to the victims' families", which has yet to be done.

As a reminder, a work of art commemorating these tragic events will soon be erected at the very location where they took place in Quebec City's lower town by the Comité Québec-Printemps 1918, a group of people in the Quebec City area.

The Bloc Québécois asks that the federal government publicly apologize to the victims' families and redress an 80-year old injustice by compensating them.

Those who appreciate historical accuracy also remember the events that occurred in the spring of 1918.

* * *

QUEBEC GOVERNMENT

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since it took office on September 1994, the PQ government has spent more than \$100 million to try to convince Quebecers to go along with the concept of Quebec being separate from Canada.

Here are the costs involved: \$1 million to hire PQ lobbying firms, unveil the preamble at the Grand Théâtre de Québec and set up telephone lines; \$17 million for the Secrétariat à la restructuration, for studies and for regional and national commissions; \$10 million in grants to the sovereignty council and for mailouts; \$57 million for the expenditures of the Quebec director general of elections; \$47 million for the referendum on the Charlottetown accord; and \$10 million for the Bélanger-Campeau and other parliamentary commissions.

Today, the PQ government, through acting premier Lucien Bouchard, is planning to spend millions of dollars on the Calgary declaration, although it had sworn not to spend a penny.

If Lucien Bouchard and his PQ colleagues want to know what the real problems facing Quebec society are, they should go to the people and call an immediate election, so that a real premier can be elected by all voters in Quebec.

[English]

ROYAL CANADIAN MINT

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Public Works and Government Services does not want the issue of the coin plant in Winnipeg to come before the committee.

In yesterday's question period the minister gave a spectacular show of contradictions. First he said the issue was before the courts so he could not comment. Then, when asked why they are going ahead with it if it is before the courts, he said that the court case has nothing to do with it. He says they are not competing with a private company and yet he claims that competing worldwide will give the new venture its viability.

• (1105)

Why did the minister give instructions to the committee to refuse our requests to examine this issue? It is clearly because he is afraid of all the contradictory answers. This is costing \$38 million to build, plus \$18 million in lost savings. That is a total of \$56 million and not an ounce of justification for it.

* * *

RIGHTS OF THE CHILD

Ms. Elinor Caplan (Thornhill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has long championed the rights of the child. We are signatories to the United Nations convention on the rights of the child. We led the fight on land mines which kill and maim children and we are leaders in the fight against the use of children as soldiers and cheap labour.

I would like to congratulate one Canadian, a constituent of Thornhill, who is known throughout the world for his commitment to protect children and their rights.

Mr. Craig Kielburger, founder of Free the Children, has been awarded the 1998 Franklin Delano Roosevelt freedom medal. The Roosevelt freedom medal was created to honour individuals and institutions whose work has given special meaning to those freedoms which President Roosevelt outlined in 1949: freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want and freedom from fear.

Through public speaking and personal advocacy, Craig at his young age is an example of someone who is really making a positive difference. I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of the people of Thornhill to congratulate Craig on his most impressive achievement and encourage him to continue his crusade to protect children.

[Translation]

*S. O. 31***YOUTH WEEK**

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Ahuntsic, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to point out that this is Youth Week.

Young people are the future of our country and yet many are finding themselves in a precarious situation.

[English]

Unemployment among young Canadians with less than a high school diploma is at 15%, while for those with at least a degree it is only 5%. That is why the federal government has taken steps in the most recent budget through the Canadian opportunities strategy and the millennium scholarship fund to increase the opportunities for our young people to participate fully in the economic and social development of Canada.

[Translation]

Initiatives like the summer career placements program will this year again give many young people from my riding of Ahuntsic and from throughout Canada the opportunity to gather work experience.

These measures are proof of the Canadian government's commitment to the future of our young people in Canada.

* * *

[English]

SPINAL HEALTH CARE WEEK

Mr. Jim Pankiw (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today marks the conclusion of spinal health care week. Chiropractors from coast to coast have conducted volunteer health talks about the benefits of spinal health and wellness.

Each year more than three million Canadians seek chiropractic care, making it the third largest health care profession in Canada. Clearly chiropractic care is an important component of the Canadian health care system.

There have been at least six formal government inquiries into the profession of chiropractic worldwide during the last 25 years, including Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Sweden. All have concluded that contemporary chiropractic care is safe, effective, cost effective and have recommended public funding for chiropractic services.

In addition, few health care procedures have been as extensively researched as chiropractic spinal adjustments. A wealth of scientific clinical studies have proven the appropriateness and effectiveness of chiropractic care.

Congratulations to Canada's chiropractors on the successful conclusion of this year's spinal health care week.

*S. O. 31**[Translation]***NATIONAL POLICE WEEK**

Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 10, will mark the beginning of police week in Canada.

This year, this special week is devoted to bringing the police and the community closer together. It provides an opportunity to tell the public about the vital work done by the police.

It also provides an opportunity for all Canadians to pay tribute to the devoted men and women who spare no effort to ensure that we may live in a peaceful and just society.

[English]

As Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, I have come to know and appreciate the work carried out by Canadian police and peace officers.

I know also that Canadians have great confidence in their police and great respect for them. National police week provides us all with the opportunity to show our support and appreciation for our police and I invite all Canadians to join me in saluting those men and women who have chosen to dedicate their lives to the protection of our homes and our communities. Thanks to them all.

* * *

WESTRAY MINE

Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the sixth anniversary of the Westray disaster. In 1991 the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy bestowed upon Clifford Frame, owner of Westray mine, the John T. Ryan award for mine safety.

At 5:20 a.m. on May 9, 1992 the Westray mine exploded taking the lives of 26 miners.

• (1110)

The Westray tragedy was not an accident and it was not a natural disaster. It was the end result of management that had no regard for safety and of governments that failed to ensure the well-being of workers. It was profit before people.

The United Steelworkers of America provided support to the miners and families from Westray. Together they were the driving force behind the Westray inquiry. It was the United Steelworkers of America who questioned the awarding of the John T. Ryan award to Clifford Frame and Curragh Resources. After a lengthy campaign by the steelworkers, on April 9 of this year the award was rescinded.

The Westray tragedy is a reminder of why we need unions to protect workers' rights and lives.

*[Translation]***SOCIÉTÉ NATIONALE DE L'ACADIE**

Mrs. Claudette Bradshaw (Moncton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Société nationale de l'Acadie today begins its official meeting in Wolfville, Nova Scotia.

The SNA supports and defends the rights and interests of Acadians through its interprovincial, national and international presence.

The theme of this annual meeting will be the development of an Acadian tourism product. Music, theatre, cultural institutions and other elements of Acadian heritage will be on the menu as a strategy is formulated to consolidate the wealth of Acadia.

[English]

I believe it is extremely important that we promote our Acadian heritage. By enhancing our tourism infrastructure we have a great opportunity to promote our culture and to help foster economic development in our region.

[Translation]

I think the francophone summit, which will be held in Moncton in 1999 will contribute to developing tourism in Acadia, as it will bring together more than forty—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough.

* * *

*[English]***NATIONAL FORESTRY WEEK**

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, this is National Forestry Week in Canada and how appropriate and sadly ironic given the terrible fires that are raging in Canada.

Canada boasts 235 million hectares of commercial forest land. We have a thriving industry of private woodlot owners who provide important environmental, economic and social benefits to their communities.

Despite such good news, there are still a number of major hurdles that our forestry industry must overcome, due in large part to the policies of this government. For example, the Liberals have eliminated the federal-provincial forestry agreement that was established by the Conservatives in the 1980s which provided much needed funding for silviculture management. In addition, Canada's taxation policies do nothing to encourage landowners to invest in sustainable management practices that would allow for increased fibre production.

As we celebrate National Forestry Week, I call on the government to recognize the tremendous contributions made by private

woodlot owners to our economy. Investing in our forest industry today will ensure its viability for future generations.

* * *

[Translation]

QUEBEC CITY CONFERENCES OF 1943 AND 1945

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ): “Humiliation”, Mr. Speaker. Not mine, but that of the Liberal members for Pierrefonds—Dollard, for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, for Bourassa and for Shawinagan.

How ironic, to see the hon. member for Bourassa protesting the worthy homage being paid to two of the greatest political figures of this century when, last November 18, he described the statue of General de Gaulle as a “monument to a stupid remark”.

How cynical, to see a Prime Minister falsely accusing the Government of Quebec of using history for political gain. Has he already forgotten his phone call last year to Jacques Chirac to put a halt to their plan to issue a stamp commemorating de Gaulle’s “Vive le Québec libre!” Is that not using history for political gain?

According to Mackenzie King himself after the conference, his role in it was no more important than that of the managing director of the Château Frontenac.

It would seem that the very people who accuse the separatists of waking up each morning expecting to be humiliated were a bit quick to feel humiliated themselves yesterday.

* * *

FORESTRY

Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, recently a new initiative on sustainable forestry development was signed by representatives of government and industry.

That document was the outcome of a recent congress held in the national capital to make the Canadian public aware of the need to manage the forests in such a way that they can be perpetuated as a resource and continue to support the economic development of many Canadian communities.

The strategy includes a Canada-wide forestry science and technology action plan, which was drawn up by the scientific community.

It was also agreed at the congress that the public and private sectors will promote the candidacy of Quebec City as the host of the 2003 world forestry congress

S. O. 31

[English]

BOBBY CURTOLA

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I was not born when Bobby Curtola was at the peak of his fame, but I am no less proud of him as a Canadian and a fellow Edmontonian.

• (1115)

Yesterday Bobby received the Order of Canada and I know that Canadians from all walks of life will join me in congratulating him not just for the award but for a lifetime of achievement.

Bobby was one of Canada’s first international pop music stars, a pioneer in demonstrating that Canada is blessed with an abundance of talent.

Long before the Beatles drew throngs of screaming teens to their shows Bobby was out there on the road doing the same. Most important, Bobby Curtola proved that you can be both a superstar and a nice guy. That is what his fans will say today. Super stardom never went to Bobby’s head. He was, is and will remain the sort of man we are proud to call a friend and a fellow Canadian.

Congratulations on behalf of all Canadians and Edmontonians to Bobby Curtola.

* * *

RESTIGOUCHE RIVER RATS HOCKEY CLUB

Mr. Jean Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche, PC): Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate all members and volunteers of the Restigouche River Rats hockey club.

Last season they finished in last place as an expansion team. However, this year they won the maritime junior A hockey championship.

Unfortunately this past weekend they lost the Fred Page cup in the championship game bringing their season to an end. They finished as the number 2 team out of 37 from Ontario, Quebec and Atlantic Canada.

I say with great pride they are number one in the hearts of hockey fans in Madawaska—Restigouche. My hat is off to a job well done.

* * *

[Translation]

POLYVALENTESAINTE-THÉRÈSE

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Saint-Eustache—Sainte-Thérèse, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome a group of students from my riding of Saint-Eustache—Sainte-Thérèse.

Welcome, my friends from École polyvalente Sainte-Thérèse.

Oral Questions

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

HEPATITIS C

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, newspapers across the country are publishing government documents that show clearly that from the seventies and the eighties the Liberal government knew and did not act on the tainted blood issue. It had information that could have prevented this tragedy.

Is the real reason this government will not go back and compensate before 1986 because the Prime Minister was a member of the cabinet that could have prevented this tragedy?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the documents referred to in this morning's reports were all in the hands of Mr. Justice Krever. He took them into account when he prepared his report in three full volumes.

A reading of that report makes it clear from the chronology that it was really 1986 when those responsible should have and could have acted to put tests in place to verify the presence of these contaminants in the blood supply.

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the documents are a real potent reminder of what exactly this government did.

The regulators ignored reports in the *New England Journal of Medicine*, a prestigious medical journal. They also ignored what other countries were doing. They grossly underestimated the numbers of people infected.

This Liberal government shirked its responsibility in those days. Why is it shirking that responsibility today?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Justice Krever said that compensation for hepatitis C victims should come from the provinces. He made no reference to support coming from the federal government.

In spite of that, this government through the Minister of Health took the lead in bringing the provinces to the table to work out a compensation plan and put \$800 million on the table, with the provinces coming up with only \$300 million.

This shows our concern. This shows our sense of commitment.

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the file is still open and I think the noose is tightening.

The truth of the matter is the government in the seventies and eighties had access to that information. When Judge Krever asked

for the documents to show what the cabinet said about this, what did it do? It closed the file. It would not let anybody see it.

Is not the reason that those files were closed is that the Liberal government cares more about its own than about victims?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, he is misstating completely. I reject this premise with respect to the position of this or previous governments and the position of the Krever commission.

All this material was made available quite freely and openly to the Krever commission. Mr. Justice Krever took it fully into account. He commented on it to the extent he considered necessary and he said compensation should be paid to all victims and it should come from the provinces. In spite of this we have exercised our concern. We have expressed our concern through bringing the provinces to the table and offering \$800 million.

● (1120)

The hon. member should stick to the facts and not talk the way he has been talking.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the federal government is a senior partner in this issue and the Deputy Prime Minister knows better. The facts are clear. The federal regulators knew the blood system was contaminated prior to 1986.

The federal regulators knew that surrogate testing was available. The federal Liberal government of the day chose not to implement that testing. As a result thousands of Canadians were infected with tainted blood and have hepatitis C.

When is the government going to do the compassionate thing, the right thing, and compensate all victims?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member overlooks the fact that all the documents referred to in the report this morning were in the hands of Mr. Justice Krever when he examined the history and came to his conclusions.

It is clear from his report, it is clear from a reading of his chronology, that it was in 1986 when those responsible could and should have acted and put tests in place.

Let me emphasize the point made by the Deputy Prime Minister. Even after his lengthy years long study and his three volume exhaustive report, Mr. Justice Krever recommended compensation be paid by the provinces. Notwithstanding that, this government showed leadership by arranging for compensation—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Okanagan—Coquihalla.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the federal government is responsible because it was the federal regulators who made the error.

Oral Questions

For a solid month now we have been hearing the government denying its liability. In fact, it has been blaming other governments. The Liberals have no problem fingering a government when they were not in power. The fact is this scandal goes back to the Trudeau Liberals. Why does this government insist on protecting its own political butts instead of protecting Canadians through a healthy blood system? Compensate all victims.

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a week ago in the House the hon. member's party was urging us to accept the Krever report. If that is the case why does it not continue with that position and accept that Mr. Justice Krever called for compensation of all victims but he said it should be done by the provincial governments? He did not find the fault that the Reform Party is inaccurately and unworthily trying to attribute to previous Liberal governments.

* * *

[Translation]

MILLENNIUM SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the education coalition has now been joined by the three largest employer organizations in Quebec, the Chambre de commerce du Québec, the Conseil du patronat du Québec, and the Association des manufacturiers et des exportateurs du Québec, in its opposition to the millennium scholarships.

These groups are demanding that Ottawa show the top priority it attaches to an agreement by postponing passage of its bill, in order to finalize the negotiations under way and, if necessary, amend the bill accordingly. The consensus is clear.

So that negotiations have the best possible chance of succeeding, is the minister prepared to suspend consideration of the bill—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. Deputy Prime Minister.

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are seeking an agreement, but we are not prepared to negotiate in public.

The hon. member must await the results of our efforts to negotiate in good faith and not try to turn this important issue into a battleground.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, will the Prime Minister finally realize that he is running directly counter to the Quebec consensus against the millennium scholarships? And when will he get out of the education sector?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have no intention of interfering in a provincial area of jurisdic-

tion. We have the right to enter into direct contact with young Quebecers, just as we do with young Canadians anywhere else in the country.

We are trying to arrive at an agreement to co-operate with the provincial government, and our negotiations are continuing.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the federal government is in such a hurry to create a place in history with its millennium scholarships that it is shamelessly fiddling about with its financial statements and including an expenditure of \$2.5 billion in 1997-98, when the foundation does not yet exist and no scholarships will be given out until 2000.

How many times will the auditor general have to rap the knuckles of the Minister of Finance before he understands he has to stop his financial juggling, which discredits the government's financial statements?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to take the auditor general's opinion into account. We do not share his viewpoint and are prepared to continue negotiations with the Province of Quebec.

• (1125)

I wonder why the Bloc Québécois in the House is opposing the interests of young Quebecers, who need scholarships to continue their education.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if ordinary citizens behaved like the Minister of Finance, they would have Revenue Canada after them and would be considered tax evaders.

Why is the government not setting the example by complying with the objective accounting rules of the public sector, as the auditor general has been asking for the past three years?

[English]

Mr. Tony Valeri (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has made it clear from the outset that when we take a policy decision that involves taxpayer money we will book the money right away. Gone are the days when the government would rack up billions of dollars in promises and leave the bill to be picked up sometime later.

The auditor general clearly disagrees with us. However, we believe our approach is one that Canadians will support because it is the most honest, transparent and accountable one.

* * *

HEPATITIS C

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last week in the House the Prime Minister told Joey Hache that if he wants full compensation for hepatitis C victims he should go see the Ontario premier, go knock on someone else's door.

Oral Questions

Joey Hache did go to see the Ontario premier and the premier put provincial money on the table. Quebec and British Columbia have indicated they are prepared to do the same.

When will the Prime Minister tell Joey Hache that the federal government is ready to end its silence and bring more money to the table?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have already announced my preparedness to meet with ministers of health from across the country. In fact, we are arranging that meeting for next week.

We will work toward developing a new consensus among governments. I am waiting to see what the position is of various other provinces. Some of them have not clearly stated their position. Those that have been stated are really very different. So it may be difficult to reach a consensus.

However, that is the purpose of the meeting and I will be at the table with that objective in mind.

[Translation]

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, British Columbia is prepared to do its part for all victims of hepatitis C, if the federal government will put in more money. Other provinces are waiting for a signal from Ottawa to do the same.

Is the federal government prepared to send this signal now? Is it prepared to guarantee today to the forgotten victims that its wallet will be open in Toronto?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have made it very plain that I would be very happy to meet my counterparts.

We are now trying to set a date for next week. We intend to find out the positions of all the provinces ahead of time, I hope.

My objective as the representative of the Government of Canada is to see whether a consensus can be reached among all the governments at the negotiation table.

[English]

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, the news just does not seem to get any better for the Minister of Health, does it?

The minister has stood in this House for the last five weeks and talked about an arbitrary cut-off date of 1986. Reports now are that federal regulators were aware as early as 1981 that in fact there was a problem with the system. The Krever report says compensate all the hepatitis C victims.

Will the minister finally accept responsibility to compensate all the victims and stop hiding behind the provinces?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, he should explain why, in spite of Mr. Krever's findings in his report, he said the provinces should do the compensating.

I do not think the hon. member should try to pursue his leadership campaign in this context.

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, if I had any aspirations I certainly would do a much better job than the Minister of Health in leadership campaigns.

Before meeting with the provinces the Minister of Health had better ask for authority from the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance to get the right direction when dealing with the provincial health ministers.

Do you have a contingency plan? Are you going to meet the provinces as a eunuch or are you going to have the opportunity to develop certain financial contributions to the hepatitis C victims?

• (1130)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Before the hon. Minister of Health responds, please address the questions through the Chair.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have already made clear that we are going to the table next week to determine whether there is a new consensus. In terms of leadership, the member should bear in mind that if it were not for this government and the leadership of the Prime Minister there would not be compensation in place for any victims.

It was this government that started that process, it was this government that brought the parties to the table, it was this government that produced the agreement to compensate 20,000 victims.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Jeremy Beaty, the president of the Hepatitis C Society, received a call from the health minister's office the other day, from the minister's top political adviser. Unfortunately it was not to tell him there would be more money on the table. Mr. Dossetor, the health minister's top adviser, phoned Mr. Beaty and asked him not to be at the upcoming meetings for the discussions on money. He bullied him and tried to intimidate him into not going to those meetings.

Why did the minister allow that to be done? Why will he not let Mr. Beaty be at all of the upcoming talks?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member is quite wrong. It does a grave disservice to Mr. Dossetor to suggest such a thing.

In fact what has happened is that as Minister of Health of Canada and following on the resolution adopted by this House the other day, I have written to all ministers of health in Canada. I have urged them to accept that representatives not only of the Hepatitis C

Oral Questions

Society but also of the hemophilia society be received by the ministers when we meet next week. I have every confidence that the ministers will agree with that suggestion and will receive those representatives.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, that is certainly not what Mr. Beaty says. Mr. Beaty says that Mr. Dossetor phoned him and tried to intimidate and embarrass him, that he tried to tell him not to come to these meetings and please do not ask to be at the money portion of the talks.

The health minister knows these talks are about the money. Why did the health minister instruct Mr. Dossetor to tell Mr. Beaty to stay home, not to bother to come to those discussions because he would not be able to talk about the money part of those discussions?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us stick to the facts. The facts are that as minister I have written to Mr. Beaty and the representatives of the hemophilia society. I have told them that I have asked the ministers to agree that victims will be received next week when the ministers meet. That is the right thing to do. It follows on the resolution the House has adopted. I have every confidence that the ministers will agree to receive those representatives next week.

[Translation]

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the Minister of Health announced, which was somewhat presumptuous on his part, that the hepatitis C matter was closed.

Pressure from the victims, the Canadian public and the provinces seems to have got him thinking. We are now told that he will not arrive empty-handed at the health ministers meeting.

What is the federal government prepared, in concrete terms, to offer hepatitis C victims not covered by the existing agreement?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, we agreed with the provinces, including Quebec, on a particular approach to compensation.

Now Quebec has changed its position, and Ontario as well. This has prompted us to suggest that another ministers meeting be called to see if the various governments can reach a new consensus.

I will be at the table next week to determine whether all the provinces can once again—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Argenteuil—Papineau.

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since he can easily afford it and since he is primarily responsible for this tragedy, will the minister admit that his

government must also play a major part in compensating all victims of hepatitis C?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member is fully aware of the fact that we have already contributed a large share of the compensation paid to the victims infected between 1986 and 1990.

Next week, we will see if a consensus can be achieved among the various governments. I will be there to make that determination.

* * *

• (1135)

[English]

INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, an access to information commissioner is supposed to be an advocate of openness, someone who will fight against Liberals who want to shred documents and hide facts. The last thing we need is a political Liberal patronage appointment. That is like putting Mr. Fox in charge of chicken coop security.

There should be an open competition for this job. Why is the Prime Minister ignoring Canadians who want facts and instead looking for the Liberal with the largest paper shredder?

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am a little bit more than disappointed with the remarks by the hon. member.

Any discussion that takes place in camera between House leaders is never revealed on the floor of the House. I am sure that the hon. member's House leader will have a few words with him later in that regard behind the curtains.

Meanwhile I would suggest to the hon. member no nomination has been formally offered. None has been made.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I received no information from my House leader from a meeting. This is an issue of accountability and openness. Instead of huddling in secret with his patronage advisers, the Prime Minister should publish the job description, specify that applicants have a record of impartiality and fairness and have an open competition. Will he do it and if not, why not?

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it gets even worse. Now the hon. member is accusing career civil servants of being political hacks of the government and presumably thereby accusing other people with similar qualifications which is the first thing wrong. Second, the hon. member should know, if he has even read one sentence of the act, it is an appointment of this House offered by the

Oral Questions

government but appointed by a vote of this House. One would think that this House must be democratic.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Co-operation.

At the World Food Summit, Canada made a commitment to actively promote food security and fight world hunger. Yet, for the last ten years, CIDA has continued to cut its support for agriculture, food and nutrition.

Can the minister explain why CIDA has cut the funding of the agriculture, food and nutrition programs for the 24 least developed nations by close to 80% since the early 1990s, despite Canada's commitment at the Rome Summit?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we continue to want to help those less fortunate. It should be pointed out that CIDA has tried to do more with much less.

The report card on CIDA's programming is very good, and we should be proud of the work the agency has done with much less money.

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if we are to believe the minister, everything is always perfect and never less than wonderful.

Is the minister aware that by reorganizing CIDA by geographic region rather than by sector of activity, she is weakening professional services in agriculture, leading to the poor results we are now seeing?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will say it again. When a department goes through difficult years like those we have just seen, with the cuts we sustained, CIDA has done its utmost to address the problems of the most disadvantaged. The reports from our programs are excellent.

That having been said, we are going to keep on trying to meet all the challenges throughout the third world.

* * *

[*English*]

INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's office is looking for a new information commissioner. We have just heard an answer from the government House leader.

So far in the process there have been no advertisements, no job description, no search committee. This is supposed to be about openness and transparency.

Why is the government so focused on putting in a political appointment rather than doing a search for the best person for the job?

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, no name has been offered. How does no name having been offered constitute a lack of consulting with whomever? No name has been offered, so none has been offered in contravention of anything. In terms of any conversation held between House leaders, if I were to put the conversations of members across the way on the floor of this House right now it might not be a pretty sight. I wonder who would lose in the process.

• (1140)

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government House leader is obviously squirming about something. I have no idea what he is talking about.

What we are talking about is the process. Why is there not a search committee? Why not have the best person for the job? Why will he not change the process when this is the time he can get the best person for the job?

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is changing his tune. He is saying that the system of appointing officers of this House should be changed. When did he and his colleagues ever advocate such a change in the past? When did he ever produce legislation, a private members' bill or any other initiative?

I think people should watch out before they talk from both sides of their mouth.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour.

The negotiations between the CBC and the 1,400-member CBC communication workers union are stalled. They have been under way since March 1995. Some union members have been without a collective agreement for more than two and a half years. The points in dispute are job security, wage increases and private sector use of CBC premises.

Will the Minister of Labour respond favourably to the union's proposal of a conciliation commissioner, in order to provide these employees with a collective agreement at last?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we continue to work with the parties. At this time I will have to take the matter under advisement and get back to the member.

* * *

EXTRADITION

Mr. John McKay (Scarborough East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada regards itself as a humanitarian nation. It brings into this country in excess of 200,000 people on an annual basis. Regrettably among them are a small number of war criminals and fugitives from justice. I ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice just how Bill C-40 will address this problem?

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week the Minister of Justice on behalf of the government tabled in this House, and we announced officially, a new extradition act.

The bill overhauls extradition laws in Canada and brings us in line with the 21st century. Most importantly the proposed legislation will prevent Canada from becoming a safe haven for fugitives who want to avoid facing the judicial system in countries where they commit crimes. Also, cross-border crimes will be more easily covered by this bill, crimes such as telemarketing fraud, computer crimes and transnational organized crime.

* * *

RAILWAYS

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

A consortium of private companies wants to build an \$11 billion high speed rail system in southern Ontario and Quebec. It is not necessary to read very far into their announcement before discovering that this happy little group expects the people of Canada to pay for the railway on which they want to run their trains.

Will the minister assure the House that this government will not commit to providing public funding for private profit?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this report was received yesterday by us and by the Ontario and Quebec governments subsequent to discussions a number of years ago.

It is an interesting proposal. It does entail the expenditure of public funds. As the hon. member knows full well, I have been on the public record as saying that VIA Rail, the passenger service, should seek funding from the private sector for its capital needs.

The hon. member is a member of the transport committee that is studying this very issue. I would ask him and his colleagues to look at the proposal and give us advice. In the meantime I am reviewing it and I will be discussing it with my colleagues.

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if the transport committee is so important, it is a pity that these people did not bring it up when they appeared before the transport committee a few weeks ago.

If this product is so financially attractive, the six companies involved certainly have the clout to raise the money but they prefer to have taxpayers take two-thirds of the risk.

Two of the consortium members, Bombardier and SNC-Lavalin, are renowned for their taste for Liberal pork. If this is such a good project, why do they have to come to the public trough?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raises certain questions. I suggest that he have the committee call the consortium before the committee and ask these questions of the consortium. Some of the questions he has raised we will be asking as a government.

• (1145)

We are working together on finding a solution for passenger rail that will find financing for its capital needs. I fail to see why the hon. member seems so spooked by a proposition by private sector companies to do something government is asking them to do to help with the financing of passenger rail.

* * *

EDUCATION

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, skyrocketing tuition fees and deregulation are causing a two tier educational system in Canada. The Americanization and privatization of post-secondary education are directly the result of gutted federal funding.

When will the government stand up and stop the bleeding of post-secondary education? When will the government make clear that a two tier system is unacceptable in Ontario or anywhere in Canada?

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has successively in various budgets, especially in the last budget, gone through extraordinary efforts to deal with debt relief for students. It has also promoted a number of granting systems such as Canada student grants and the millennium scholarship.

Many initiatives have been undertaken in the budget to help students with the costs that accrue for post-secondary education.

Oral Questions

We have gone to extraordinary measures. If that is considered bleeding, I do not know what else we can do to ameliorate the situation.

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the millennium fund does not even come close to repairing the damage. Tuition fees are out of control and students are facing crushing debt because the government has failed to set standards for accessibility.

Will the government act now to stop a two tier system and to set a national standard for accessibility for education?

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I suggest the hon. member speak to her colleagues in the Government of British Columbia to deal with the issue of skyrocketing tuition fees.

I think it can be said that the government's commitment is real. We have gone through extraordinary efforts to deal with the costs related to post-secondary education in the budget and in many other measures the government has undertaken.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister of fisheries. As the minister knows, the communities of Canso and Mulgrave, Nova Scotia, are anxiously awaiting a decision with respect to shrimp quotas.

The Canso Trawlermen's Co-op and the ACS company of Mulgrave submitted proposals for shrimp quota. The quotas could very well determine the survival of these communities.

Delegations from both groups travelled to Ottawa. Although the minister was unavailable, DFO officials were briefed on their dire situation.

Time is running out. Could the minister tell us when he plans to announce a decision with respect to the northern shrimp quota?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the northern shrimp issue is complicated. I should say the good news is that there is more shrimp available this year than last. In one area at least, area 6, it is substantially higher.

The problem side of this is that the requests of those who wish allocations, including the communities to which the hon. member referred, far exceed the shrimp available.

It will be a very difficult decision. It will probably be made within the next four to ten days. I assure the member that the representations made by the people in his province, as well as the

other provinces of Atlantic Canada, will be taken into consideration.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, I would turn the minister's attention now to area 18 and the crab fishery in Nova Scotia.

I have been informed that due to the soft shells of the crab this year fishermen have been forced to comply with a 48 hour notice to close the fishery in this area.

By confining fishermen to an area that is insufficient and by adding new licences, DFO has put the future of this fishery in peril.

Is the minister prepared to redefine this area and address the concerns of the fishermen in area 18?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the issue with respect to the crab fishery that the hon. member mentioned is one of conservation.

We have concerns with conservation because the biomass of crabs has declined quite dramatically. We expect that there will be a turn up in some two to three years.

In the meantime we have to take conservation measures. When it is necessary to take these measures quickly we know they may disrupt the fleet. We know it may be difficult for adjustment, but the member must remember that the fish come first.

* * *

YOUTH

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State (Children and Youth).

• (1150)

While Canada's unemployment rate continues to drop many people remain concerned about the high unemployment rate among youth and about providing young Canadians with the opportunity to access quality education.

Could the secretary of state tell the House what she is doing to assist young Canadians?

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Ottawa Centre for this very important question.

The member will know that in April alone 26,000 jobs were created for young people, 66,000 since January.

We continue through the Canadian millennium scholarship fund, Canada student study grants, tax relief, tax measures, EI premium holidays and increased funding for SchoolNet.

HEALTH

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last October 9, I introduced in the House Motion No. 222 which was designed to revamp the organ donor system. It will save lives, and it passed unanimously.

[Translation]

Last year, however, 122 people died while waiting for a transplant. Still, the Minister of Health has done nothing to ensure that this motion is adopted in whole or in part

The minister has the opportunity to take the necessary steps. Will he promise this House to implement the motion before the end of the year? People's lives are at stake.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate the initiative taken by the hon. member last year. I am very pleased to discuss it with him, as I am aware of his interest in the subject.

[English]

There are things that can be done by the federal and provincial governments. While I cannot point to any specific change that has resulted from the motion, I certainly would be happy to discuss with the hon. member specific things he would like to see the federal government do and engage in a dialogue with him because I agree with the objective of his motion.

* * *

[Translation]

DRINKING WATER MANAGEMENT

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the export of drinking water has been the object of intense debate in Quebec, but there is unanimous agreement that Quebeckers must be the ones to decide on management of this resource.

Last Monday, the Minister of Foreign Affairs stated his intention of using certain laws to reverse a provincial decision in this matter.

Does the Minister of the Environment acknowledge that drinking water management is a provincial area of jurisdiction, as are all natural resources?

[English]

Mr. Julian Reed (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. member that Canada has a role to play in terms of a decision regarding the export of drinking water.

At the present time Canada opposes large scale exports of water. The matter in question in Ontario has been referred to the International Joint Commission and we will await the results of its findings.

*Oral Questions***FISHERIES**

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister of fisheries. It seems that the Liberal patronage appointment of the former member for Selkirk—Red River as head of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation has led to a situation that would be comical if it were not so tragic.

Apparently the chairman of the board will not allow Mr. Fewchuk to do his work. It is reported that they might not give him keys to the washroom.

I wonder what the minister has to say about this. Surely we are all concerned about the future of this corporation. I wonder what he has in mind to deal with this very difficult situation.

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there certainly are management problems with the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. They relate, as the hon. member has indicated, to certain differences between the directors and the president of the association.

I would point out that it is extremely important to have an effective organization marketing on behalf of the freshwater fishermen of Canada. This is a particularly important one. We have appointed a former deputy minister of fisheries, Mr. Bruce Rawson, to look into this matter. I am awaiting his report day by day and I am hoping it will come soon.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADA LABOUR CODE

Mr. Jean Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court of Canada has refused to hear the Wal-Mart appeal. Employees at the Windsor store will therefore have to form a union, although they voted 151 to 43 against doing so.

• (1155)

In light of these events, will the government now agree to drop clause 46 from Bill C-19 and reassure the workers of this country that their democratic decisions will be respected?

[English]

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Ontario Labour Relations Board in the Wal-Mart case was upheld by the Ontario Court of Appeal.

The Supreme Court of Canada has refused to hear an appeal. This is a provincial issue.

*Oral Questions***AGRICULTURE**

Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

It appears that some Americans are making threatening statements regarding Canada's export of wheat to the United States, are asking Canada to lower its dairy subsidies and are continuing to challenge the effectiveness of our marketing boards.

Would the minister tell the House what approach he will use to defend Canadian farmers?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that there were some comments made by some people in the United States yesterday, but I think it is important that we distinguish between political rhetoric from some U.S. senators and the position of the U.S. government.

Both Canada and the United States recognize the value of a rules based trading regime in both NAFTA and the World Trade Organization. We are living and working within those rules.

There is a difference between rhetoric and reality, and the reality is that Canada will continue to abide by the rules.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as the minister just said, there is a lot of rhetoric about this issue and most of the rhetoric is coming from the minister himself.

The fact is that the United States has threatened to rewrite NAFTA to cap our sales because it believes that the compulsory nature of the Canadian Wheat Board allows the Canadian Wheat Board to dump unfairly priced wheat into the United States.

We need to know what exactly the government will do to protect the future of wheat sales going to the U.S. Will the government do something or will it just continue to spout rhetoric?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would pay attention, examinations have been done by the Canadian Wheat Board in the past and by a number of international and independent groups. The actions and sales of the wheat board have been examined before.

When we have asked the United States to give us one example of where the Canadian Wheat Board is not trading fairly and not trading by the rules, it has been unable to do that.

I will repeat. We will play by the rules and we will ensure that the United States does the same.

[Translation]

INFORMATION CANADA OFFICE

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

Public rumour has it that the ICO will now come under the Minister of Public Works, who is already responsible for ensuring the government's visibility, or the Privy Council Office.

Will the Acting Prime Minister admit that the only responsible thing to do would be to end this shameful waste of public money by abolishing this propaganda office and turning over the money thus saved to creators, who certainly need it these days?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I take the hon. member's question merely as a clarification of the government's management, and I will discuss the matter with the other members of Cabinet and the Privy Council.

* * *

[English]

BANKING

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, neither the Liberal caucus nor the Competition Bureau looking into the proposed bank mergers has the mandate or is taking the responsibility for studying the impact on job losses.

Potentially thousands of jobs could be lost. In Regina 33 local branches belong to one of the merger partners. Their customers and employees can read the writing on the wall and it is not very good news.

Will the government be supporting my motion next Tuesday to allow immediate industry committee hearings on the impact of the bank mergers on consumers, small businesses and rural Canada?

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should know, particularly because of his function in his party, that private members' hour is just that.

* * *

● (1200)

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Jean Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche, PC): Mr. Speaker, at a recent meeting with officials of the human resources development offices in Madawaska—Restigouche I was disturbed to learn that major cuts have been made to summer career placement programs.

These offices represent one of the highest rates of unemployment in the country, yet the minister saw fit to take away what little students in the area can find to put themselves through school.

How can the minister look these affected students in the eye and justify the department's action?

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member should know that we have a \$120 million summer student employment program, as well as many other opportunities in other programs.

Unfortunately, because there is such a huge demand for summer employment funding, we have had to redistribute the resources to meet the needs across the country, not just in certain ridings, but in every riding.

This unfortunately has happened and we are dealing with it. We are working on it and we hope that we can reach more students and not ignore and leave some out.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance.

What evidence does he have to show that this government's approach to job creation and economic growth is working for Canadians?

Mr. Tony Valeri (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, certainly we are very pleased to have the unemployment rate down over one percentage point from a year ago.

There was strong job growth in April especially since it led the decline in the number of unemployed Canadians. The unemployment rate is now at its lowest level in almost seven years.

Over 171,000 new jobs have been created so far in 1998. There have been 543,000 jobs created since December 1996. All of these jobs have been in the private sector.

We will continue to do what we said we would do and that is to make sure that the fundamentals are right. We have eliminated the deficit. We will keep interest rates low to ensure that inflation stays stable and we will continue on that track.

* * *

CIDA

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the foreign affairs committee, in the presence of the minister responsible for CIDA, some Liberal backbenchers said that if B.C. businesses want to get CIDA contracts they should move their businesses to Ontario.

Will the minister publicly denounce these irresponsible comments?

Routine Proceedings

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all I can say—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): If the hon. minister wishes to answer it is totally up to the minister.

An hon. member: Name the member.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): This will bring an end to the question period.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTIONS

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During question period the Secretary of State for Children and Youth said that tuition fees in B.C. are skyrocketing.

I would like to correct that and point out that B.C. has had a—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): That is a point of debate, not a point of order.

Mr. Gurmant Grewal: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am wondering if these are irresponsible comments.

Why will you not allow—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): When it is over it is over.

We will proceed now to the daily routine of business.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table in this House today, in both official languages, a number of Order in Council appointments which were made recently by the government.

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

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker,

Routine Proceedings

pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to six petitions.

* * *

SAHTU DENE AND METIS COMPREHENSIVE LAND CLAIM AGREEMENT

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I am pleased to table, in both official languages, two copies of the 1996-97 annual report of the implementation committee on the Sahtu Dene and Metis comprehensive land claim agreement.

* * *

• (1205)

[English]

GWICH'IN LAND CLAIM AGREEMENT

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, copies of the 1996-97 annual report of the implementation committee of the Gwich'in comprehensive land claim agreement.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

FINANCE

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Vaughan—King—Aurora, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Finance pursuant to its order of reference dated March 31, 1998. Your committee has adopted Bill C-36, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in parliament on February 24, 1998, and has agreed to report it without amendments.

* * *

PETITIONS

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to present a petition from constituents of Victoria—Haliburton who are asking the government to remove the GST on all reading material.

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will be answering Question No. 80.

[Text]

Question No. 80—Mr. Keith Martin:

Could the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Public Works and Government Services explain: (a) what public tendering processes were used in the acquisition process for purchasing the *M.V. Madeleine*; (b) how many passengers and cars this ship can carry; (c) how many passengers and cars this ship has carried since it came into service; and (d) what the annual subsidy is to keep this ship in service?

Hon. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): In so far as Public Works and Government Services Canada and Transport Canada are concerned:

(a) The operator, CTMA Traversier Ltée, identified the availability of a used vessel. There was no public tendering process. As has been the case in the past when it was in the best interest of the public to do so, Treasury Board of Canada has provided approval for the purchase of the *M.V. Madeleine*, then named *M.V. Isle of Inisturk*. In acquiring this vessel the Crown benefited from exceptional circumstances as a result of an offer from Irish Ferries Limited to sell the vessel to Canada.

(b) The *M.V. Madeleine* can carry over 1,000 passengers, 258 automobiles and 29 tractor trailers.

(c) The *M.V. Madeleine* entered into service on July 5, 1997. During its operating season (between July 5, 1997 and December 31, 1997) the ferry carried 51,790 passengers, 18,424 passenger vehicles and 1,393 commercial vehicles.

Note: The ferry service does not operate between late January and the end of March, depending on ice conditions. In addition, the *M.V. Madeleine* underwent a scheduled refit between November 5 to December 5, 1997, during which time the *M.V. Lucy Maud Montgomery* carried out the *M.V. Madeleine*'s schedule service.

(d) The subsidy for the 1997 operating year was \$2.4 million, which is equal to the amount of the previous year. Subsidy levels are expected to remain the same for the foreseeable future.

[Translation]

Mr. Peter Adams: Mr. Speaker, I ask that all other questions stand.

Mr. Jean Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche, PC): Mr. Speaker, I see that the parliamentary secretary answered a question today, but I would really like an answer to mine.

[English]

Question No. 21 has been on the Order Paper since October 3, 1997. I asked about the response yesterday and I intend to ask every day until we get the answer.

The parliamentary secretary has repeatedly promised the House that he will make inquiries as to when Question No. 21 will be answered. What are the results of his inquiries and when will Question No. 21 be answered?

Government Orders

Mr. Peter Adams: Mr. Speaker, I note again Question No. 21. I have been looking into the matter and the question will be responded to as soon as possible.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is it agreed that the other questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

CANADA LABOUR CODE

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-19, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and of Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 30.

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in debate on Bill C-19. The most controversial aspect of the examination of the Canada Labour Code is, without a doubt, the matter of replacement workers.

As we know, only two provinces have passed legislation at this time to restrict employers' use of replacement workers, or scabs as we call them in Abitibi, during work stoppages. Those two provinces are Quebec, where there have been restrictions since 1977, and British Columbia since 1993. Ontario had adopted similar mechanisms in 1993, but these were done away with in 1995.

Where sectors under federal jurisdiction are concerned, there have been numerous conflicts which have raised greater awareness of this issue, but to date the code contains no clauses banning the use of replacement workers during work stoppages.

• (1210)

The task force found that, despite the opposing points of view of labour and management, there was one point on which they both agreed, which was that "no one believes the use of replacement workers is justified if this is intended to do away with a union or to undermine its role, rather than to obtain an acceptable collective agreement".

As the majority of the task force recommended, there will not be a blanket ban on the use of replacement workers. The Canada Labour Relations Board will, however, be empowered to order an employer to cease to use such workers during a strike—

Mr. Yves Rocheleau: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the hon. member for Abitibi is not addressing Group No. 2. He is speaking to a motion which will come up later in the debate, we hope, unless the Reform Party amends it.

He is totally out of order. Not that this is not interesting but it is totally out of order when we are supposed to be looking at Group No. 2.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Trois-Rivières is quite correct that we are supposed to be debating the motions in Group No. 2. However, there has been a good deal of latitude during the course of this debate and it would be unfair of the Chair to be particularly restrictive to a particular member in light of the fact that there has been quite a bit of latitude. Perhaps the member for Abitibi would be conscious of the remarks of the member for Trois-Rivières and every once in a while talk to the debate at hand just to keep us on track.

The Chair will endeavour to keep the debate more closely relative to the specific motions at hand. I thank the hon. member for Trois-Rivières for bringing this to my attention.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy St-Julien: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your judgment and the comment by the member for Trois-Rivières. It is true, I did notice a certain latitude in the speeches since this morning. It is the only time today. We have until 1.30 p.m. It is true that we can speak about the motions in Group No. 2. If members want me to speak about the motions in Group No. 2, I have just done so.

The majority of task force members said they would not recommend a general ban on replacement workers during illegal work stoppages. Members did, however, recommend a certain number of amendments to the code so that these workers would not be used to reduce bargaining rights and so that the rights of workers in a bargaining unit who were on strike or locked out would be protected.

The adoption of these measures constitutes a balanced solution to the issue of replacement workers.

Why did I depart from the motions in Group No. 2. I did so because, during the last postal strike in 1997, the federal minister, the Liberal member for Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, decided, as the minister responsible for Canada Post, not to bring in strike-breakers, or scabs. That is the reality of a minister of action who, by his decision, helped workers.

We know that the words strikebreaker and scab do not have the same connotation in the other provinces. Nowadays, we speak about replacement workers.

What I wanted to say today, leaving aside the motions in Group No. 2, as the member for Trois-Rivières pointed out, is that, in

Government Orders

November 1992, I introduced a bill in the House of Commons to amend the Canada Labour Code so as to prohibit strikebreakers. It was also intended to amend the Canada Labour Code in order to prevent crown corporations from resorting to strikebreakers during a dispute to maintain essential services.

For several years now, and this is important, Quebec's major labour organizations have been taking a civilized and responsible approach.

For the future of our workers in Canada, in Quebec, and in Abitibi, federal and provincial crown corporations should, in any general strike, follow the example of the federal minister, the Liberal member for Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, who, during the last strike by Canada Post, introduced a general ban on employers bringing in other workers to replace striking employees.

Let us follow the example of this minister. Let us follow the example of Quebec.

• (1215)

[English]

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to speak to the motions before us today. I am going to concentrate on two of the motions. Primarily I am going to talk about democracy and the democratic rights of labour union members and workers to choose their agents in order to basically have a say in what happens to them.

I think it might be illustrative for all the eager Liberals on the other side, those who really want to hear examples and facts, to tell them a bit of my own personal experience since I worked for many years in what would be called a compulsory union shop. That is rather remarkable since I am a professional mathematician. I taught at the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology. At the time when I started there was no union there. It was run by the provincial government directly as an arm of the department of advanced education. We had no union.

I remember that those were some of the finest years we had because we were able on very short notice to make adjustments to salaries and benefits as needed in order to attract qualified staff.

It happened a few years later that the provincial government on being pushed by certain numbers of people there allowed the formation of a union, the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees. Because we were run directly as an arm of the federal government, we were then forced into membership in the union. Preceding that all we had was a loose association. It was called the CSA, the civil service association.

The civil service association before the union was able to bring matters of concern to the employer. We did that at the local level at the institute and most of our grievances were dealt with fairly and quickly.

Along came the government giving its approval to the union and we then had a forced union membership. Instantly a number of things happened. Instead of having one boss, we now had two bosses. Instead of having quick and easy ways of adjusting our working conditions, salary and so on, it became a cumbersome legal thing.

In saying all this, I am not in any denigrating the unions or the union movement. As has been stated by a number of other people, there has been a number of very positive contributions made by the unions over the past number of years in this country and in other countries in improving the lot of workers. But there are some situations where a union shop just does not fit.

In our professional capacity there as instructors it did not fit. The reason I say this is we were not permitted to exercise our democratic rights. As a matter of fact, and this will come perhaps as a surprise to some members, I was actually for a time the president of the local of the union there. I got totally fed up with the union guys at headquarters telling us what we had to ask for and totally ignoring what our membership at our place of work wanted. It was very frustrating.

In expressing my frustrations against the union my colleagues said that's our man, and lo and behold they elected me and I was the president of the local because I was ready to stand up for democracy. I suppose I was a reformer before Reform was even invented. I thought the wishes of the people represented took precedence over the organization to which they belonged.

We were forced into the union and here I was a member of that union. I tried my best to represent our wishes. I was trying as much as possible to co-operate with our employer, with the administration of the place.

• (1220)

When occasion required it, on behalf of our members I made forceful representations in order to correct things that were not right. Most of my frustration was with the union. It would not listen. We had very inequitable treatment. We were taxed by the union about three times as much as the average for that union. We were about 10% of the total membership so it really did not have to worry about us.

We asked formally if we could get out of the union. We asked our employer, the department of advanced education, if we could form a professional association and represent ourselves. It was not even considered. It would not take it forward. It was so afraid that the union would then call a strike against the whole province and as a result it would tie everything up. The employer was totally intimidated by the union.

When I say on one hand the unions have a positive role to play, one of those roles is not intimidation. One of those roles is not to hold everybody else hostage in order for them to promote their agenda. It must be done democratically.

Over a period of time there were some very interesting developments. In 1982 the province of Alberta decided to cut loose the technical institutes and the colleges from direct control and direct administration of the department. Instead they had new boards appointed. I will not get into a discussion of political patronage appointments at this stage. That is not on topic and I know I would be called on it on relevance. So I will not talk about that.

We were called on to choose our bargaining agent. There were at each of these institutes and colleges a number of instructors and teachers. We were called instructors where I worked. There were 750 instructors at the place where I worked and there were about 750 instructors at Southern Alberta Institute of Technology. There were a number of different locations with a large number of people. It is quite practical to have a collective agreement in situations like that. No problem there.

They asked if we should have the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees continue to represent us or should we go on our own. Having the board of governors come in gave us that window of opportunity to choose. Under the new legislation there was a choice for a new institution, a new organization for the members to choose.

We had a good debate. It was a great debate. I love a good substantive debate. I love one where all the members opposite are listening without heckling. I do not hear a voice of protest from any of them as I speak.

It really was a great window of opportunity and we discussed it. In the industrial area of our institute there was a greater favour to maintain a union. They thought it would have greater clout. The argument on the other side was that if we had our own association, free from the central office of the union, we could concentrate fully on what we were about at our institute. It was decided that we would have a vote. The vote that decided we would go on our own was as high as it had been on our previous straw votes where we had asked if we wanted to get out of the union.

All I am saying is that we were given the democratic right. There was a vote held. As I recall, 85% of the members of our staff said let us form our own association. I was then further honoured to be asked to be the founding president of the new staff association. I was there to organize it and put it all together. We had a great time representing our people. The key is that the people had the choice.

This bill before us denies the union members, the workers, that actual choice.

• (1225)

It states that if there is some external outfit such as the employment relations board it can say those people have a union whether they want it or not. That is not democratic and is a violation of the very principle of democracy. Therefore I speak very strongly against this bill as it is now stated and very strongly in favour of the Reform motions which will amend it and fix it up.

Government Orders

I see my time is up. Could I have unanimous consent to continue for a few more minutes?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Jason Kenney: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not know how unanimous consent can be denied without a quorum.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is the hon. member calling quorum?

Mr. Jason Kenney: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): We have quorum.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the cackling from across the aisle from our colleagues who do not seem to take too great an interest in this important debate about democracy in Canada.

I think the kind of procedural games the government plays is shameful. We just saw my hon. colleague from Elk Island try to extend his limited remarks on this very important bill and was denied by no one except some Liberal who poked his in from behind the curtain carrying a cup of coffee.

I do not know what has happened to the traditions of democratic debate and deliberation in this place but I do know what the government is intending to do with Bill C-19. It is attacking—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): As a point of fact, that is not who denied unanimous consent. Let us try to keep the remarks elevated somewhat.

Mr. Jason Kenney: Mr. Speaker, I am doing just that and I hope my hon. colleagues in the government will keep their conduct in this place elevated. That is not what I see. It is not what I see in this bill and not what I see in the way they dismiss debate in this House. They know that what is introduced by a minister representing the bureaucrats in his departments is going to be passed regardless of what is said in this place, regardless of what they say, regardless of

Government Orders

whether they sit in this place and debate bills on second reading or in clause by clause or in committee.

They know that in so far as democratic deliberation is concerned, this place has been turned into a joke by this and previous governments. I know that many of the members opposite, honourable members, confident people and people of integrity, sat in this place and debated bills like Bill C-19 when the previous Progressive Conservative government sat in a majority on the government side. They tried to debate things while in opposition and said the same things I am now as an opposition member, that the bureaucrats run the departments, they run the minister when it comes to Bill C-19, and the minister runs the backbench majority of this House.

Democracy is not working and it is not working in Bill C-19. Labour department bureaucrats have written a bill that overrides the fundamental principles of liberal democracy on which this country relies. They say that a hand picked group of patronage hacks who sit on the Canadian Industrial Relations Board, people of real integrity and principle like Ted Weatherill, will be able to determine whether workers are forced into a union against the will of as many as 70% of the members. That is what Bill C-19 at page 14 states.

It says the board may order a representational vote on union certification to satisfy itself that the workers want the union. They do not have to. They can certify the union themselves.

• (1230)

Who? Not the workers. Who? Not the members of parliament. Not democratically elected representatives, but hand picked, unaccountable, unelected, patronage appointees of the government. They have more power in this bill than do ordinary working Canadians. That is a disgrace.

I do not know how the members opposite—what members there are opposite—can support a bill that undermines the principle of democracy. All we are saying through Motion No. 7, through our effort to amend this section of the act is that yes, workers have the right to collectively bargain. Yes, they have the right to gather together and to enforce their rights and to negotiate their rights as a collective bargaining unit. Never should a union be imposed on individuals at a workplace unless they invite it upon themselves. That is called democracy.

Right here, what we are seeking to do through Motion No. 7 moved by my hon. colleague from Wetaskiwin is:

That Bill C-19, in Clause 13, be amended by replacing lines 22 to 24 on page 14 with the following:

“13. Subsections 29(1) and (2) of the act are replaced by the following:

29.(1) The Board shall, for the purpose of satisfying itself as to whether employees in a unit wish to have a particular trade union represent them as their bargaining agent, order that a representation vote be taken among the employees in the unit where it is satisfied that at least thirty-five per cent of the employees in the unit are members of the trade unit applying for certification.

It is simple and it speaks for itself. I cannot understand why the government members opposite would not support it.

I look at the testimony that was brought before the human resources committee on this legislation. People like Mr. Clem Paul, president of the North Slave Metis Alliance said on this matter “The Metis do not want unionism forced on them because of the collective wishes of other groups in the workplace”. The Metis want to be free to join a union or not, according to the wishes of the individual. Imagine, freedom. Mr. Paul understands that but the labour minister, his bureaucrats and the backbenchers do not.

Mr. Paul went on to say “The choice of whether membership in a union benefits the worker should be the decision of each person who is free to make it for themselves. Restrictions on our freedom to benefit from opportunities coming available for the first time will harm us”. He is speaking of the Metis people becoming full partners in any groups of Canadian society. This is somebody whose people are struggling to get a leg up economically and they see the danger implicit in this bill.

Mr. John Keenan is vice-president of human resources at Falconbridge Limited, a major national mining company that has created thousands of good paying jobs in our economy. On this section of Bill C-19 he said that “unionized labour is a reality of working life. As long as there are equitable checks and balances in our system, the labour relations system, we can work in a harmonious fashion with our union colleagues”.

He went on to say “As it is now proposed, this section of the code will polarize labour-management relations and bring us back into the dark days of the 1950s and 1960s when labour relations were at a very low ebb in this country. We made a lot of progress and it is not appropriate to turn back the clock”. He also said that his company was not consulted on this bill.

Mr. Jim Utley is vice-president of human resources at Cominco, another major employer. He said on this section that “a secret ballot for all certification decisions would address these issues and ensure that employees are given an opportunity to express their views privately and without either the union or the employer looking over their shoulders”.

What is the problem with guaranteeing a right to a secret ballot, he asked, and so do I. He goes on to say “The process is the cornerstone of our democratic society, yet the proposed legislation expounds circumstances where this fundamental right is denied employees”.

Government Orders

The witnesses went on and on and on at the labour committee, at the human resources committee saying that this is an attack on democracy.

I ask my colleagues opposite why they do not accept the principle we are proposing in Motion No. 7. It is the principle of democracy, the principle that nobody should be coerced by the power of the state to give up some of their freedoms, to give up forced union dues unless they give their consent.

The principle that started small / liberal democracy was the principle of no taxation without representation, that people cannot be coerced by the power of the state to surrender the fruits of their labours, or to surrender some of their individual liberties unless they concur in that process.

● (1235)

Bill C-19 by refusing to require a secret ballot vote for certification with the support of the majority of members would do just that. It would force up to 70% of the people at a workplace into a union even though they expressed their clear and heartfelt objection.

This has happened. It happened under the rabid labour legislation introduced by the socialist parties, in Ontario under Bob Rae and in British Columbia under that maven of economic growth policy, that real democrat Glen Clark. Those two provinces had the same kind of provision where the provincial labour boards could certify a union even against the express wishes of the majority of the workers.

What has happened? In Windsor, Ontario the Wal-Mart employees voted 151 to 43 against union certification. But the Ontario Labour Relations Board hacks, appointed, unaccountable, unelected appointees, using Bob Rae's labour code said "Sorry. We do not like the outcome of this vote. We are going to force the 151 to accept what the 43 wanted". That is not democracy. Neither was it democracy in B.C. when the workers at the Wal-Mart store in Nelson voted overwhelmingly against union certification and the B.C. relations board overturned that.

In closing I encourage hon. members opposite to stand up for the democracy they represent by having been elected to this place and let workers exercise it through a secret ballot in the workplace.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this has turned into a very spirited debate. I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me so quickly so I can get to the nub of this debate today and the things which concern me about Bill C-19.

As in a lot of bills there is a lot of material in Bill C-19 that is easy to support. The idea of a labour code for Canada is not a bad thing.

Obviously this bill is a revamp of what we already have and it is not a bad idea to update it. It did come in in the last parliament and

the government had second thoughts about it and for some good reasons, which I will get into in a minute, decided to drop it from the Order Paper. Now a year later it has been brought back in this parliament. We have seen significant amendments proposed by the official opposition in committee and in the House to try to bring the balance we think is necessary in labour legislation.

I was in the logging industry for many years. In the logging industry in British Columbia if the company is of any size it likely means it is a unionized company. I have lived on both sides of that equation. I worked for a number of years when our company was not unionized. I was there during the unionization vote when the members voted to join the union. Without getting into any of the coercive nature that this bill talks about that the employers might enter into, I could give a tale of woe from the other side on that one.

Even so, the IWA is not a bad union to work with and we were happy to do so for many years. Even after we were unionized, even though I was in essence the employer with the ability to hire and fire, the union did not mind. I was a member of the union even then. The union did not seem to mind. It took my union dues and was quite happy to do that while I was on the workforce for many years. Eventually I went into full time management. I have seen it from all perspectives. In those perspectives it is important that the word balance in labour legislation be a key principle that we follow.

For example one of the amendments we proposed in committee involved the privacy of individuals as to whether or not they wanted their name to be released to a union when an organizing drive occurred. I would suggest there is a balance here.

The union I believe has a right to talk to individuals in the workplace, to put forward its proposals, tell workers why it thinks they should belong to a union and why the workforce should be unionized. That is a right unions have. One of our basic blue book principles is the right to organize, to strike peacefully and so on. That is a right workers need to have.

● (1240)

Balancing that though is also the right of workers to their privacy. In other words, should the employer have to give the names, addresses and phone numbers of workers to a union organizer? That should be the choice of the workers. It is an interesting word which the previous speaker used quite often, the word choice. They should have the choice. By all means they may be very interested in that information. They may say to the employer "Send them my name and address. I would like to hear from them".

Many people have a different view. They say "That is my choice. I may want that, but if I do not want that, it is my right to say my name is not on the list. I do not want anybody telephoning me at home. I do not want them knocking on the door of my private

Government Orders

dwelling. If they want to talk to me, they can see me at work because that is what this is all about". That is their right.

That is balance between the rights of the organizer to organize as they should have and the rights of the employee, the prospective union member, to—

Mr. Pat Martin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to speak to the idea of the relevancy of what the member is talking about. We are supposed to be talking about Group No. 2 which I believe is Motion Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 30. Really, what the hon. member was talking about has no bearing whatsoever on Reform's motion or—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): With respect he is speaking directly to Motion No. 7 which amends 29.1.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up by saying it is very relevant to Motion No. 7. I am trying to build the case in this debate that the idea of balance is brought in by our Motion No. 7. I use that as an example. We brought in an amendment and the government accepted it which I think that was good and very wise in that case. I would urge them again on this one, Motion No. 7 to get to the nub of this debate, which is to try to bring balance into it.

Do workers have the right to organize? A quote from our party's principles is that Canadian workers have the right to join unions, to organize, to strike peacefully. That is a basic democratic right in a free society. We say that is a right and it must be maintained. Now we get into the how to make this a balanced and fair procedure.

When my company was unionized many years ago it was a pretty straightforward process although I will not get into some of the shenanigans that went on. The process in essence was that union organizers did their best to convince employees they would be better off in the union.

It was kind of a strange twist at the time. I remember thinking it was so ironic. We had just sent our entire staff and their spouses on a free trip to Hawaii. Maybe that was coercion but what happened of course is that they used all kinds of tactics to organize. They will do that. Organizers have their own way of doing that. They convinced enough workers to go so they convinced them in a vote. People voted and they were able to go forward.

Did we go to the labour relations board and say this should not happen, that this was an injustice? We said we would have to adjust some of our things accordingly. They wanted to be paid on a scale and they asked us to remove all the bonuses. I could not understand it, never could and never will. We removed the bonus system and other stuff and they preferred it. That was the workers' choice. They made the choice and went ahead.

The choice is theirs and should be theirs in a secret ballot. There should be no way they have to stand up at a public meeting and ask

if anyone dares to stand up against the motion and people cower in the background. Of course not. They should be able to say "I am going to go to the ballot box and make my vote. I either want to join the union or I do not". It is their choice to make. By all means, that is the balance. That is the check and the balance in itself in the secret ballot box.

What this motion tries to correct is the error in the government legislation. The government can say "Only a third of the people voted for that but we think we know better than they do. We think we can read their minds, we are omniscient. We have that special power available only to government ministers and we can tell that they did not really mean it, so we will override their democratic choice and we will get them to join that union whether they like it or not".

• (1245)

I wonder what would happen on the decertification side. What would the unions say if they said that only 35% voted to decertify but they could tell the rest of them did not really mean it? Sure they voted, it was a secret ballot, they put their minds around the issue and they made it up on their own, but really they are what? Are they children? They are not. These are adults making a choice in a free and democratic society. They should no more be decertified on a 35% vote than they should be certified.

It is a simple case. If the board said that it felt something coercive was going on, if it felt somebody was out of line in some way, then it should order another vote. It should say that it will not stand for whatever the activity might be. If the union is out of line by pressuring somebody or the employer threatens somebody, we can deal with that. That is illegal. You cannot coerce people on this. So we are going to deal with that activity and then we are going to order another vote. As a free society we have secret ballots and choice on so many issues. We should also have that choice to join or not to join a union.

This Reform motion tries to bring that balance into the legislation. There is a need for workers to make that choice and they have a right to know that choice will be respected when the ballots are counted. This balance is not in this legislation. The balance we propose under Motion No. 7 brings it back in.

I would love to talk about final offer binding arbitration and another way to balance conflicting interests but I will do that during debate on a further group of amendments.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lee Morrison: Mr. Speaker, we do not have a quorum.

[*English*]

And the count having been taken:

Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The question is on Motion No. 6. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The recorded division on Motion No. 6 stands deferred. The next question is on Motion No. 7. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The recorded division on Motion No. 7 stands deferred.

● (1250)

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 8. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 30. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The recorded division on Motion No. 30 stands deferred.

We will now proceed to the motions in Group No. 3.

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-19, in Clause 24, be amended by replacing lines 32 to 45 on page 19 and lines 1 to 4 on page 20 with the following:

“47.3 (1) In this section, “previous contractor” means an employer who, under the terms of a contract or other arrangement that is no longer in force, provided preboard security screening services to another employer, or to a person acting on behalf of that other employer, in an industry referred to in paragraph (e) of the definition “federal work, undertaking or business” in section 2.”

Motion No. 28

That Bill C-19, in Clause 45, be amended

(a) by replacing line 25 on page 35 with the following:

“tion 24(4) or 34(6), section 37, 50 or 69,”

(b) by replacing line 32 on page 35 with the following:

“subsection 24(4), paragraph”

He said: Mr. Speaker, this clause of Bill C-19, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code, is dealing with successor rights in a contract.

Government Orders

What we are suggesting here is that a large section of this successor rights legislation should be removed because it basically gives too much discretionary power to the minister. We really do not think it is appropriate that the minister has the power to say which federally regulated industries or businesses are going to have this successor rights applied to them.

The minister and departmental officials have explained to the committee and to me that the biggest concern here was with preboarding screening at airports. When the people providing the services at the airports would organize then usually what would follow would be the sale of the business providing the contract to the airport. The sale of the business would nullify the union that had just been organized.

• (1255)

The department was telling us that it had a large concern in the area of security for airports, and that it was continually training and retraining people to do the work of screening at the airports. There was the possibility that security would not be as efficient and as effective as it should be. Perhaps we should give the minister and his department that much.

What we are saying is that we are not willing to allow the minister carte blanche on deciding which industries would be affected by these successor contracts, which businesses would be handcuffed by not being able to renegotiate with their employees should they take over in a bona fide sale condition.

There are other parts that apply to this portion that determine and define what is meant by sale, which in any sort of leasing program or rollover the business is deemed to have been sold.

My colleague from British Columbia is most anxious to speak to this bill and to this amendment. He has instances where railroads have been willing to close spur lines and private companies have been willing to buy up the line from them and start short line railroads. It is a disincentive to those fledgling businesses to take a contract that is going to handcuff them into paying the same sort of wages and benefits that CPR or CNR have been paying.

This is a disincentive to business. Some members on the government side have some concern with this part of the act. I am hopeful they will have an opportunity to address this in their remarks and I am hopeful they will concur with the Reform Party that this should be addressed. I am anticipating their overwhelming support for my motion.

The hon. member from Rainy River has some expertise in the railroads. I am positive that he will be on his feet in a few minutes to tell us about the great benefits in the railroad unions.

There is some merit to the aspect of preboarding screening. Everyone in Canada should feel secure that preboarding screening is done with the utmost of care and that no foreign materials or

contraband can be smuggled on to aircraft. We all feel a lot better about that because we use those services so often.

It does not seem to matter what bill we are addressing in this House. Over and over again the governor in council has been given the latitude to make all kinds of rulings that should be addressed in legislation rather than left to the whim of the minister and cabinet.

The present government when it was in opposition certainly must have made similar representations at that time. I am very concerned because of what might happen through orders in council. I would ask them to consider very carefully this aspect of the bill.

• (1300)

The successor rights provided in this bill will have the effect of really tying in anybody who is a bona fide purchaser of any federally regulated industry to whatever contract the predecessor had. If the company was not flourishing at the time that the seller sold then it would be very difficult for a fledgling person to step into an area where he would have to compete with a global supplier as in the case of the railroads.

In Alberta there are short line railways. If they had to compete with all the classifications found in the unions as far as job descriptions and all the rest it would be very difficult for them. As it is they are in a position where they can provide a very effective service with minimal amounts tied up in labour capital.

One particular operator in Alberta is the engineer of a very successful short line railroad. I am sure he would most concerned if he were to read these portions of the bill.

In other sections of the bill we have to be very cognizant that the legislation the House of Commons passes should have some benefit for the average person in Canada. The average person in Canada is very dependent on the state of the economy, whether it is buoyant, stagnant or whether it is actually going backward. We would have to assess every piece of legislation to that effect and assess whether the average Canadian will benefit from the things we are talking about on the bill or whether this will make it easier to form unions, thereby benefiting the union bosses rather than the union rank and file.

I am certain there are other members who would like to add their wisdom to this portion of the bill which I would be most interested in hearing. I encourage members to vote in favour of this most sensible amendment.

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, successor rights provisions in the Canada Labour Code have not been interpreted to apply where there is a change of contractor.

As a result when employees of a contractor elect to unionize and bargain collectively they often lose their jobs or are forced to give up monetary benefits when the contract is awarded to another contractor.

Government Orders

As recommended by the Sims task force, Bill C-19 does not extend successor right provisions to loss of contract situation. The bill does include a provision applicable only to airport preboarding security screening contracts which serves a number of purposes. It protects the remuneration of a group of low wage employees who have lost their employment when a contractor has been able to win a tender by lowering wage rates. It codifies an existing Transport Canada policy which was negotiated with the airlines in 1998 to address questions about the quality of preboarding security screening services at Canadian airports. The official opposition has put forward a motion to delete paragraph B of the provision which would authorize the governor in council to extend application of this provision. Extension of the provision would be considered only should serious problems attributable to contract retendering arise in other services or sectors and only following thorough consultations with affected parties.

• (1305)

As members are no doubt aware, amending the Canada Labour Code can be a lengthy process. This provision will ensure that potentially serious situations can be addressed within reasonable timeframes.

Motion No. 28 would deny an employee any remedy if his or her employer violates section 47.3 by failing to pay equivalent remuneration.

I urge members to not support those motions.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Motions No. 9 and 28 introduced by the Reform Party member, because they are related.

I think that the best way of understanding the doublespeak too often characteristic of legislation and officialdom is to read the explanatory notes provided by the government.

What we are to take from Motion No. 9 is that, because of the problems caused by the airline industry's practice of awarding successive contracts for pre-board security screening services, Transport Canada concluded, in 1988, an agreement with Canadian to protect the salaries and benefits of employees when pre-board security screening services were put out to tender. This is the policy that is codified in law.

The bill adds that it will be possible to extend the application of this provision to other sectors of activity that might, of course, be designated by regulations made by the governor in council. This has to do with the whole idea of the privatization of certain public services. Members know how popular this is right now.

It is the matter of the continuity of existing collective agreements, that is the improved general working conditions employees

have managed to acquire over years, very often decades, of labour relations, particularly with respect to wages. This is what the Reform Party wants to lay open to question again.

This is most unfortunate, in our opinion, because these are social gains which have enabled us to live in what can be described as a civilized society, benefiting from the gains acquired by the labour movement at the cost of great struggle, and we must not forget this. Those gains have led to a more just society, at least in certain areas.

The Reform motion lays all of this open to question again, as it refuses to acknowledge the previous contractor, or in other words the obligation of the new contractor to provide employees with the same benefits they received before.

The Reform Party is also subtly challenging the board's ability to intervene. In order to be consistent with its own rather sneaky attack against the low wage earners, against unionized workers, it says that the board ought not to have the power to intervene under section 47.3, which deals with the previous contractor.

It wants this to be removed, which would mean the board could no longer invoke section 47.3, which applies to contractors and allows the board to require the party against which a complaint has been filed—since there is a right to file a complaint if one feels one is not being properly treated by a new contractor—to cease to contravene these requirements.

As a result of eliminating section 47.3 and the possibility of intervention if such cases do occur when there is more privatization as a result of increased deregulation and government withdrawal from certain areas, this will prevent the board from being able to order the employer to pay employees an amount equivalent to, or in excess of, the amount they would have been paid by the employer if there had not been a violation.

• (1310)

This gives a very good idea of the sort of mentality to be found in the official opposition, within this so-called reform party, which reforms from underneath, widens the gap between the rich and the poor and delights in the monstrous profits made by private industry, where there is no requirement to be accountable, except to the shareholders. They are almost congratulating themselves on the widening gap between the rich and the poor. They want to bring everyone down to the same level. They challenge such commendable things as unions. They challenge them instead of recognizing them.

The working conditions of the honest worker are at stake. This is what is being challenged by those who have a say, who polish their halos as they bend parliamentary procedures, as we have seen recently, and they are doing this on the backs of low income Canadians.

Government Orders

We must decry this with our very last breath, because, in the end, workers' dignity is at issue. The aim is to make the biggest profits with the lowest expenditure on the backs of the employees. This was curbed in the evolution of societies through the intervention of unions and the arrival of social programs. It was regulated somewhat. In today's neo-liberal context, there are lawyers of their ilk who defend the widening of the gap between the rich and the poor, and I think it is our job to criticize them.

[English]

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am quite interested in these clauses. I did rise to speak to some of the other motions to try to convey our views and why we are not in favour of Reform's motions to amend Bill C-19 at this late stage.

The motions we are dealing with now, Nos. 9 and 28, deal with successor rights, a fundamental principle that we should be happy to have strengthened and enshrined in our code because it is a matter of basic fairness again.

Like so many of the changes in Bill C-19, it finds its origins in the fact that we are striving for a balanced situation to be put in place that is more fair to all the parties. It deals specifically with airport workers. However, we can take this idea further because with the privatization and more and more frequent sales and mergers of companies, this issue comes up more often in the federally regulated industrial relations climate.

There are recent horrifying examples that have worked out to the detriment of workers. For instance, in the privatization at Goose Bay, non-military people are now being hired back by the private contractor at about half the wages they used to make before. The instances were piling up to the point where it was necessary to take some steps.

I do not think any of these motions are going to really help us to achieve social justice. I do not think one can ever achieve social justice through parliamentary means, frankly, because that is the job of the labour movement. It is the union's job to achieve economic and social justice.

What we can do is try to create the legislative framework within which unions can function, prosper, flourish and do their jobs. Bill C-19 tries to deal with the historic imbalance that exists between employers and employees, the imbalance in the power relationship. We are trying to level those things out so that people have a fighting chance and can deal with each other on a level playing field.

A number of the motions that Reform is trying to advocate here worry me because there is always something just below the surface that is kind of sinister about Reform motions. It is cause for concern. It is not even that far under the surface. It is sometimes quite overt. A person can be presumed to have intended the

probable consequences of his or her actions. It is a well known point in law. The probable and predictable consequences of many of the motions the Reform Party is advocating would be that it would be much more difficult for workers to form a union. It would be much more difficult for workers to negotiate benefits through their union, and all those predictable things.

● (1315)

Really what they are trying to sell here is a worked over version of the right-to-work policy and philosophy. Right to work is the sad state of affairs in 21 of the United States. I do not think it is any coincidence that the Fraser Institute has just released "Right to Work", the answer for the new millennium for labour relations, which is being flogged around the Hill. In fact, copies were delivered to my office.

Reform is using Bill C-19 as a launching pad to try to kick off its campaign to introduce right-to-work legislation in this country. It failed to do that in the province of Alberta. Even a right winger like Ralph Klein threw the idea out because it is an obsolete, out-dated and divisive concept. It has tried to introduce it into parliament in a back-handed, back-door way.

While we are legitimately trying to make Bill C-19 better, those members are trying to tear down the whole idea with a rather sinister package of motions which really undermines the whole concept of freedom of association, the right to collective bargaining and the legitimate role of unions to try to elevate the standards of wages and working conditions for the people they represent.

There is nothing wrong with fair wages. Fair wages benefit the whole community. In the richest and most powerful civilization in the history of the world, someone would have a hard time arguing why we should be tightening our belts and rolling back when banks and corporations are making record profits. Who will advocate for working people that point of view if unions will not make the argument for them?

I really am worried by the tone and the content of some of the motions put forward by the Reform Party. I think there is an underlying objective here. I used the word "sinister" and I do not think it is overstating things.

Those members seem to have, whether it is stated right up front or coming in the back door in some kind of sleazy way, a secondary objective. I can point out one case certainly. They were arguing that when 35% of the cards are signed, under Bill C-19 a vote will be ordered. The labour board may have a supervised vote so that workers can then choose whether they want a union or not.

The change they made would result in having a vote every time. Even if the workers' representative went to the labour board with 85% of the cards signed, their change states that the labour board shall order a vote. Workers would have to vote even if they

demonstrated 100% support. They are making people vote twice. How democratic is that?

Are those members not satisfied that people have voted once? Will people be made to vote until the desired result is achieved? They talk about democracy. That is nothing short of sleazy. It is an abuse of power.

Those members are trying to slip in a secondary objective with something which, on the face of it, might look like a reasonable request.

If they were only asking that the board shall order a vote if 35% of the cards are signed, but if 51% of the cards are signed or 50%-plus certification is automatic, I could then vote in favour of the motion. But that is not what they mean. It is a much bigger package than that.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to point out some of these things before the end of the day. I have a feeling we are going to be up and down a number of times saying that those members are abusing democracy again. Although I should not say that because filibustering is a legitimate tactic that members use in the House of Commons.

However, it makes me wonder how it is in the best interests of the Canadian people. It makes me wonder whether they have really thought about the 100,000 prairie farmers who are very anxious to see Bill C-19 go through so they can ship their crops with the comfort of knowing that things will be handled and there will not be any work stoppages interfering with the movement of their commodity.

Have they talked to the UGG? Have they talked to the pool elevator operators? Have they talked to the prairie farmers and received their okay for dragging this bill to a halt and preventing Canadians from having the advantage of this very worthwhile piece of legislation? I do not think so, because the prairie farmers who those members like to think they represent would give them an earful. I think they would tell them loud and clear that they want passage of Bill C-19 because it has merit and value. It is good for Canadian working people and it will create balance.

• (1320)

In some of their remarks they even had the audacity to suggest that Bill C-19 is going to somehow have an impact on our ability to trade internationally, that it is going to hold us back. They were talking about the guy from Papua, New Guinea. It is completely absurd.

In actual fact the countries that are moving forward, the countries that are making progress, are the countries that deal in a tripartite way, where business, government and labour sit down at

Government Orders

the table together to chart a social and economic plan and platform. It is not divisive. These guys are living in the past. They want to smash unions. They want unions out of the way. They do not recognize the legitimacy of unions.

We are not going to move forward if we have that mindset. The hon. member for Trois-Rivières is nodding his head because Quebec's model follows those lines. Labour is a legitimate practitioner in the community. Labour is seen to have a valid opinion and is consulted.

When the Reform Party finally gives up trying to bash unions and trying to be shills for the right to work movement and the Fraser Institute, maybe we can move forward as a country in a truly tripartite fashion. I think that is what Bill C-19 speaks to and that gives me some hope that there is an interest in dealing with issues in that way.

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, there are two things I could do; however, I am going to do only one. My temptation is to get into this tirade of nonsense that we were just subjected to, but I am not going to do that. I am going to talk about the amendments in Group No. 3.

An hon. member: You have some support on the other side there, Werner.

Mr. Werner Schmidt: I am so pleased that for a change the government has seen some wisdom coming from the official opposition. That is very good and I commend government members for it. I hope that when it comes to Group No. 2 they will remember that and vote in favour of the motion that the official opposition has presented. It is very significant that they do that because democracy is at the heart of this issue to a large degree. There are a lot of things at the heart of this issue.

I would like to get to the actual amendment that is being proposed by the official opposition. I would like to read that part of the bill which is being deleted by this amendment.

If we look at the bill we see that the connecting word is "or". We can do this specific thing that is being codified in the legislation that currently exists governing airports, employees and the contracts that exist. Then it says "or". We want to leave that first part in because to codify that is advisable and a good thing. But after that we find the word "or" and it states:

(b) provided any other service that may be designated by regulation of the Governor in Council,—

That opens the door to anything. It is so wide open we could drive half a dozen trucks through it and we would not know they had gone through. It continues:

—on the recommendation of the Minister, to another employer or a person acting on behalf of that employer in any industry that may be designated by regulation of the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister.

Private Members' Business

That is so wide open that it really takes away one of the fundamental considerations in running a business or in negotiating a contract.

By the way, I have to slip at least one point in here to respond to the tirade of remarks that we heard just a moment ago.

• (1325)

The official opposition in no way opposes the organization of labour into groups to negotiate contracts. In fact we encourage that in a way that allows that kind of organization to take place in the most democratic fashion that can be devised. That is at the heart of this issue. Having done that, we need to recognize that if we are going to have contracts like that—and the idea of successor rights deals with those contracts—the one thing we do not want in those contracts is ambiguity.

Paragraph (b), which we are deleting from the proposed bill, makes it totally ambiguous as to who will and who will not be designated by the governor in council on the recommendation of the minister, and who should be included or excluded in terms of successor rights. That is precisely what contract negotiations are all about. They take away the ambiguity of salary schedules, they take away the ambiguity of benefits, bonuses, group insurance plans or whatever the employee benefits might be. All of those are written into the contract to take away that ambiguity.

The successor rights that presently exist ensure that the employee who has been employed by a previous contract can continue on through to the next employer when doing the same kind of work as the employee was doing under contract with the federal government. The employee is employed by the minister. However, paragraph (b), which we want to delete, opens it up so wide that nobody knows what in the world is going on. One of the major reasons we oppose this is because of the ambiguity.

Not only do we want definite, specific certification requirements, we want specific recognition of what exists or does not exist in terms of successor rights. We want that for three reasons: it provides stability, predictability and confidence for the contractor, the existing business, the employer and the government. We want to know what it will cost us.

I cannot believe my ears sometimes when the government seems to say only this far and no farther, but in the next instance it seems to have an absolutely open door. For the life of me I cannot understand some of the nonsense we heard yesterday about the absolutely open, unaccountable regional development agencies. They can come forward, make applications, present their budgets, have no measurable objectives, change their mandates every three or four years and the government say this is responsible.

We want to know how much an employment contract will cost. Then we can plan our budgets properly. We also want to be able to predict what the new employer will be involved in with this group of employees. We want to be confident that the contract will not be changed arbitrarily or that if another employer were to take a related contract that somehow another union would come in and change the employer's relationship with the employees. Then we would have a contradiction and a major conflict.

That brings me to the beginning of this bill. This is the number one purpose of the bill:

This enactment implements reforms to the industrial relations provisions of Part I of the Canada Labour Code, to provide a framework for collective bargaining that enhances the ability of labour and management to frame their own agreements and allows workplace disputes to be resolved in a timely and cost effective manner.

That is the underlying principle which is supposed to be governing this legislation. It is a wonderful statement. Who would not agree with that kind of statement? Then we see a provision like this and we ask: What does that do to bring about harmony and stability? What does that do to create planning, consistency and the confidence that this will work?

It is amazing the way in which Liberals can twist logic.

• (1330)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): It being 1.30 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]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I received notice from the hon. member for London North Centre that he is unable to move his motion during private members' hour on Monday, May 11, 1998.

It has not been possible to arrange an exchange of positions in the order of precedence. Accordingly I am directing the table officers to drop that item of business to the bottom of the order of precedence. Private members' hour will thus be cancelled and government orders will begin at 11.00 a.m.

* * *

RURAL ROAD SYSTEM

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should apply a portion of tax dollars raised on fuel sales to the maintenance of the rural road system in Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a beautiful sunny Friday afternoon in Ottawa. I know the majority of members in the House would much

Private Members' Business

prefer to be in their ridings or with their families. However, I assure them that I will make sure I keep their attention totally rapt on an issue that is extremely important not only for constituents in my riding but for constituents throughout our great country.

The issue I have brought forward is not a terribly romantic one. It is not something that people can stand on soapboxes, make wonderful speeches and get very emotional about. Even though there is no romanticism tied in with the issue, I can assure it is a very vital issue. The issue is one that is the economic lifeline of rural Canada, particularly western rural communities.

The motion as put forward has not been deemed to be votable, which is unfortunate and I mean that very sincerely. I know members of the Liberal government would be more than happy to support an issue of this nature. A number of members on the government side have these issues and problems cropping up in their communities, particularly those in rural Ontario.

This is the economic lifeline of rural Canada. This is the economic lifeline of western Canada wherein the commodities produced in rural western Canada are commodities that have to travel across a transportation system to get to market.

The agricultural industry is a huge industrial sector in Canada. We are known nationally and internationally as the providers of agricultural products second to none. In order to take the product from the farm gate and get it to world markets it requires a transportation system and infrastructure that are in proper condition.

Sir John A. Macdonald saw transportation as a link of this great country. He saw it through the railroads. Now our transportation systems have changed quite dramatically over those years. We now have dramatic changes in air travel. We have dramatic changes in rubber traffic and travel on road systems. In fact, back in Sir John A.'s day he would not have expected the kind of travel we have now on the electronic highway. If the truth be known, it is still the simplistic transportation system of roadways that is so very important to our country.

Rural infrastructure is deteriorating as we speak. The rural infrastructure is in peril. It is in absolute disarray at this point in time, the reason being there are no federal tax dollars going into our national highways.

• (1335)

Because of Liberal policy, the reduction of transfer payments and their impacts on provincial governments, provincial governments have cut back on their own infrastructure. They are also responsible for ensuring our national highways are maintained, upgraded and rehabilitated.

There is no federal money going into the national highways program. The reconstruction and maintenance of the Trans-Canada Highway are done on the backs of the provinces. The provinces spend their money. I give them full credit, particularly the western provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. They have done an exemplary job with perhaps the exception of Saskatchewan which has not put a lot of money into the Trans-Canada Highway. The other three western provinces have put substantial dollars to twin the highway which is the vital transportation link across the country.

They have done it with provincial dollars and without federal dollars. Thus they do not have any provincial dollars to put into secondary roads. I speak today of the secondary roads which are the vital link to our rural communities and to major market areas. That downloading has caused severe problems.

Let us look in our mind's eye at producers in rural Manitoba, rural Saskatchewan or rural Alberta. No longer do we have the vital rail links we have talked about, have heard about and have in fact experienced. As a result of CN and CP rail abandonment programs the short lines going into communities have now been abandoned.

The only option for producers in the areas is to transport their commodities—and we are talking huge bulk commodities in most cases—across rural municipal roads that do not have the benefit of tax dollars to the same degree as federal government. These roads unfortunately cannot be maintained by small rural municipalities which have a smaller assessment base today than they had previously.

Producers are taking the commodity and transporting it many more miles than they had to years ago. In their wisdom grain companies, and rightfully so, are developing new and major grain terminals, high throughput terminals. By example, I have four new terminals being built in my constituency.

With four new high throughput terminals also comes the abandonment of the smaller grain elevator which in most cases was located close to the producer. Producers only had to travel perhaps 5, 10 or 15 kilometres to arrive at an elevator. Now they have to travel in some cases up to 100 kilometres on rural roads for which there is no money available for maintenance.

Producers are now using much larger vehicles such as semi-trailers and B-trains or a semi-trailer with a little pup attached. Unfortunately they take a grave and great toll on highways in the rural areas of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. This is a great dilemma for the RMs. Because of the downloading from the provinces and no money coming in, obviously the opportunity of getting product to market becomes less and less possible and more and more expensive.

This little preamble explains why I am here, why we are here and why this issue is so very important. The real issue is how to get

Private Members' Business

dollars to the real area of responsibility. The real responsibility lies with the federal government. It lies with the federal government to put in place a national highways program.

I will not talk specifically to that right now, but let us look at the waterfall effect. If there were a national highways program where the federal government put in dollars and provincial governments did not have to spend money on the Trans-Canada Highway or major routes, they could then put their money back into where it is necessary right now in rural municipalities.

Canada remains the only developed country in the world that does not have a national policy for highways. Canada has a national policy for air, marine and rail, but none for the mode that conveys the most people and the most goods. That is deplorable.

• (1340)

I am asking today that dollars be identified simply from a percentage of the excise tax raised on fuel. This does not take a rocket scientist to understand.

The federal government collects from taxpayers billions of dollars a year through taxes on fuel. Virtually none of that money goes into the actual area it should, infrastructure and road improvement. It goes into this big black hole called general revenue and is spent on wonderful projects the Liberals see fit to support such as the backbencher's millennium fund and other areas of responsibility. It certainly has not gone into the compensation package for hepatitis C victims, but I was not to mention that in this speech.

The federal government has said it would allocate 50 cents of every dollar of anticipated surplus for new priorities. It would be my humble opinion to suggest to the government it should start helping rural Canada by endorsing the principle of the motion.

The motion calls on the federal government to make a real commitment to rural Canada. The rural road system is a vital element to Canadians from coast to coast, but in particular my area of responsibility, western Canada, has not been given a fair and equitable consideration in this matter.

That being said, the committee on Private Members' Business did not deem the motion votable. Unfortunately the majority of committee members did not see it as an important enough issue to deem it votable. I think there would be a wide range of support from all members if in fact they had the opportunity to vote on the motion.

Western Canada will receive less than 2% of all federal investment in highways during the next five years. Cash flow projects from Transport Canada suggest that during the next five years the federal government will contribute about \$900 million to eastern Canada for highway construction. Western Canada will receive \$13 million, of which zero goes to Manitoba, \$2 million goes to

Saskatchewan, zero to Alberta, \$6 million to B.C., \$4 million to Yukon and \$900,000 to the territories.

It is clear that municipal governments cannot continue to carry the financial burden of the maintenance of these roads without more financial contribution from the federal government.

In Manitoba alone the federal government will collect approximately \$140.7 million in road excise tax this year and zero will go back to Manitoba in that same time. The federal government has not committed any funding toward Manitoba's provincial highway system for the 1998-99 fiscal year.

In the years between 1992 and 1996 the federal government allocated on average \$6.4 million per year to Manitoba despite collecting in Manitoba an average of \$124 million per year.

An hon. member: What about the equalization funds?

Mr. Rick Borotsik: The equalization payments have already been cut. The equalization payments have been reduced by some 35% in the meantime. I am trying to concentrate specifically on the excise tax that is being collected, \$140 million out and zero back into roads.

In reality the federal government has only put 4.8% of the money it collects from Manitoba road users back into Manitoba roads. That is deplorable.

It should also be noted that of the \$27 million the western grain transportation adjustment fund allocated by the federal government to Manitoba in 1997 very little went back to roads. The Liberal government of the day decided it was best to put it into the electronic highway as opposed to the rural infrastructure program.

There are some alternatives. As a matter of fact the president of UGG said that moneys generated from the sale of the hopper cars that will take place, the \$250 million to \$350 million, should go back into rural road infrastructure. Its president, Mr. Ted Allen, said that investment in road infrastructure at both the federal and provincial level had failed to keep up with the pace of the burgeoning growth in the agriculture sector.

• (1345)

When the hopper cars are sold, the money should not be put back into general revenue for these wonderful programs that are thought up. The money should be put back into the programs that we should have right now such as rural roads.

The president also noted that the federal government collects over \$4 billion in fuel tax revenue annually, but last year spent only \$270 million nationally in road infrastructure. That being said I would like to say that the federal government in fact does have a mandate. It is a federal responsibility to make sure that the infrastructure in the transportation system in this country is in working order.

The economy that is developed and generated from rural Canada is immense. We have to make sure that the infrastructure stays in place in order for us to enable the economy to further develop. We must further develop that infrastructure.

I do have an opportunity to wrap up in the last five minutes. I will be more than happy to do that.

Mr. Tony Valeri (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this motion recommends that the government dedicate all the revenues from fuel taxes to just one purpose, maintaining Canada's rural road system.

First let us make it clear that from day one this government has recognized the importance of Canada's infrastructure to improve our quality of life, unlike the hon. member across the way.

One of the first actions we took upon taking office in 1993 was to launch the \$6 billion Canada infrastructure program together with the provinces and municipalities as partners. The program was extended last year with an additional \$425 million federal commitment. This joint effort has benefited both urban and rural communities by strengthening their competitiveness with improved infrastructure, including rural roads.

Let us also be very clear about the consequences of supporting the motion we are debating today. In 1996-97 excise taxes on fuel amounted to \$4.4 billion. By earmarking these funds for rural road maintenance, the government would then have three options: reduce spending in other areas by the same amount; raise taxes by \$4.4 billion; or let the deficit re-emerge, one thing that the hon. member is very familiar with given the fact that he is from the Conservative Party.

Canadians do not want their health spending, education assistance or old age security cut by \$4.4 billion. They do not want their taxes increased by \$4.4 billion. And they certainly do not want the deficit to reappear after having made so many sacrifices to get rid of it. Clearly none of these options is acceptable.

Equally important, earmarking taxes is an idea that is fundamentally flawed. It would curtail the government's ability to respond to new and emerging priorities. It could result in overfunding of some initiatives and underfunding of others.

To be effective, government has to be flexible so it can adapt quickly to changing priorities. That is why the government's current policy is to direct all revenues into the consolidated revenue fund from which all initiatives are funded. Simply put, earmarking taxes would tie the government's hands by limiting its ability to address important priorities as they arise. It is simply bad policy.

It is clear that the government is in much better fiscal shape than it was even several years ago and that it will have more room to manoeuvre in the years ahead and more resources to address

Private Members' Business

important issues, but we must maintain a realistic perspective in this regard. In an era of limited resources government must be focused. It must work in partnership and it must only act where it can make a difference. It must take a balanced approach to the overriding objective of building a strong economy and a secure society.

The 1998 budget announced a historic fiscal achievement and reconfirmed our balanced approach to building a strong economy and a secure society. It announced that the federal books would be balanced in 1997-98 for the first time since 1970. We will also balance the budget this year and next year. It is the first time in almost 50 years that Canadians will see three consecutive balanced budgets.

Our commitment to fiscal responsibility to put an end to credit card government does not end there. We will reduce Canada's debt burden through a two front strategy of stronger economic growth and a concrete debt repayment plan.

Our government has always recognized that a healthy bottom line is a means to an end and not an end in itself, unlike the Reform Party. The 1998 budget uses our new leverage for strategic investments in areas where government can make a difference.

For example the budget launched the Canadian opportunities strategy. The strategy, including the Canada millennium scholarships, will improve Canadians' access to knowledge and skills, something that the Reform Party is not in favour of.

The budget provides funding to increase the Canada child tax benefit by an additional \$850 million in two steps.

Improving Canadian health care is one of the government's core priorities. That is why as our books improve one of our first and most significant initiatives was to introduce legislation to increase the Canada health and social transfer cash floor from \$11 billion to \$12.5 billion.

• (1350)

Finally the 1998 budget also begins the process of general income tax relief which is a key priority for Canadians and for the government. We all know, as it has been said often in the House, that at the outset tax relief measures would be modest because the financial dividend that makes them possible is modest as well. The budget announced reductions in taxes for those who can least afford to pay them, low and middle income Canadians. These measures will provide close to \$1.6 billion in tax relief to 14 million low and middle income Canadians, that being 90% of all income tax filers.

These are the government's priorities. We believe that they reflect what Canadians want.

Our goal is to build a strong economy and a secure society, one that can provide Canadians with the opportunity and the ability to

Private Members' Business

succeed in an ever evolving economy while still ensuring their security and well-being. Our approach is delivering real benefits for Canadians today and a robust outlook for Canada as we look toward the new millennium. We saw the unemployment numbers just the other day.

Governments have to make choices. We have to make choices about what priorities we should pursue as a government and ensure that those priorities reflect what Canadians tell us.

Earmarking over \$4 billion in revenues for rural highway maintenance would not be the best choice for Canada or Canadians. That is why I urge all members to reject the motion before the House. It is bad policy. It is a policy that does not reflect Canadian priorities.

I respectfully submit that what the government has done since 1993 does reflect what Canadians have asked for. We see the fruits of our labour. We see that Canadians have made sacrifices. The government is not about to squander the sacrifices Canadians have made by imposing a policy upon them that would not reflect what they want.

The government will not start to earmark money and get into the whole scenario where it is overfunding in one area, underfunding in another area and ultimately having to make choices. To do what the hon. member is asking we would have to raise taxes. We would have to make cuts in other areas in order to fund \$4.4 billion to do what the hon. member is asking. That is not what Canadians are asking for. It is certainly not what the government is prepared to do.

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the shortage of money the parliamentary secretary refers to could be solved if we gave all the national highways to Bombardier. There is always money for folks like them. Then there would be no argument here today.

I listened to the parliamentary secretary's dissertation and I lost track of the number of times I heard the words "our government, this government, my government". This is Private Members' Business. I do not think the hon. parliamentary secretary is clear on the concept. In fact he is hardly clear on any concept.

This is the only country in the western world that has no national highway program or even a coherent national highway policy. This country has 900,000 kilometres of public roads, streets and highways. Of them, 202,000 or 22% are in my own little province of Saskatchewan and a minuscule fraction, 15,000 kilometres are federal roads mostly in parks and on Indian reserves. Another 24,400 kilometres are part of the designated national highway system.

The federal government collects a whopping \$5 billion annually in fuel taxes of which \$4 billion comes specifically from highway fuels.

I would remind the hon. parliamentary secretary that the excise tax on fuels was initiated in response to the first fuel shock. It was used to buy up a bunch of private oil companies. It was a portion of the discredited national energy policy. It was a stick with which to beat the Canadian people.

• (1355)

Guess what? We are not using the excise tax for that purpose any longer. But has anyone ever heard of a government ceasing to collect a tax that it does not use for the purpose that it was designed for? Good heavens, we are still collecting the income tax which was brought in as an emergency measure to finance the war effort in World War I. We still have the excise tax that was brought in to help us through the first oil shock.

To cut this down to a little finer geographic limit, on gasoline alone, not diesel, the federal fuel excise tax in the prairie provinces is \$650 million. The annual return to those provinces is limited to a few million, very few million as we heard from the hon. member for Brandon—Souris. For their excise taxes they get back a little bit of WGTA compensation for roads and a minuscule share of the famous infrastructure program.

Concerning Saskatchewan, I have to disagree with the hon. member for Brandon—Souris. Saskatchewan has actually given up on the predatory federal government and has started on its own to go ahead and twin the Trans-Canada Highway. With partners like we have in the federal government there is just no hope.

Saskatchewan actually had all its money on the table four years ago for the twinning program. The feds negotiated but when it came down to the short strokes and discovered that the Saskatchewan government was serious, it ran for the woods. Now we are paying for it ourselves.

I would like to give some numbers. This is the place where numbers should be discussed as it is a technical subject. The U.S. invests 31% of its gas tax revenues in highways. Germany invests 38%. Italy invests 45%. Australia invests 50%. France and Spain invest 65% each. Great Britain invests 100%. Canada invests 4% in highways.

With rail line abandonments we are having a disaster in our transportation system in western Canada. The highways and municipal roads are falling apart. Nevertheless, I do not have exactly the same take on this as the member for Brandon—Souris. I do not think the feds should take dedicated fuel tax revenues and put them directly into municipal or rural roads. I do believe that the government should give a reasonable portion of them to the provinces to use, as they would naturally bring them back into the municipal system.

I also believe the government should meet its obligations and do something about our disgraceful national highway system. We are a laughing stock.

There is one little stretch of the famous Trans-Canada Highway in the western edge of my riding, 108 kilometres, that has killed 39 people in the last 20 years. People call it the death strip. It is one of the places where the Saskatchewan government is now starting to do some twinning. It is in the Maple Creek area. This is only one death strip. There is another one in the Kicking Horse Pass. There is another one not too far out of Revelstoke. They are everywhere and this government will not pony up to its responsibilities.

At one time we had legislation in this country to bring in a national highway system. We actually completed a Trans-Canada Highway of sorts way back in 1961 but since then nothing has happened. We have a federal government that shirks its responsibility.

The Canadian Automobile Association has come with a plan which I and my party have supported now for a number of months. I think it makes eminent sense. They say "We know the federal government is addicted to this excise tax. It cannot just put it all from whence it came into roads where it should go. So give us back a mere 20%, two cents to the litre". Within six or seven years we would have a national highway system that we would not have to be ashamed of, that would not be killing our citizens, that would not be forcing people driving from eastern to western Canada to divert down through Michigan in order to avoid our national highway.

• (1400)

This is happening right now. It is not just mom and pop on vacation but the commercial trucking industry is picking its way down through the United States in order to avoid the use of the Trans-Canada Highway. That is embarrassing. That is disgraceful.

As a Reformer of course I cannot avoid talking about costs. The hon. parliamentary secretary alluded to it. We would not have money to do surveys on the desirability of sodomy if we were going to spend money on public roads. But if we do not look after our roads they disintegrate.

In the first 12 years the cost of maintaining a paved road is only \$500 to \$1,000 per annum per kilometre. At that point deterioration accelerates and we have to start resurfacing at a cost of about \$80,000 per lane kilometre. After another 12 years pavement break-up begins and full reconstruction has to be done at a cost of about a quarter of a million dollars per lane kilometre.

What is the old saying, a stitch in time saves nine. If we looked after these roads, if we gave them the maintenance they deserve, we would not be getting into the box we are in now.

The Trans-Canada Highway is old by highway standards. The two lane highway we have through most of the country was

actually built in 1961-62. It has to be fixed. Nobody except the feds has any money and the feds glom every nickel they can get. It is about time they started to live up to their responsibilities.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today to the motion by the member for Brandon—Souris. I will first read the motion, so we can put the debate in context.

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should apply a portion of tax dollars raised on fuel sales to the maintenance of the rural road system in Canada.

When we first read the motion, we tend to want to support it, because when as members we realize that the rural road system in our riding, in our region, is not necessarily adequate, we feel that something should be done.

Unfortunately, it is like knocking at the wrong door. The federal government should not be looking after the rural road system. We have increasingly of late been looking at the possibly of developing a home care system, which the government would look after across Canada.

The situation is the same in the case of the rural road system. It is under provincial jurisdiction, and if there is one government not equipped to look after it, it is the federal government. We need only look at the past mess in the whole business of federal government transportation policy development.

In my riding, they decided some 15 years ago to close a railway line. That put huge pressure on the road system and resulted in endless numbers of trucks on the road. Now, we are having to repair the road in question.

The province has to pay for the bad choice by the federal government because the regional road system needs to be maintained.

• (1405)

I think we have to put things in perspective. The jurisdiction is provincial and the responsibility, municipal. A whole process already exists to manage this sort of thing.

If there is a model or an approach for the future we might contemplate, it might well be the infrastructure program. The Bloc has already indicated its support for renewal of this program. It earned the congratulations of the President of the Treasury Board, who said to us on April 3, following our request, that he appreciated the Bloc Quebecois' support for the Canada-Quebec infrastructure works program and wanted to assure us that our viewpoint would be given all due consideration when the federal government examined the options for the future of the program.

This might be an approach. If the federal government wants to spend a third of the money in such a program and leave it up to the

Private Members' Business

local level to decide its priorities and how best to improve its regional network, this might be the way to go.

However, this arrangement must not provide for programs that would allow the federal government to intervene directly in the rural network. This would be in contradiction to its recent practice in the transportation sector of divesting itself of ports and airports.

Over the past 30 years of administration, we have seen that costs have skyrocketed. Costs are always higher and things are always more complicated when the government which has the jurisdiction is further removed from the reality and costs are always lower when the closer government assumes responsibility and accountability for the work done.

So, there is perhaps another approach to be considered. In the end, it is always the same consumer who pays. If people want a good rural road system and if they want the appropriate level of government, be it municipal or provincial, to have the money available, the federal government could simply reduce its tax grab and allow the government responsible for developing the rural road system to collect the money.

Unfortunately, the solution proposed will not correct a very real problem. If people decide to let the federal government invest in this project, they will never be able to ensure that it is accountable and that the money collected has actually been spent on the rural road system.

Like the member for Brandon—Souris, I have examples in my riding of manufacturers that could benefit from a better rural road system. In Saint-Joseph-de-Kamouraska, there is a small company located on a rural route that needs a better road system for reasons of improved accessibility. This would help with its economic activity, the development of its markets and the transportation of the goods it produces. In the case of examples such as these, I think that something should obviously be done.

Another example in my riding is highway 185 between Rivière-du-Loup and New Brunswick. This highway has experienced an incredible increase in car traffic because of the improvement in communications and the fact that the Rivière-du-Loup sector, among others, is a regional transportation pole. We would like to see additional money invested in this area.

I think that no one in our region would criticize the federal government for deciding all of a sudden not to go ahead with the purchase of submarines for \$750 million but rather to make this amount available to local governments to help improve the highway system.

In Canada, the highway system was developed after the railway system, which had itself been developed along an east-west axis that no longer meets current development priorities.

The road system must be developed on a north-south axis so we can travel from Vancouver to Seattle, from the western provinces to the U.S. Midwest, or from Ontario and Quebec to New England, which would ensure better access to the North American market and promote exportation.

In this respect, the federal government should ask itself whether it is really investing in the right areas.

• (1410)

Let us avoid asking the federal government to intervene in the rural road system in Canada. It lacks the efficiency for this. Besides, this is not its responsibility. It is a provincial responsibility, a municipal responsibility. The proof of this lies in the implementation of the first phase of the infrastructure program.

In my riding, we have spent money on projects in a number of municipalities, and since the municipality was in charge of the project, the work could often be done at half the cost it would have been for a higher level of government to do it.

The local government knows what is required. It knows what is needed, it knows what additional resources are needed to get results. But let us not get federal government money involved. We will lose more in administration costs than we will gain in actual investment in the project.

We have already seen this in the past, systems that cost so much to administer that the funds do not get to those they are intended to help.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that I recognize the good intentions of the hon. member behind this motion, but I do not see this as the right solution to a real problem. The real solution lies more in getting the federal government to look after its own affairs a little more, to ensure that it runs its own affairs more efficiently, to agree to decrease the tax burden on Canadians, so that the governments responsible for such projects will be the ones to levy taxes as they are needed.

The road system, whether rural, provincial, or Canada-wide, is an essential tool of economic development, and when the federal government said that it would subject all of its actions to the criterion of rural impact, I trust that this was not with the intent of intervening in areas in which it cannot be efficient.

[English]

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill (Bras d'Or, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be part of the debate today on the matter of great importance for rural Canadians. I congratulate the hon. member for focusing our attention on the state of rural roads in Canada.

With over 90% of the land mass, one third of the population, one fifth of the employed workforce, rural issues demand more attention than they receive.

Private Members' Business

Primary industries comprise the bulk of rural Canada's economic vitality. This trend comes from industries such as energy, forestry, minerals, agriculture, fisheries and many others.

Without a rural road infrastructure there is no way to get at these resources or to get them to markets around the world. In such a large country with economic prospects flung far and wide, we need good roads or this country will go nowhere.

It is not an exaggeration to say the economic contribution of rural Canada is enormous. Rural Canada produces almost half our exports. Our world trade surplus in 1995 was \$73 billion, a staggering success.

The economic output of rural Canada accounts for close to one fifth of the GDP. It is not all fresh air and lemonade. Rural Canadians contribute far more than their share to the economic vitality and to the standard of living of Canadians everywhere.

It is clear to all that rural Canada remains neglected. Services and infrastructures are poor in many areas and government and the private sector have been unable to overcome these difficulties.

I quote from the March 1997 report of the House Standing Committee on Natural Resources, a report entitled "Think Rural".

After hearing from a great many witnesses on the state of rural Canada, the committee had this to say about rural roads: "Existing deficiencies in transportation and infrastructure, especially roads, were repeatedly brought to our attention. We were informed that the rural infrastructure in place is often poor quality and that there is a complete lack of highways in remote regions. We were told that rail and air transportation is often inadequate and existing rural air transport is prohibitively expensive.

"Federal policy initiatives in transportation have historically been detrimental to maintaining rural transportation infrastructure".

There we have it, a crisis in the midst of our economic engine.

• (1415)

The Council of Ministers of Transportation has given a name to the rural road network in this era of globalization. It is simply called the strategic economic network. The council recognizes that for Canada to thrive under globalization we must have the ability to access our resources whether they be renewable in the form of fisheries and forestry or untapped deposits of wealth such as mines. Without it, the council says, Canada will suffer under globalization and the living standards of Canadians will deteriorate quickly.

This is not just about a few more bucks for asphalt. Canada needs a strategy for rural roads. Indeed there is need for a comprehensive strategy for all of rural Canada. We need effective strategies to develop exports, high technology, education and medicare. These

are all important but we neglect rural Canada at the peril of Canadians everywhere.

Rural Canadians, whether they live in the wide open spaces or in small towns, understand that nature has a balance. When the government tore up the railways in many parts of rural Canada, including Atlantic Canada, the burden previously borne by the rail network fell to the waterways and roads. Now the infrastructure of the waterways is falling into disrepair and naturally then into disuse with no support from government or the private sector.

The rural transportation system is out of balance. Essentially all we have left are roads, or very soon this will likely be the case. The removal of rail from the transportation picture means more trucks and larger trucks. That takes a toll on the road network. Roads in disrepair or roads built cheaply because of scarce public funds being diverted to other priorities mean weight restrictions and delays. This affects economic performance and can be a factor in whether or not investments are made in certain rural areas.

If a business in my constituency is transporting shellfish over roads which cause delays the product takes longer to get to market. Smaller loads are required which are less profitable and losses in product quality are inevitable. Not all the problems are economic. Poor maintenance can result in conditions that make driving dangerous.

Most rural roads are not double lane or twinned highways. Studies have proven that the types of roads which separate oncoming traffic are much safer, but if we do not have enough money for even a proper rural road network then double lanes are a luxury rural Canadians will not see. They will have to continue to face more dangerous driving conditions. This is clearly a problem, so what do we do about it?

The first thing to recognize is that in Canada roads are a provincial responsibility. However the federal government has a tradition of contributing to road building. When we compare the share of federal funding by governments in other countries, we see shares of between 30% and 65%. Our share is about 5%. In countries that share Canada's challenge of overcoming great distances and a style of federal government mixed with state or provincial jurisdiction, the U.S. and Australia have committed their federal governments to funding 100% of the construction, maintenance and rehabilitation costs of national highway systems.

In Canada there have been many calls for many years for a new national highway policy. Such a policy might co-ordinate the road building efforts in this country if for no other reason than to make the business sector more efficient in light of the demise of rail and expensive air transport. Such a national policy could address in a significant way the issues facing the rural road network, but these

Private Members' Business

issues must be embraced by a powerful strategy with the full support of government, much like the deficit fight.

An inadequate infrastructure hampers our ability to compete. It is as simple as that. In February 1997 the Standing Committee on Transport studied the issue of a national highway policy. It stated:

The committee agrees with all those who have said that the only way a National Highway Program can be implemented is if the federal government makes the commitment to provide long term, sustainable and secure funding.

Similarly the Standing Committee on Natural Resources calls on the federal government to enact a national rural development policy with a minister responsible for such a national project. The committee studied the issue of rural roads and concluded that the federal government should enter into a new cost shared agreement with the provinces to implement a national highways upgrade for rural areas.

The committee also suggested that federal tax assistance of limited duration should be provided to businesses willing to operate short haul rail lines, serve as regional air carriers or as rural airport landlords, manage and maintain rural docks and harbours, or construct road infrastructure.

• (1420)

Finally, the committee recommended that the federal government should review its application of cost recovery to services provided in rural Canada to ensure that undue financial burdens are not imposed on industries operating in rural and remote communities.

It is clear that the question of rural roads cannot be considered in isolation from the greater question of rural development. It is my understanding that the government has taken some steps which include that some thought is being given to a national rural development policy.

Recently the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food announced the rural lens policy. This policy is designed so that government programs and policies are put through the rural lens so that rural issues are given due consideration before the government acts.

However, I believe the government has failed its first test by privatizing the services delivered at the military base at Goose Bay. This policy would seem to be a pilot project to privatize services at military bases across the country and to take control, profits and opportunities out of rural communities. I do not see how this benefits rural Canada whatsoever. I do not see how this rural lens was applied at all in this instance.

In light of this momentum I would like to suggest that applying the fuel tax to the maintenance of rural roads is only one option. The rural transportation network is so important to the entire issue

of rural development that one cannot be considered without the other.

It is my understanding that the cabinet is studying a response to the think rural report. Perhaps momentum will develop to solve problems such as rural road maintenance. I am confident that when the challenges of rural development are treated in this manner only then will rural road maintenance and development receive the resources they require.

My hon. colleague is to be congratulated for his concern. This may very well be part of a comprehensive solution to the difficulties in rural Canada and how to tap the enormous potential which exists there. I join him in his concern and hope all members will ensure that the government introduces a proper rural development policy that will solve the problems the hon. member has highlighted today.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this is a perfect example of the importance of Private Members' Business. Some of the best ideas that have come to parliament have been through private members. This is absolutely one of the best examples of that.

We have a government that has an insatiable appetite for tax revenue and does not have a clue about what is important to the people of the country. Instead it wastes its money on all sorts of crazy things and the highways of the country are going downhill.

I did a calculation of government taxes when it comes to gasoline which I actually shared in the previous parliament. This being a new parliament it is time to share it again. In the 1994 budget the Minister of Finance announced a 1.5 cent a litre increase in tax on fuel. What he was not telling the people was that there was GST on top of that tax. That tax is added first and the GST is computed when all other taxes are in. Not only are the provincial and the federal taxes taxed with a GST but it is added on at the very end. That made that increase 1.605 cents, not the 1.5 that was actually touted.

I did a little calculation that showed that gasoline is taxed at 177%. Here are my premises. Before the election as well as now, if I begin with an earning of \$2.78, with what I earn at the top of my income level I get taxed on 40%. \$1.11 goes to income tax. I am now left with a \$1.67. I take that \$1.67 over to the gasoline station to buy some gasoline. What happens? There are taxes that we pay directly at the pumps in terms of excise taxes plus the taxes oil companies or retailers pay.

• (1425)

So that is money that comes from me, goes to the government in the form of taxation and accounts for very close to another 40%. Forty per cent of \$1.67 is 67 cents and I am left with \$1.00 to buy gasoline.

Private Members' Business

When I pay \$1.67 in taxes, having purchased \$1.00 worth of gasoline, it is a 167% rate of taxation. If the government cannot live with that it is really shameful.

I urge all members to support this bill. It is a very wise and important bill and a very necessary bill.

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, I will try to sum this up as quickly as possible.

I must, however, refute a couple of the comments by the parliamentary secretary. As usual, there was quite a substantial amount of fearmongering. Not once in the motion does it deal with \$4.4 billion per year going into this program.

What it deals with is a portion of the excise tax raised on gasoline to go into an area where it was meant to go in the first place, highways, roads and, in this case, rural road reconstruction.

I am not suggesting for a moment \$4.4 billion per year. What I am suggesting, however, is a plan. Is that too much to ask for, a priority that is being set and a plan that is set to deal with the priority? It may well mean \$250 million a year over a 20 year period. It may well mean \$350 million a year over a 10 year period. However, all I am suggesting is that the government get its head out of the sand and understands that there is a serious problem out there.

The hon. member from the Bloc unfortunately likes to make sure there are distinctions between federal and provincial jurisdiction. I am not getting into provincial jurisdiction. If indeed the plan should be that the provinces ultimately make the decision as to where that money should be spent I would applaud that. Take the

money being generated by federal taxes, give it to the provinces and then they can apply it to the priorities on road construction. It is not that difficult a concept.

If provinces are now spending their dollars to fix federal responsibility roads then those dollars cannot be spent for provincial roads. This is not difficult to understand, so please do that.

There was some suggestion that other priorities would be affected substantially such as health care, education and all those wonderful priorities that we all recognize as being very major priorities. I suggest then that perhaps the \$500 million that was spent in cancelling the EH-101s could have better been spent on road construction.

I suggest the \$800 million blown by this government on the Pearson airport deal could have better been spent on road construction. Let us not confuse the issue with the priorities of health care and education. Let us just suggest there is a problem. A plan should be put in place and the plan dealt with.

We can talk about a national highways program with the next private member's motion I would like to table.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hour provided for consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired and the item is dropped from the order paper.

It being 2.30 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2.28 p.m.)

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. GILBERT PARENT (CHAIRMAN)

HON. DON BOUDRIA, P.C.

HON. ALFONSO GAGLIANO, P.C.

MR. STÉPHANE BERGERON

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. PETER MACKAY

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

MR. CHUCK STRAHL

MR. RANDY WHITE

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

First Session – Thirty-sixth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay — Columbia	British Columbia	Ref.
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary — Nose Hill	Alberta	Ref.
Adams, Peter, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Peterborough	Ontario	Lib.
Alarie, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	Quebec	BQ
Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	Lib.
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Alberta	Ref.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Victoria	British Columbia	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Quebec	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	Quebec	BQ
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon — Rosetown — Biggar	Saskatchewan	NDP
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Bachand, André	Richmond — Arthabaska	Quebec	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Bailey, Roy	Souris — Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Baker, George S.	Gander — Grand Falls	Newfoundland	Lib.
Bakopanos, Eleni, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Ahuntsic	Quebec	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Ontario	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West — Mississauga	Ontario	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Timmins — James Bay	Ontario	Lib.
Bélanger, Mauril	Ottawa — Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	Quebec	BQ
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton — Gloucester	Ontario	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon E.	Lakeland	Alberta	Ref.
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Tobique — Mactaquac	New Brunswick	PC
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure — Gaspé — Îles-de-la-Madeleine — Pabok	Quebec	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Quebec	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan — King — Aurora	Ontario	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	Quebec	BQ
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg — Transcona	Manitoba	NDP
Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Ontario	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon — Souris	Manitoba	PC
Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Ontario	Lib.
Bradshaw, Claudette, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Moncton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Alberta	Ref.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

First Session — Thirty—sixth Parliament

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

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

MANITOBA (14)

Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg—Transcona	NDP
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon—Souris	PC
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	NDP
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification)	Saint Boniface	Lib.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Charleswood—Assiniboine	Lib.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk—Interlake	Ref.
Hoepfner, Jake E.	Portage—Lisgar	Ref.
Iftody, David	Provencher	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River	Ref.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North—St. Paul	Lib.
Wasylcia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	NDP

NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

Bernier, Gilles	Tobique—Mactaquac	PC
Bradshaw, Claudette, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Moncton	Lib.
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska—Restigouche	PC
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	NDP
Herron, John	Fundy—Royal	PC
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	Lib.
Scott, Hon. Andy, Solicitor General of Canada	Fredericton	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	Charlotte	PC
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour—Petitcodiac	NDP
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	PC

NEWFOUNDLAND (7)

Baker, George S.	Gander—Grand Falls	Lib.
------------------	--------------------	------

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Byrne, Gerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	PC
Mathews, Bill	Burin—St. George's	PC
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Bonavista—Trinity—Conception	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence D.	Labrador	Lib.
Power, Charlie	St. John's West	PC
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (2)		
Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
Karetak—Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Lib.
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brison, Scott	Kings—Hants	PC
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester	PC
Dockrill, Michelle	Bras d'Or	NDP
Earle, Gordon	Halifax West	NDP
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	PC
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	NDP
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough	PC
Mancini, Peter	Sydney—Victoria	NDP
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	NDP
Muise, Mark	West Nova	PC
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Eastern Shore	NDP
ONTARIO (103)		
Adams, Peter, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Lib.
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West—Mississauga	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Timmins—James Bay	Lib.
Bélanger, Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton—Gloucester	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan—King—Aurora	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe—Grey	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Lib.
Bryden, John	Wentworth—Burlington	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale—High Park	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Caplan, Elinor	Thornhill	Lib.
Carroll, Aileen	Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West—Nepean	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Guelph—Wellington	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Clouthier, Hec	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	Lib.
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor—St. Clair	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay—Nipigon	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	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 of National Defence	York Centre	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia—Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre—Rosedale	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Lib.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Lib.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity—Spadina	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce—Grey	Lib.
Jones, Jim	Markham	PC
Jordan, Joe	Leeds—Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont—Dundas	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York North	Lib.
Lastewka, Walt, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Lib.
Longfield, Judi	Whitby—Ajax	Lib.
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie—Lincoln	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister for International Trade	York West	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Sudbury	Lib.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview—Greenwood	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches—East York	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Parks)	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark—Carleton	Lib.
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo—Wellington	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora—Rainy River	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South—Weston	Ind.
O'Brien, Pat	London—Fanshawe	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Victoria—Haliburton	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga Centre	Lib.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Lib.
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Lib.
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Kent—Essex	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Lib.
Pratt, David	Nepean—Carleton	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie	Lib.
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre	Lib.
Reed, Julian, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Halton	Lib.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence	Perth—Middlesex	Lib.
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming—Cochrane	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Lib.
Speller, Bob	Haldimand—Norfolk—Brant	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma—Manitoulin	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron—Bruce	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Minister of the Environment	Northumberland	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Brant	Lib.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew	Kitchener—Waterloo	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Lib.
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	Lib.
Valeri, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	Stoney Creek	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Prince Edward—Hastings	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Eglinton—Lawrence	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Lib.
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Lib.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Lib.
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)		
Easter, Wayne, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Minister of Labour	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Lib.
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Hillsborough	Lib.
QUEBEC (75)		
Alarie, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	BQ
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier—Montcalm	BQ
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	BQ
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	BQ
Canuel, René	Matapédia—Matane	BQ
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies	Lib.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac—Mégantic	BQ
Coderre, Denis	Bourassa	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques	BQ
Dalphond—Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	BQ
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Discepolo, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Claude	Beauce	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil—Papineau	BQ
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard—Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	BQ
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans	BQ
Harvey, André	Chicoutimi	PC
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Lib.
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Laurin, René	Joliette	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun—Saint-Henri	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec East	BQ
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle—Émard	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Hull—Aylmer	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga—Maisonneuve	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food) (Fisheries and Oceans)	Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny—L'Islet	Lib.
Paradis, Denis	Brome—Missisquoi	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Lib.
Perron, Gilles—A.	Saint—Eustache—Sainte—Thérèse	BQ
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister of Human Resources Development	Papineau—Saint—Denis	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	BQ
Price, David	Compton—Stanstead	PC
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Westmount—Ville—Marie	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois—Rivières	BQ
Saada, Jacques	Brossard—La Prairie	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	BQ
St—Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	BQ
St—Jacques, Diane	Shefford	PC
St—Julien, Guy	Abitibi	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Saint—Lambert	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac—Saint—Jean	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski—Mitis	BQ
Turp, Daniel	Beauharnois—Salaberry	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint—Bruno—Saint—Hubert	BQ
VACANCY	Sherbrooke	
SASKATCHEWAN (14)		
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	NDP
Bailey, Roy	Souris—Moose Mountain	Ref.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	Ref.
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Lib.
Kerpan, Allan	Blackstrap	Ref.
Konrad, Derrek	Prince Albert	Ref.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	NDP
Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	Ref.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Qu'Appelle	NDP
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Ref.
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords—Lloydminster	Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre	NDP
Vellacott, Maurice	Wanuskewin	Ref.
YUKON (1)		
Hardy, Louise	Yukon	NDP

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of May 8th, 1998 — 1st Session, 36th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: Guy St-Julien

Vice-Chairmen: John Finlay
Derrek Konrad

Claude Bachand
John Bryden
Gordon Earle
Ghislain Fournier

David Iftody
Nancy Karetak-Lindell
Gerald Keddy

Judi Longfield
Grant McNally
Lawrence O'Brien

Bernard Patry
Mike Scott
Bryon Wilfert

(16)

Associate Members

Cliff Breitzkreuz
René Canuel
Bill Casey

Pierre de Savoye
Reed Elley

Maurice Godin
Rick Laliberte

John Maloney
Maurice Vellacott

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chairman: Joe McGuire

Vice-Chairmen: Murray Calder
Jay Hill

Hélène Alarie
Leon Benoit
Paul Bonwick
Rick Borotsik

Gerry Byrne
Denis Coderre
Odina Desrochers

John Harvard
Jake Hoepfner
Larry McCormick

Dick Proctor
Paul Steckle
Rose-Marie Ur

(16)

Associate Members

Peter Adams
Garry Breitzkreuz
Pierre Brien
Rick Casson

Michelle Dockrill
Howard Hilstrom
Allan Kerpan
Réjean Lefebvre

John Maloney
Lorne Nystrom
Denis Paradis
Gilles Perron

John Solomon
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chairman: Clifford Lincoln

Vice-Chairmen: Jim Abbott
Mauril Bélanger

Paul Bonwick
Sarmite Bulte
John Godfrey
Joe Jordan

Wendy Lill
Dennis Mills
Mark Muise

Deepak Obhrai
Pat O'Brien
Jim Pankiw

Jacques Saada
Caroline St-Hilaire
Suzanne Tremblay

(16)

Associate Members

André Bachand
Claude Bachand
Carolyn Bennett
Rick Borotsik
Cliff Breitzkreuz
Pierre Brien
Denis Coderre

Antoine Dubé
Maurice Dumas
Gordon Earle
Christiane Gagnon
Albina Guarnieri
Monique Guay
David Iftody

Rick Laliberte
Francine Lalonde
Eric Lowther
Peter G. MacKay
Inky Mark
Rey Pagtakhan
Louis Plamondon

George Proud
Carmen Provenzano
Nelson Riis
Benoît Sauvageau
John Solomon
Elsie Wayne
Bob Wood

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE STUDY OF SPORT IN CANADA**Chairman:** Dennis Mills

Jim Abbott	Albina Guarnieri	Pat O'Brien	Nelson Riis	(9)
Denis Coderre	Peter G. MacKay	George Proud	Suzanne Tremblay	

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chairman:	Stan Dromisky	Vice-Chairs:	Raymonde Folco John Reynolds
------------------	---------------	---------------------	---------------------------------

Jean Augustine	Louise Hardy	John McKay	Maria Minna	(16)
Sarmite Bulte	M. Sophia Leung	Grant McNally	Deepak Obhrai	
Norman Doyle	Steve Mahoney	Réal Ménard	Jacques Saada	
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold				

Associate Members

Claude Bachand	Libby Davies	Patrick Martin	Diane St-Jacques
Pierre Brien	Monique Guay	Benoît Sauvageau	Daniel Turp

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chairman:	Charles Caccia	Vice-Chairmen:	Bill Gilmour Gar Knutson
------------------	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------

Sarkis Assadourian	Aileen Carroll	Roger Gallaway	Karen Kraft Sloan	(16)
Gérard Asselin	Rick Casson	John Herron	Rick Laliberte	
Bernard Bigras	Yvon Charbonneau	Joe Jordan	David Pratt	
Chuck Cadman				

Associate Members

Peter Adams	John Duncan	Louise Hardy	Nelson Riis
Hélène Alarie	John Finlay	Clifford Lincoln	Benoît Sauvageau
Leon Benoit	Paul Forseth	John Maloney	Peter Stoffer
Pierre Brien	Maurice Godin	David Price	Stéphan Tremblay

FINANCE**Chairman:** Maurizio Bevilacqua**Vice-Chairs:** Monte Solberg
Paddy TorsneyMark Assad
Scott Brison
Roger Gallaway
Dick HarrisDavid Iftody
Yvan Loubier
Gilles PerronGary Pillitteri
Karen Redman
Nelson RiisGerry Ritz
Paul Szabo
Tony Valeri

(16)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
André Bachand
Sue Barnes
Carolyn Bennett
Rick Borotsik
Claudette Bradshaw
Pierre Brien
Jocelyne G. BujoldOdina Desrochers
Nick Discepola
Norman Doyle
Antoine Dubé
Raymonde Folco
Joe Fontana
John Herron
Dale Johnston
Jim JonesJason Kenney
Francine Lalonde
René Laurin
M. Sophia Leung
Peter MacKay
Steve Mahoney
Larry McCormick
Alexa McDonough
Bob MillsLynn Myers
Bob Nault
Lorne Nystrom
Pauline Picard
Charlie Power
Yves Rocheleau
Alex Shepherd
John Solomon**FISHERIES AND OCEANS****Chairman:** George Baker**Vice-Chairmen:** Charles Hubbard
Gary LunnYvan Bernier
John Duncan
Wayne Easter
Howard HilstromNancy Karetak-Lindell
Gar Knutson
M. Sophia LeungBill Matthews
Lawrence O'Brien
Carmen ProvenzanoYves Rocheleau
Paul Steckle
Peter Stoffer

(16)

Associate MembersGilles Bernier
René Canuel
Paul ForsethGhislain Fournier
Bill GilmourPhilip Mayfield
Svend RobinsonMike Scott
Angela Vautour**FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE****Chairman:** Bill Graham**Vice-Chairs:** Colleen Beaumier
Bob MillsSarkis Assadourian
Jean Augustine
André Bachand
John CannisMaud Debien
Raymonde Folco
Gurmant Grewal
Ted McWhinneyDenis Paradis
Charlie Penson
Julian Reed
Svend RobinsonBenoît Sauvageau
Bob Speller
Daniel Turp

(18)

Associate MembersClaude Bachand
Sue Barnes
Eugene Bellemare
Bill Blaikie
Paul Bonwick
Claudette Bradshaw
Sarmite BulteAileen Carroll
Monique Guay
Joe Jordan
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
Gurbax Malhi
Richard MarceauKeith Martin
Paul Mercier
Bob Nault
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Charlie Power
George ProudKaren Redman
Nelson Riis
Jacques Saada
John Solomon
Diane St-Jacques
Pierrette Venne
Bryon Wilfert

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair: Colleen Beaumier

Jean Augustine Paul Bonwick	Claudette Bradshaw Maud Debien	Raymonde Folco Keith Martin	Svend Robinson Diane St-Jacques	(9)
--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

Chairman: Bob Speller

André Bachand Bill Blaikie	Sarmite Bulte Raymonde Folco	Robert Nault Charlie Penson	Julian Reed Benoît Sauvageau	(9)
-------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----

HEALTH

Chair: Beth Phinney

Vice-Chairs: Elinor Caplan
Reed Elley

Carolyn Bennett Aileen Carroll Claude Drouin Maurice Dumas	Grant Hill Dan McTeague Lynn Myers	Pauline Picard Greg Thompson Rose-Marie Ur	Maurice Vellacott Joseph Volpe Judy Wasylcia-Leis	(16)
---	--	--	---	------

Associate Members

Pierre Brien Libby Davies Pierre de Savoye Michelle Dockrill	Antoine Dubé Christiane Gagnon Sharon Hayes John Herron	M. Sophia Leung Keith Martin Réal Ménard	Caroline St-Hilaire Paul Szabo Stéphan Tremblay
---	--	--	---

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chairman: Reg Alcock

Vice-Chairs: Bonnie Brown
Dale Johnston

Diane Ablonczy Rob Anders Carolyn Bennett Claudette Bradshaw	Brenda Chamberlain Paul Crête Libby Davies Nick Discepola	Jean Dubé Christiane Gagnon Albina Guarnieri Larry McCormick	Bob Nault Stéphan Tremblay Bryon Wilfert	(18)
---	--	---	--	------

Associate Members

Yvan Bernier Pierre Brien Jocelyne G. Bujold Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral Antoine Dubé	Reed Elley Yvon Godin Sharon Hayes Wendy Lill	Inky Mark Patrick Martin Réal Ménard Maria Minna	Lorne Nystrom Yves Rocheleau Diane St-Jacques Angela Vautour
---	--	---	---

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chairman: Robert Bertrand

Vice-Chairmen: Art Hanger
Bob Wood

Chris Axworthy
Leon Benoit
Hec Clouthier
Maurice Godin

Peter Goldring
Judi Longfield
Pat O'Brien

John O'Reilly
David Pratt
David Price

George Proud
John Richardson
Pierrette Venne

(16)

Associate Members

Pierre Brien
Denis Coderre
Monique Guay

Jim Hart
John Maloney
Peter Mancini

Patrick Martin
Bob Mills

Daniel Turp
Elsie Wayne

NATURAL RESOURCES AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chairman: Brent St. Denis

Vice-Chairmen: David Chatters
Ben Serré

Réginald Bélair
Gilles Bernier
Jocelyne G. Bujold
Gerry Byrne

Roy Cullen
Pierre de Savoye
Yvon Godin

Jim Gouk
Ovid Jackson
Jerry Pickard

Carmen Provenzano
Darrel Stinson
Bob Wood

(16)

Associate Members

Hélène Alarie
Chris Axworthy
Bernard Bigras
Pierre Brien
René Canuel

Jean-Guy Chrétien
Michelle Dockrill
Ghislain Fournier
Bill Gilmour
Jim Jones

Gerald Keddy
Derrek Konrad
René Laurin
Réjean Lefebvre

Gilles Perron
Nelson Riis
Angela Vautour
Maurice Vellacott

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chairman: Peter Adams

Vice-Chairs: Marlene Catterall
Chuck Strahl

George Baker
Stéphane Bergeron
Yvon Charbonneau
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral

Ken Epp
Mac Harb
André Harvey

Bob Kilger
Rey Pagtakhan
Carolyn Parrish

John Richardson
John Solomon
Randy White

(16)

Associate Members

Michel Bellehumeur
Bill Blaikie
Don Boudria

Garry Breitkreuz
Michelle Dockrill
Norman Doyle

Jay Hill
René Laurin
Bill Matthews

Réal Ménard
Suzanne Tremblay

SUB-COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

Chairman: Randy White

Garry Breitkreuz
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral

André Harvey

Bob Kilger

John Solomon

(6)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair: Carolyn Parrish

William Blaikie
Yvon Charbonneau

Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral

Ken Epp

André Harvey

(6)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Chairman: Bob Kilger

Stéphane Bergeron
Bill Blaikie

Don Boudria

André Harvey

Randy White

(6)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chairman: John Williams

Vice-Chairmen: Ivan Grose
Andrew Telegdi

Mark Assad
Sue Barnes
Elinor Caplan
Odina Desrochers

Gurmant Grewal
Mac Harb
Jason Kenney
René Laurin

Steve Mahoney
Philip Mayfield
Lynn Myers

Lorne Nystrom
Rey Pagtakhan
Elsie Wayne

(17)

Associate Members

Roy Bailey
Garry Breitreuz
Scott Brison
Jocelyne G. Bujold

Rick Casson
Bev Desjarlais
Michelle Dockrill
Antoine Dubé

Michel Guimond
Jim Jones
Derrek Konrad
Denis Paradis

Gilles Perron
Alex Shepherd
Peter Stoffer

TRANSPORT

Chairman: Raymond Bonin

Vice-Chairmen: Roy Cullen
Lee Morrison

Roy Bailey
Murray Calder
John Cannis
Bill Casey

Bev Desjarlais
Claude Drouin
Joe Fontana

Michel Guimond
Stan Keyes
Inky Mark

Paul Mercier
Carolyn Parrish
Lou Sekora

(16)

Associate Members

Chris Axworthy
Yvan Bernier
Rick Borotsik

Pierre Brien
Paul Crête
John Cummins

Ghislain Fournier
Rick Laliberte
John Maloney

Yves Rocheleau
Elsie Wayne

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint-Chairmen: Philippe D. Gigantès
Gurbax Malhi

Joint Vice-Chairman: Philip Mayfield

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Roch Bolduc
Eymard G. Corbin
Mabel M. DeWare

Richard J. Doyle
Jerahmiel S. Grafstein
Louis J. Robichaud

Marlene Catterall
Hec Clouthier
John Finlay
Deborah Grey
Howard Hilstrom
Jim Karygiannis
Raymond Lavigne

Wendy Lill
Paul Mercier
Louis Plamondon
David Price
Karen Redman
Jacques Saada
Brent St. Denis

(23)

Associate Members

Libby Davies

Maurice Dumas

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joint Chairs: Sen. Rose–Marie Losier–Cool
Sheila Finestone

Joint Vice-Chairmen: Denis Coderre
Rahim Jaffer

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Gérald A. Beaudoin
Jean–Robert Gauthier
Noël A. Kinsella
Jean–Claude Rivest

Fernand Robichaud
Louis J. Robichaud
Lucie Pépin
Jean–Maurice Simard

Eugène Bellemare
Claudette Bradshaw
Cliff Breitreuz
John Godfrey
Bob Kilger
Dan McTeague
Ted McWhinney

Val Meredith
Mark Muise
Denis Paradis
Louis Plamondon
Suzanne Tremblay
Angela Vautour

(25)

Associate Members

Pierre Brien

Lorne Nystrom

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: Céline Hervieux–Payette
Derek Lee

Joint Vice–Chairman: Ted White

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Michael Cogger
Marisa Barth Ferretti
Normand Grimard
William M. Kelly

P. Derek Lewis
Léonce Mercier
Wilfred P. Moore

John Bryden
Bill Casey
Paul DeVillers
Ken Epp
Marlene Jennings
Ghislain Lebel
Gary Lunn
Gurbax Malhi

John Maloney
Inky Mark
Ian Murray
Lorne Nystrom
Alex Shepherd
Caroline St–Hilaire
Tom Wappel

(25)

Associate Members

Chris Axworthy
Michel Bellehumeur

Michel Guimond
Richard Marceau

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

CHILD CUSTODY AND ACCESS

Joint Chairs: Landon Pearson
Roger Gallaway

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Erminie J. Cohen
Joan Cook
Anne C. Cools

Mabel M. DeWare
Duncan J. Jessiman
Lucie Pépin

Eleni Bakopanos
Carolyn Bennett
Robert Bertrand
Madeleine Dalphond–Guiral
Sheila Finestone
Paul E. Forseth
John Harvard
Nancy Karetak–Lindell

Judi Longfield
Eric Lowther
Gary Lunn
Peter Mancini
Denis Paradis
Caroline St–Hilaire
Diane St–Jacques

(23)

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

Panels of Chairmen of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

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

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Rey D. Pagtakhan	to Prime Minister
Ted McWhinney	to Minister of Foreign Affairs
Stan Keyes	to Minister of Transport
Wayne Easter	to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Gerry Byrne	to Minister of Natural Resources
John Godfrey	to Minister of Canadian Heritage
Julian Reed	to Minister for International Trade
Walt Lastewka	to Minister of Industry
Claudette Bradshaw	to Minister for International Cooperation
Tony Valeri	to Minister of Finance
John Richardson	to Minister of National Defence
Ovid L. Jackson	to President of the Treasury Board
Eleni Bakopanos	to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Joseph Volpe	to Minister of Health
Brenda Chamberlain	to Minister of Labour
Karen Kraft Sloan	to Minister of the Environment
Jerry Pickard	to Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Maria Minna	to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
George Proud	to Minister of Veterans Affairs
Bernard Patry	to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Paul DeVillers	to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Robert D. Nault	to Minister of Human Resources Development
Peter Adams	to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
John Harvard	to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Sue Barnes	to Minister of National Revenue
Nick Discepola	to Solicitor General of Canada

CONTENTS

Friday, May 8, 1998

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada Labour Code	
Bill C-19. Report stage	6703
Mr. Morrison	6703
Mr. Gilmour	6704
Mr. Lowther	6705
Mr. McNally	6706
Mr. Grewal	6707
Mr. Hart	6707
Mr. Jaffer	6708

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Colouring Contest	
Mr. O'Reilly	6709
Emergency Preparedness Week	
Mr. Grewal	6709
National Forest Week	
Mr. Harvard	6710
Mental Health Week	
Mr. Adams	6710
Comité Québec-Printemps 1918	
Mrs. Gagnon	6710
Quebec Government	
Mr. St-Julien	6710
Royal Canadian Mint	
Mr. Epp	6711
Rights of the Child	
Ms. Caplan	6711
Youth Week	
Ms. Bakopanos	6711
Spinal Health Care Week	
Mr. Pankiw	6711
National Police Week	
Mr. Discepola	6712
Westray Mine	
Ms. Desjarlais	6712
Société nationale de l'Acadie	
Mrs. Bradshaw	6712
National Forestry Week	
Mr. MacKay	6712
Quebec City Conferences of 1943 and 1945	
Mr. Marceau	6713
Forestry	
Mrs. Barnes	6713
Bobby Curtola	
Mr. Jaffer	6713
Restigouche River Rats Hockey Club	
Mr. Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	6713

Polyvalente Sainte-Thérèse

Mr. Perron	6713
------------------	------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Hepatitis C

Mr. Hill (Macleod)	6714
Mr. Rock	6714
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	6714
Mr. Gray	6714
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	6714
Mr. Gray	6714
Mr. Hart	6714
Mr. Rock	6714
Mr. Hart	6714
Mr. Gray	6715

Millennium Scholarships

Mr. Crête	6715
Mr. Gray	6715
Mr. Crête	6715
Mr. Gray	6715
Mr. Loubier	6715
Mr. Gray	6715
Mr. Loubier	6715
Mr. Valeri	6715

Hepatitis C

Ms. McDonough	6715
Mr. Rock	6716
Ms. McDonough	6716
Mr. Rock	6716
Mr. Borotsik	6716
Mr. Gray	6716
Mr. Borotsik	6716
Mr. Rock	6716
Mr. Strahl	6716
Mr. Rock	6716
Mr. Strahl	6717
Mr. Rock	6717
Mr. Dumas	6717
Mr. Rock	6717
Mr. Dumas	6717
Mr. Rock	6717

Information Commissioner

Mr. Epp	6717
Mr. Boudria	6717
Mr. Epp	6717
Mr. Boudria	6717

Canadian International Development Agency

Mrs. Guay	6718
Ms. Marleau	6718
Mrs. Guay	6718
Ms. Marleau	6718

Information Commissioner

Mr. McNally	6718
Mr. Boudria	6718
Mr. McNally	6718
Mr. Boudria	6718

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	
Mr. Rocheleau	6718
Mrs. Chamberlain	6719
Extradition	
Mr. McKay	6719
Ms. Bakopanos	6719
Railways	
Mr. Morrison	6719
Mr. Collenette	6719
Mr. Morrison	6719
Mr. Collenette	6719
Education	
Ms. Davies	6719
Ms. Blondin—Andrew	6719
Ms. Davies	6720
Ms. Blondin—Andrew	6720
Fisheries	
Mr. MacKay	6720
Mr. Anderson	6720
Mr. MacKay	6720
Mr. Anderson	6720
Youth	
Mr. Harb	6720
Ms. Blondin—Andrew	6720
Health	
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	6721
Mr. Rock	6721
Drinking Water Management	
Mr. Bigras	6721
Mr. Reed	6721
Fisheries	
Mr. Blaikie	6721
Mr. Anderson	6721
Canada Labour Code	
Mr. Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	6721
Mrs. Chamberlain	6721
Agriculture	
Mrs. Ur	6722
Mr. Vanclief	6722
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	6722
Mr. Vanclief	6722
Information Canada Office	
Mrs. Tremblay	6722
Mr. Collenette	6722
Banking	
Mr. Solomon	6722
Mr. Boudria	6722
Human Resources Development	
Mr. Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	6722
Ms. Blondin—Andrew	6723
Employment	
Mr. Bélanger	6723
Mr. Valeri	6723
CIDA	
Mr. Grewal	6723
Ms. Marleau	6723

Points of Order	
Oral Questions	
Ms. Davies	6723
Mr. Grewal	6723

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Order in Council Appointments	
Mr. Adams	6723
Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Adams	6723
Sahtu Dene and Metis Comprehensive Land Claim Agreement	
Mr. Patry	6724
Gwich'in Land Claim Agreement	
Mr. Patry	6724
Committees of the House	
Finance	
Mr. Bevilacqua	6724
Petitions	
Goods and Services Tax	
Mr. O'Reilly	6724
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Adams	6724
Mr. Dubé	6724

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada Labour Code	
Bill C-19, Report Stage	6725
Mr. St-Julien	6725
Mr. Rocheleau	6725
Mr. St-Julien	6725
Mr. Epp	6726
Mr. Kenney	6727
Mr. Strahl	6729
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	6730
Mr. Strahl	6730
Mr. Morrison	6730
Division on Motion No. 6 deferred	6731
Division on Motion No. 7 deferred	6731
Division on Motion No. 8 deferred	6731
Division on Motion No. 30 deferred	6731
Motions Nos. 9 and 28	6731
Mr. Johnston	6731
Mrs. Chamberlain	6732
Mr. Rocheleau	6733
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	6734
Mr. Schmidt	6735

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Rural Road System	
Mr. Borotsik	6736
Motion	6736
Mr. Borotsik	6738
Mr. Valeri	6739
Mr. Morrison	6740
Mr. Crête	6741
Mrs. Dockrill	6742
Mr. Epp	6744
Mr. Borotsik	6745
Appendix	

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

03159442

Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canadian Government Publishing,
45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,
45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :
<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada – Édition, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9.