



House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 145

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Thursday, December 15, 1994

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, December 15, 1994

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

The Speaker: It being 10 a.m., pursuant to order made Wednesday, December 14, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on Motion P-3 for the production of papers in the name of the hon. member for Perth—Wellington—Waterloo.

Call in the members.

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

(Division No. 148)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Assadourian	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellemare
Benoit	Berger
Bertrand	Bethel
Bhaduria	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Caccia
Campbell	Catterall
Chamberlain	Chan
Chatters	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Copps	Cowling
Crawford	Culbert
Cummins	de Jong
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Duncan	Easter
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Forseth
Frazer	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gerrard	Gilmour
Godfrey	Goodale
Gouk	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grey (Beaver River)
Grose	Grubel
Guarnieri	Hanger

Hanrahan	Harb
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Hayes
Hermanson	Hickey
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Ifitody	Irwin
Jackson	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)
Lincoln	Loney
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Manning	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McGuire
McKinnon	McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Meredith
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
O'Brien	O'Reilly
Ouellet	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Penson
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Ramsay
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Ringma	Rock
Schmidt	Serré
Shepherd	Silye
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
Strahl	Szabo
Taylor	Telegdi
Thalheimer	Thompson
Tobin	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanlief	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Whelan	Williams
Wood	Young
Zed—185	

NAYS

Members

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Brien

Government Orders

Bélisle	Canuel
Caron	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Dalphond-Guiral	Debien
de Savoye	Deshaies
Dumas	Fillion
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin	Guay
Guimond	Jacob
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Marchand
Mercier	Ménard
Nunez	Paré
Picard (Drummond)	Pomerleau
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
St-Laurent	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—42

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bevilacqua	Bouchard
Clancy	Crête
Dubé	Dupuy
Lalonde	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)

(1030)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare the motion carried.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS*[English]***DEPARTMENT OF CANADIAN HERITAGE ACT**

The House resumed from December 14 consideration of Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage and to amend and repeal certain other acts, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a) the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions on report stage of Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage and to amend and repeal certain other acts.

The first question is on Motion No. 8. The vote on Motion No. 8 also applies to Motion No. 10.

[Translation]

An affirmative vote on Motion No. 8 obviates the necessity of the question being put on Motions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 21. A negative vote on Motion No. 8 necessitates the question being put on Motions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. The vote on Motion No. 1 also applies to Motion No. 9.

[English]

The vote on Motion No. 5 also applies to Motion No. 21.

[Translation]

The vote is on Motion No. 8, standing in the name of the hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata.

[English]

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I think you will find unanimous consent to apply the vote just taken on Motion No. P-3 to the motion now before the House in reverse.

Mr. Lee: Madam Speaker, I am certainly prepared to give my consent to this. In the last vote I was present but did not vote. I would ask that the record show that I abstained from voting on the last motion. I am certainly present for this vote and will vote with my caucus.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

*(Division No. 149)***YEAS**

Members

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Brien
Bélisle	Canuel
Caron	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Dalphond-Guiral	Debien
de Savoye	Deshaies
Dumas	Fillion
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin	Guay
Guimond	Jacob
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Marchand
Mercier	Ménard
Nunez	Paré
Picard (Drummond)	Pomerleau
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
St-Laurent	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—42

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Assadourian	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellemare
Benoit	Berger
Bertrand	Bethel
Bhaduria	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Caccia
Campbell	Catterall
Chamberlain	Chan

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare the motion lost. The next question is on Motion No. 1.

(1035)

[Translation]

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

*(Division No. 150)***YEAS***Members*

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Brien
Bélisle	Canuel
Caron	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Dalphond—Guiral	Debien
de Savoye	Deshais
Dumas	Fillion
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin	Guay
Guimond	Jacob
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Marchand
Mercier	Ménard
Nunez	Paré
Picard (Drummond)	Pomerleau
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
St-Laurent	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—42

NAYS*Members*

Ablonczy	Adams
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Assadourian	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellemare
Benoit	Berger
Bertrand	Bethel
Bhaduria	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Caccia
Campbell	Catterall
Chamberlain	Chan
Chatters	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Copps	Cowling
Crawford	Culbert
Cummins	de Jong
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Duncan	Easter
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Finestone

Chatters	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Copps	Cowling
Crawford	Culbert
Cummins	de Jong
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Duncan	Easter
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Forseth
Frazer	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gerrard	Gilmour
Godfrey	Goodale
Gouk	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grey (Beaver River)
Grose	Grubel
Guarnieri	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harb
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Hayes
Hermanson	Hickey
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren (Etobicoke North)
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Manning
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire	McKinnon
McLaughlin	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Pagtakhan	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Penson	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Proud
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Ringma
Rock	Schmidt
Serré	Shepherd
Silye	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Taylor
Telegdi	Thalheimer
Thompson	Tobin
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
Williams	Wood
Young	Zed—186

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bevilacqua	Bouchard
Clancy	Crête
Dubé	Dupuy
Lalonde	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)

Government Orders

Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Forseth
Frazer	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gerrard	Gilmour
Godfrey	Goodale
Gouk	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grey (Beaver River)
Grose	Grubel
Guarnieri	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harb
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Hayes
Hermanson	Hickey
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren (Etobicoke North)
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Manning
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire	McKinnon
McLaughlin	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Pagtakhan	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Penson	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Proud
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Ringma
Rock	Schmidt
Serré	Shepherd
Silye	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Taylor
Telegdi	Thalheimer
Thompson	Tobin
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
Wood	Young
Zed—185	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bevilacqua	Bouchard
Clancy	Crête
Dubé	Dupuy
Lalonde	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare the motion lost.

(1045)

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. I think you would find unanimous consent that the members who have voted on the previous vote be recorded as having voted on the vote now before the House in the following manner: Liberal members voting nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Do we have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

Mr. Laurin: Madam Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois will vote nay on this motion.

Mr. Silye: Madam Speaker, Reform members vote yea, except those who wish to vote otherwise.

[English]

Mr. Taylor: Madam Speaker, New Democrats present in the House today vote nay.

Mr. Bhaduria: Madam Speaker, I will be voting nay.

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

(Division No. 151)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)	Chatters
Cummins	Duncan
Forseth	Frazer
Gilmour	Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Hayes	Hermanson
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Manning
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Penson	Ramsay
Ringma	Schmidt
Silye	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson—38

NAYS

Members

Adams	Allmand
Althouse	Anawak
Anderson	Assadourian
Asselin	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumur

Bellemare
Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélisle
Campbell
Caron
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Copp
Crawford
Dalphond—Guiral
de Jong
Deshaies
Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Duhamel
Easter
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gaffney
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway
Gerrard
Godin
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Jordan
Kirby
Kraft Sloan
Langlois
Laurin
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre
Lincoln
Loubier
MacDonald
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McGuire
McLaughlin
McTeague
Mercier
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Murphy
Ménard
O'Brien
Ouellet
Parrish
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Proud
Regan
Rideout
Rock
Serré
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Telegdi

Berger
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand
Bhaduria
Blondin—Andrew
Bonin
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Canuel
Catterall
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cowling
Culbert
Debien
de Savoye
DeVillers
Dingwall
Dromisky
Dumas
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagliano
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Jacob
Keyes
Knutson
Landry
Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel
Lee
Leroux (Shefford)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)
Maloney
Marchand
Marleau
Massé
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nunez
O'Reilly
Pagtakhan
Paré
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Reed
Richardson
Rocheleau
Sauvageau
Shepherd
St-Laurent
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Taylor
Thalheimer

Tobin
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wells
Wood
Zed—189

Torsney
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
Whelan
Young

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bevilacqua
Clancy
Dubé
Lalonde

Bouchard
Crête
Dupuy
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare Motion No. 2 negatived.

The next question is on Motion No. 3.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. I think you would find unanimous consent that the members who have voted on the previous vote be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House in the following manner: Liberal members voting nay.

[Translation]

Mr. Laurin: Madam Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois vote yea.

[English]

Mr. Silye: Madam Speaker, the Reform Party members who are present today will vote yea, except for those who wish to vote otherwise.

Mr. Taylor: Madam Speaker, New Democrats vote nay.

Mr. Bhaduria: Madam Speaker, I will be voting nay.

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

(Division No. 152)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Benoit
Bernier (Gaspé)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien
Bélisle
Caron
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Dalphond—Guiral
de Savoye
Dumas
Fillion
Frazier
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Grey (Beaver River)
Guay
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hayes
Hill (MacLeod)
Hoepfner
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Loubier

Government Orders

Manning	Marchand
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mercier	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Ménard
Nunez	Paré
Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau	Ramsay
Ringma	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Silye	St-Laurent
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—80

NAYS

Members

Adams	Allmand
Althouse	Anawak
Anderson	Assadourian
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beumier
Bellemare	Berger
Bertrand	Bethel
Bhaduria	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Caccia	Campbell
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Copps	Cowling
Crawford	Culbert
de Jong	De Villers
Dhaliwal	Dingwall
Discepola	Dromisky
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gerrard	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)	Lee
Lincoln	Loney
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McGuire	McKinnon
McLaughlin	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	McWhinney
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Pagtakhan	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Rock
Serré	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Taylor	Telegdi

Thalheimer	Tobin
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
Wood	Young
Zed—147	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bevilacqua	Bouchard
Clancy	Crête
Dubé	Dupuy
Lalonde	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare Motion No. 3 negated.

[Translation]

The next question is on Motion No. 4, standing in the name of the hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata.

[English]

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. I think you would find unanimous consent that the members who have voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House in the following manner: Liberal members voting nay.

[Translation]

Mr. Laurin: Madam Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois will be voting yea.

[English]

Mr. Silye: Madam Speaker, the Reform Party will be voting nay, except for those who wish to vote otherwise.

(1050)

Mr. Taylor: Madam Speaker, New Democrats will be voting yea.

Mr. Bhaduria: Madam Speaker, I will be voting nay.

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 153)

YEAS

Members

Althouse	Asselin
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Blaikie
Brien	Bélisle
Canuel	Caron
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Dalphond—Gural
Debien	de Jong
de Savoye	Deshaies
Dumas	Fillion
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin	Guay
Guimond	Jacob
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Shefford)

Loubier
McLaughlin
Ménard
Paré
Pomerleau
Sauvageau
Taylor

Marchand
Mercier
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Laurent
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—48

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Allmand
Anderson
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Benoit
Bertrand
Bhaduria
Bodnar
Boudria
Bridgman
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Caccia
Catterall
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cowling
Culbert
DeVillers
Dingwall
Dromisky
Duncan
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Frazer
Gaffney
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gerrard
Godfrey
Gouk
Gray (Windsor West)
Grose
Guarnieri
Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Harvard
Hermanson
Hill (Macleod)
Hoepfner
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacDonald
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Mills (Red Deer)
Murphy
O'Brien
Ouellet
Parrish
Payne
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud

Adams
Anawak
Assadourian
Baker
Barnes
Bellemare
Berger
Bethel
Blondin—Andrew
Bonin
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Brushett
Béclair
Campbell
Chamberlain
Chatters
Copp
Crawford
Cummins
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Duhamel
Easter
English
Finestone
Flis
Forseth
Fry
Gagliano
Galloway
Gilmour
Goodale
Graham
Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel
Hanger
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hayes
Hickey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)
Maloney
Manning
Marleau
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McKinnon
McTeague
Meredith
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
O'Reilly
Pagtakhan
Patry
Penson
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Ramsay

Government Orders

Reed
Richardson
Ringma
Schmidt
Shepherd
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wells
Wood
Zed—179

Regan
Rideout
Rock
Serré
Silye
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Szabo
Thalheimer
Tobin
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
Whelan
Young

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Members

Bevilacqua
Clancy
Dubé
Lalonde

Bouchard
Crête
Dupuy
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare the motion lost.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 5.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent to apply the vote on report stage Motion No. 3 to the motion now before the House.

[Translation]

Mr. Laurin: Madam Speaker, we agree. The members of the Bloc Québécois vote yea.

[English]

Mr. Silye: Madam Speaker, the Reform Party members will be voting yea, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

Mr. Taylor: Madam Speaker, in consultation with my colleagues in the New Democratic Party we are voting nay.

Mr. Bhaduria: Madam Speaker, I will be voting nay.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 152.]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motions Nos. 6 and 7.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent to apply the same vote to report stage Motions Nos. 6 and 7. If you could just seek unanimous consent, you would get to apply the vote on Motion No. 4 to Motions Nos. 6 and 7.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

Government Orders

Mr. Laurin: Madam Speaker, there must be a mistake; we did not vote on Motion No. 4 as we intend to vote on Motions Nos. 6 and 7.

[English]

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, if I could just attract the attention of our colleagues for a moment. I am seeking unanimous consent to apply the vote taken to report stage Motion No. 2. That is, item 4 on the list that we have before us.

I am seeking unanimous consent to apply that vote to report stage Motions Nos. 6 and 7.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 151.]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare Motions Nos. 6 and 7 lost.

(1055)

The next question is on Motion No. 11.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I believe you will find unanimous consent to apply the vote taken on report stage Motion No. 1 to this motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 150.]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare Motion No. 11 lost.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 12. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 12 obviates the need for a vote on Motion No. 13. A negative vote on Motion No. 12 necessitates a vote on Motion No. 13.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent to apply the vote taken on report stage Motion No. 2 to the motion now before the House.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 151.]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare Motion No. 12 lost.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 13.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent to apply the vote taken on report stage Motion No. 1 to the motion now before the House and you would find further unanimous consent to apply that to report stage Motions Nos. 17, 22 and 24 as well.

[Translation]

Mr. Laurin: Madam Speaker, again, I think that the numbers of the motions reported by the hon. Liberal Party whip should be checked because all this is not consistent with the previous agreement.

Would it be possible to repeat the numbers of the motions being referred to?

[English]

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I would ask consent that the result applied to Motion No. 1 apply to report stage Motions Nos. 13, 17, 22 and 24.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 150.]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare Motions Nos. 13, 17, 22 and 24 lost.

(1100)

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 14. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 15, 16, 18, and 19.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I seek unanimous consent to apply the vote taken on report stage Motion No. 3 to the item now before the House.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under division No. 152.]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare Motion No. 14 lost. Consequently, Motions Nos. 15, 16, 18, and 19 are also lost.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 20. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 23.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent for the members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House in the following manner: Liberal members voting nay.

[Translation]

Mr. Laurin: Madam Speaker, we will vote yea.

Government Orders

Mr. Silye: Madam Speaker, the Reform Party will vote yea, except for those members who may wish to vote otherwise.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[*English*]

Mr. Taylor: Madam Speaker, New Democrats vote yea.

Mr. Bhaduria: Madam Speaker, I will be voting nay.

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

*(Division No. 154)***YEAS**

Members

Ablonczy	Althouse
Asselin	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bachand	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Bridgman
Brien	Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Bélisle	Canuel
Caron	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Cummins
Dalphond—Guiral	Debien
de Jong	de Savoye
Deshaies	Dumas
Duncan	Fillion
Forseth	Frazier
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gilmour	Godin
Gouk	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hart	Hayes
Hermanson	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoeppner
Jacob	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Manning	Marchand
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McLaughlin	Mercier
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard	Nunez
Paré	Penson
Picard (Drummond)	Pomerleau
Ramsay	Ringma
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Silye
St-Laurent	Stinson
Strahl	Taylor
Thompson	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—86

NAYS

Members

Adams	Allmand
Anawak	Anderson
Assadourian	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellemare	Berger
Bertrand	Bethel

Bhaduria	Blondin—Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélaïr	Caccia
Campbell	Catterall
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Copps
Cowling	Crawford
Culbert	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dingwall
Discepola	Dromisky
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Fiis
Fontana	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gerrard	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guamieri	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)	Lee
Lincoln	Loney
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McGuire	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
O'Brien	O'Reilly
Ouellet	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Proud
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Rock	Serré
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Thalheimer	Tobin
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
Wood	Young
Zed—141	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bevilacqua	Bouchard
Clancy	Crête
Dubé	Dupuy
Lalonde	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)

Government Orders

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare Motions Nos. 20 and 23 negatived.

(1105)

[English]

Hon. Diane Marleau (for the Minister of Canadian Heritage) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think you would find unanimous consent to apply the vote just taken on report stage Motion No. 20 in reverse to the concurrence motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Does the House agree?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

(Division No. 155)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Allmand
Anawak	Anderson
Assadourian	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellemare	Berger
Bertrand	Bethel
Bhaduria	Blondin—Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélaire	Caccia
Campbell	Catterall
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Copps
Cowling	Crawford
Culbert	De Villers
Dhaliwal	Dingwall
Discepola	Dromisky
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gerrard	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)	Lee
Lincoln	Loney
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)	Massé
McGuire	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
O'Brien	O'Reilly
Ouellet	Pagtakhan

Parrish	Patry
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Proud
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Rock	Serré
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Thalheimer	Tobin
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
Wood	Young
Zed—141	

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Althouse
Asselin	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bachand	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Bridgman
Brien	Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Bélisle	Canuel
Caron	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Cummins
Dalphoné—Guiral	Debien
de Jong	de Savoye
Deshaies	Dumas
Duncan	Fillion
Forseth	Frazer
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gilmour	Godin
Gouk	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hart	Hayes
Hermanson	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Jacob	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Manning	Marchand
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McLaughlin	Mercier
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard	Nunez
Paré	Penson
Picard (Drummond)	Pomerleau
Ramsay	Ringma
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Silye
St-Laurent	Stinson
Strahl	Taylor
Thompson	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—86

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bevilacqua	Bouchard
Clancy	Crête
Dubé	Dupuy
Lalonde	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)

Routine Proceedings

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare the motion carried.

When shall the bill be read the third time? Is there unanimous consent to read the bill the third time later this day?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Madam Speaker, in order to comply with the order of the House made earlier this day, I am now tabling copies, in both official languages, of the report of the Security Intelligence Review Committee entitled "The Heritage Front Affair".

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I hereby submit to Parliament, through your good offices, the final report of the task force on economic instruments and disincentives to sound environmental practices.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to submit two copies, in both official languages, of the document entitled "Canadian Positions with Respect to Conventions and Recommendations" adopted at the 79th and 80th sessions of the International Labour Conference in Geneva in June 1992 and June 1993.

The report is to be referred to the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development.

* * *

CANARCTIC SHIPPING

Mr. Joe Fontana (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the 1993 annual report of the Canarctic Shipping Company Ltd.

(1110)

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 38 petitions.

* * *

[English]

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the fourth report of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association concerning the North Atlantic Assembly annual session which was held in Washington, D.C., from October 14 to 18, 1994.

* * *

[Translation]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Natural Resources relating to our review of the mining industry.

I wish to thank those who testified before or submitted briefs to the committee. By their input, they have made a significant contribution to our work.

Mr. Bernard Deshaies (Abitibi, BQ): Madam Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois who sit on the committee welcome the recommendations contained in the report of the Standing Committee on Natural Resources concerning mining development. However, the Bloc Québécois saw fit to append a dissenting report to make sure that these recommendations do not promote federal interference in areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction, particularly with respect to costly duplication and overlap between actions taken by each level of government.

Finally, Bloc members want the Minister of Natural Resources to make sure that the implementation of the tax measures described in these recommendations will benefit the mining industry and that appropriate control measures will be put in place so that there is no loophole, in the interest of the national Treasury and the continued credibility of the mining industry.

Routine Proceedings

[English]

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-66, an act to amend the Western Grain Transportation Act.

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

* * *

VETERANS REVIEW AND APPEAL BOARD ACT

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (for the Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-67, an act to establish the veterans review and appeal board, to amend the Pension Act, to make consequential amendments to other acts and to repeal the Veterans Appeal Board Act.

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

* * *

(1115)

CANADA PENSION PLAN ACT

Mr. Janko Peric (Cambridge, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-299, an act to amend the Canada pension plan (increased contributions and pension).

He said: Madam Speaker, I have the pleasure to table a private member's bill which aims to improve the Canada pension plan.

The amendments to the Canada pension plan which I am proposing will cause the plan to grow significantly in contributions and benefits. The expanded plan will eventually result in a more adequate retirement pension for all Canadians and will reduce the need for private pensions and retirement savings plans.

The Canada pension plan would then provide an adequate and fully portable pension for all Canadians.

I hope that all members will support this initiative.

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

* * *

[Translation]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

AGRICULTURE

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I move that 15 members, three interpreters and three members of the staff of the Standing

Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food be authorized to hold meetings on the future of Canadian agriculture in Saint-Hyacinthe, Victoriaville, Quebec City, Forestville, Halifax and Charlottetown from January 22 to 28, 1995, and in Kelowna, Kamloops, Lethbridge, Saskatoon, Winnipeg, London, St. Catharines, Brockville and Alfred, from February 5 to 15, 1995.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent to move the motion?

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): There is not unanimous consent.

* * *

PETITIONS

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Bill Graham (Rosedale, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the pleasure to present to the House a petition which prays that this House will speedily recognize the need to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. The petition is signed by over 90 Canadians. I am pleased to support this petition.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have a petition which was collected and prepared by students of St. Anne's School in Peterborough. It reads:

"We the undersigned citizens and children of the province of Ontario draw the attention of the House of Commons and the Minister of Justice to the following: That criminals do not fear the law as much as we the citizens and children fear for our safety because of recent crime involving guns. We wish that the federal government enact more severe penalties for the perpetrators of crimes involving the use of firearms. We believe in crime control as well as gun control".

CHILD ABUSERS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have another petition which is signed by more than 120 people of the Peterborough area which reads:

"We the undersigned residents of Canada draw the attention of the House to the following: Whereas babies and young children lack the ability to defend themselves against abusers; and whereas thousands of innocent, vulnerable, defenceless children every year fall victim to sexual abuse, serious physical and psychological harm, maiming and death; and whereas child abusers must be dealt with harshly by the criminal justice system, your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to amend the Criminal Code to ensure stiffer sentences and mandatory treatment for all child abusers".

LEONARD PELTIER

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have a third petition which is from more than 125 citizens of Peterborough and the surrounding area.

(1120)

The petitioners point out that at the time of the extradition of Lakota-Chippewa native American Leonard Peltier from Canada to the United States, the information provided surrounding Mr. Peltier's case was fabricated by the U.S. authorities. Since that time new information has emerged which indicates that Leonard Peltier was not guilty of the crime for which he has spent the last 18 years in prison. Therefore the petitioners request that Parliament hold an external review of the 1976 extradition hearing and that he be brought back to Canada for asylum.

PARLIAMENTARY PRAYER

Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have two petitions pursuant to Standing Order 36.

The first petition deals with the prayer in Parliament.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the second petition deals with assisted suicides.

It is a pleasure to present both of these petitions.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by residents of Canada.

They point out that Canadian citizens support lawful and responsible use of firearms and ammunition, that many Canadians oppose laws to put more restrictions on the prohibition of legal firearms ownership rather than addressing violent criminal misuse of firearms.

The 1993 Auditor General's report indicates that many firearms regulations were brought in as a matter of public policy with no regard to further effectiveness or potential benefit.

The petitioners call on Parliament not to enact any further firearms control legislation, regulations or orders in council. The petition is signed by 277 residents of Kootenay West—Revelstoke. I highly concur with this petition.

MINING INDUSTRY

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have a number of signatures from petitioners in the Yukon.

They note that Canada's mining industry is the mainstay of employment in over 150 communities across Canada. They therefore call on the Parliament of Canada to take action that will grow employment in this sector, promote exploration, rebuild Canada's mineral reserves, sustain mining communities

Routine Proceedings

and keep mining in Canada. In addition they request that the Canadian Industry Mineral Federation which has proposed a 10-point plan be supported by the Government of Canada.

GRANDPARENTS' RIGHTS

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I would like to present a petition signed by several people from Saint Paul, Alberta in the heart of my constituency of Beaver River.

They are saying that grandparents as a consequence of death, separation or divorce of their children are often denied access to their grandchildren. The relationship which exists between grandparents and grandchildren is very natural, fundamental and certainly a special one.

These petitioners are requesting that Parliament amend the Divorce Act to include a provision similar to section 611 in the Quebec civil code which states: "In no case may a father or mother without serious cause place obstacles between the child and grandparents. Failing agreement between the parties, the modalities of the relations are settled by the court".

They are asking that they be allowed to go to court to settle these matters.

Madam Speaker, I wish you a Merry Christmas.

HUMAN RIGHTS

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

One is on behalf of 149 of my constituents from the riding of North Island—Powell River requesting that Parliament not amend the human rights code that would indicate societal approval of same sex relationships.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the other petition signed by 33 of my constituents requests that Parliament not repeal or amend section 241 of the Criminal Code and therefore will uphold the current law disallowing euthanasia. I personally concur with these petitioners.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Ms. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to present a petition from members of my riding. There are 563 signatures. It reads:

"We the undersigned residents of Canada draw to the attention of the House the following: That one of the core values of Canadian society is a strong belief in equality. That equality for all Canadians includes freedom from hatred, harassment and discrimination. That all Canadians regardless of race, religion, gender or sexual orientation must be treated equitably under the same circumstances. That great misunderstanding still exists in Canada resulting in acts of discrimination, harassment and crimes of hate against citizens on the basis of sexual orientation.

Routine Proceedings

“Therefore we the petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to enact legislation to amend the human rights act to prohibit discrimination against persons based upon their sexual orientation. Further we call upon you to pass the Liberal government Bill C-41 which gives tougher sentences to those who commit crimes of hate against others on the basis of their sexual orientation”.

(1125)

MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. Benoît Serré (Timiskaming—French River, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to present a petition signed by 290 Canadians with regard to mining.

The petitioners are very concerned about the decline of ore reserves in this country. They are very concerned about the fate of the 150 mining communities that depend on mining for their livelihood. They call on Parliament to take action that will grow employment in this sector, promote exploration, rebuild Canada's mineral reserves, sustain mining communities and keep mining in Canada.

I concur with the petitioners.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by 31 residents of Vancouver and the greater Vancouver region requesting that the Canadian Human Rights Act be not amended so as to provide for same sex relationships.

Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have a petition with 30 signatures of Canadians who wish to bring to our attention the fact that this petition calls for an amendment to the human rights code to include sexual orientation as a prohibited ground of discrimination. The fundamental principle underlying the petition is to ensure that people are treated equally in Canada regardless of their sexual orientation.

CRIMES OF VIOLENCE

Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have petitions here from right across Canada to add to the over three million signatures that I have already presented in the House. These petitioners feel that there are serious discrepancies in the criminal justice system and many vulnerable persons have little protection under the current system, women, children and disabled persons in particular.

These petitioners request that Parliament recognize that crimes of violence against the person are serious and abhorrent to society and that Parliament amend the Criminal Code of Canada, the Bail Reform Act of 1992 and the Parole Act accordingly.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have two petitions signed by people from Deep River, Rolphton, Pembroke, Petawawa and other areas throughout the Ottawa Valley. They request that Parliament act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 43, 44, 69 and a supplementary answer to Question No. 82.

[Text]

Question No. 43—**Mr. Chatters:**

How many and what are the names of the Indian bands and tribal councils that are being co-managed and having their bank issued cheques co-signed by Indian affairs officials?

Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Currently there are 97 recipients under a financial management plan, FMP: 86 recipient controlled, seven co-management and four third-party managed. No Indian band or tribal council has their band issued cheques co-signed by Indian Affairs officials.

DIAND requires First Nations or their organizations, with a cumulative deficit greater than 8 per cent of their total revenues, to have in place a FMP to address the situation. The manner in which this FMP is managed depends upon the severity of the situation:

Recipient controlled: Where the FMP is exclusively managed by a recipient who is deemed to have the required administrative skills to address the difficulty;

Co-managed: Where the recipient is deemed not to have the required skills and recommends to DIAND the name of an independent qualified person or organization to be responsible for the financial affairs of the recipient; and

Third party managed: Where the recipient is deemed not to have the required skills and the health and safety of the community is at risk, DIAND appoints an independent qualified person or organization to administer the day to day affairs of the recipient.

The names of Indian bands and tribal councils who are under a co-management regime cannot be released as this information is confidential third party financial information under section 20(1)(b) of the Access to Information Act.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 44—Mr. Chatters:**

With respect to financial audits conducted by or for the government on Indian bands, tribal councils and aboriginal/Metis organizations, (a) how many audits were conducted during the last five years, (b) how many were considered fully satisfactory and approved by the government, (c) how many received a failing grade from the government?

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): I am informed by the Departments of Canadian Heritage, Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Justice and the Privy Council Office as follows:

In so far as Canadian Heritage is concerned: (a) two; (b) two; (c) Please refer to Justice's reply, part (c).

In so far as Indian Affairs and Northern Development Canada is concerned in the past three years—DIAND's automated audit tracking system contains three years of date, (a) 2,034 audits were conducted; (b) 1,573 unqualified and 318 qualified audit opinions were accepted by the department. The Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants has classified audits into three categories, unqualified, qualified and denial of opinion. A denial of opinion is not accepted by the government; and (c) 143 audits have a denial of opinion. DIAND prepares action plans to address financial management problems for those recipients who have a denial of opinion.

DIAND does not fund Metis organizations. For such organizations, please refer to the answers provided by Canadian Heritage, Justice and the Privy Council Office.

In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: (a) three; (b) one; (c) two. One audit was jointly sponsored by Canadian Heritage, the Federal-Provincial Relations Office of the Privy Council Office, Justice Canada, Saskatchewan Department of Social Services, the Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Affairs Secretariat.

In so far as the Privy Council Office is concerned: (a), (b) and (c) Please refer to Justice's reply, part (c).

Question No. 69—Mr. Bodnar:

With regard to the recent audit of the Saskatchewan Metis Nation, completed by Deloitte-Touche, (a) what was the total amount of expenditures questioned by the auditors, (b) in terms of these questioned expenditures, (i) who made each expenditure, (ii) for what amount, (iii) for what purpose and on what date?

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Total amount of funding questioned by the auditors: \$2,770,131

Programs:

Core Program, 1993–1994
Canadian Heritage: \$514,180
Total: \$514,180

Tri-Partite Program, 1993–1994
Privy Council Office: \$313,320
Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Affairs Secretariat: \$313,320
Total: \$626,640

Core Program, 1992–1993
Canadian Heritage: \$601,311
Department of Justice: \$50,000
Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Affairs Secretariat: \$10,000
Total: \$661,311

Tripartite Program, 1992–1993
Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Affairs Secretariat: \$370,000
Department of Justice: \$460,600
Saskatchewan Social Services: \$71,000
Total: \$901,600

Fur Trappers Meeting, 1992–1993
Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Affairs Secretariat: \$10,000
Total: \$10,000

Justice System Program, 1992–1993
Department of Justice: \$56,400
Total \$56,400

Question No. 82—Mr. Cummins:

What effect did the late signing of the aboriginal fishing agreements in British Columbia have on the Department of Fisheries and Oceans enforcement of the agreements and fisheries regulations in 1994?

Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): On September 23 the hon. member raised the question of the impact of the late signing of agreements on enforcement and regulation of British Columbia fisheries. On November 18 a response was provided which assessed the impact of late signing on the overall enforcement of agreements and regulations pertaining to management of the aboriginal fishery.

The answer provided to the question posed by the hon. member in September was neither inaccurate nor misleading. The response acknowledged that late signing did have some effect.

In characterizing this effect as small, the response was correct in the context of management of aboriginal fishing throughout British Columbia and in the context of the legal capacity to enforce against unauthorized fishing. The question posed by the hon. member was set in both these contexts. The response was not meant to imply that in specific areas and for specific agreements the late signing of agreements did not have negative implications as recorded in the documents cited by the hon. member.

The response characterized the effect on "enforcement of the agreements and fisheries regulations" as small for the following reasons:

1. The integrity of management systems made up of both agreements and regulations was maintained. All aboriginal salmon fishing before the signing of agreements was licensed under the aboriginal communal fishing licence regulations. These licences provided an enforceable framework for the control of aboriginal fishing until agreements were signed.

2. While there were problems with the implementation of some of the more complex agreements, particularly the Sto:Lo agreement, these instances must be interpreted in the context of the 47 agreements signed in 1994 with aboriginal groups across British Columbia.

Government Orders

3. In 23 cases steps were taken to minimize the effect of delays in signing agreements through bridge funding agreements starting at the beginning of May. These agreements provided aboriginal groups with funding to continue management and enforcement activities under protocols established the previous year while negotiations on allocation numbers and funding levels for the current year continued. In the Sto:Lo area, while bridge funding was not possible, a contractor was employed to monitor the fishery.

4. Finally, many of the problems with enforcement which have been identified by fisheries officers are not related to the late signing of agreements. Problems of resource levels, planning and communication while real, and in some cases perhaps attributed by officers to signing of agreements, are actually more related to other aspects of the operation of the department.

The minister has never denied that there were problems with enforcement of aboriginal fishing agreements and regulation in British Columbia in 1994. Many concerns were raised by fisheries officers when the minister met with them on November 2. Some of these problems, such as the curtailed activities of aboriginal guardians and other problems with the ability of some aboriginal groups to participate in management, were related to the late signing of agreements and were identified as such in the initial response. However, in the face of failure to reach agreements at an earlier date, the department took steps to minimize these effects.

The minister is committed to conservation and has taken measures to ensure that the reasons for the disappointing returns to the Fraser this year are independently investigated and publicly reported on. The minister does not believe the late signing of agreements was the primary cause of poor returns in the Fraser. The minister would like to point out that, as agreements are negotiated documents, the department does not have complete control over when they are signed. However, if late agreements are bad, the government must consider the effect of no agreements and no aboriginal involvement on the management of the fishery.

This should not be a game of semantics debating the definition of "little impact". Suffice to say, all issues contributing to the situation on the Fraser this year are being assessed and the minister is committed to taking whatever remedial action proves necessary to ensure conservation.

With specific reference to the late signing of agreements steps have already been taken to commence negotiations on agreements for 1995 in early January. To provide time for planning the implementation of agreements the minister will not be authorizing the signing of agreements after a deadline well in advance of when fishing for major runs is to commence.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The questions as enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered.

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

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

DEPARTMENT OF CANADIAN HERITAGE ACT

Hon. David Anderson (for the Minister of Canadian Heritage) moved that Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage and to amend and repeal certain other acts, be read the third time and passed.

Hon. Sheila Finestone (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women), Lib.): Madam Speaker, the hearings on Bill C-53 by the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage during the past weeks have given many Canadians from all sectors of our society the opportunity to present their views on the responsibilities encompassed in the proposed legislation.

Every kind of opinion has been heard about this bill, including the name of the department, the portfolio and its holdings, and suggestions on how to amend various acts under its jurisdiction. This expression of a wide range of views about the Department of Canadian Heritage is consistent with the objective of our parliamentary system of fairness and openness in government. It is consistent with the government's ideal about giving all citizens the right, the access and the opportunity to become involved in all aspects of Canadian life.

(1130)

[Translation]

The Department of Canadian Heritage would encourage the possibility of greater participation by our fellow citizens in the social, political, cultural and economic life of their country.

In a few moments, my colleague, the member for Mississauga East, will speak about the many advantages of having one integrated department.

Indeed, the department's responsibilities, which range from natural reserves and historic sites and figures to sports and include the arts and cultural industries, really cover all aspects of life in Canada.

Government Orders

[English]

(1135)

My intention therefore is to concentrate on the multicultural aspects of Canadian life and why there is a need for a program that focuses on building understanding and respect and on fighting racism, bigotry and prejudice.

For my government this program is more than building a monument. It is far more lasting in terms of daily living for Canadians, whatever their language, culture, milieu, newly arrived or long time resident. Multiculturalism is about the very fabric of our society.

Canada has been built by wave after wave of immigrants. All Canadians other than the First Nations have their roots reaching to the four corners of the earth. They have kept coming and they have come at different stages.

I was at a very moving and beautiful ceremony yesterday held at Rideau Hall with the Governor General of Canada. At that ceremony Dr. Dmytroa Cipywnyk, a very distinguished Canadian of Ukrainian descent and who is president of the Canadian Ethnocultural Council, received in the name of the 37 groups that represent ethnocultural communities across Canada a coat of arms.

It was a very moving day as I saw Ukrainians, Germans, Italians, Greeks, Jewish people, East Indians, people from the Czech Republic, Poland, Argentina, people of Irish descent and people from countries all around the world who all belong to this Canadian Ethnocultural Council. They had decided that they wanted to have a heraldic emblem that would represent who they are and what it means to be part of Canada.

I was very touched and moved by the words of the Governor General. Mr. Hnatyshyn made a comment on the choice of the heraldry, the red and white crest with the winged seeds. He said maple trees are different. Maple seeds have a design that allows them to spiral to the ground far from the trees. They take root in new places, adapt to new conditions and thrive. That is the kind of spirit that has drawn millions of people to this land for hundreds of years. It is that spirit that draws people here today.

I thought that was very demonstrative of the role and the place that Canadians have played from all parts of this world, from the Irish who came here fleeing hunger and famine to the Chinese who came to help build the railways, to the blacks who came through the underground railway. All kinds of people have come to this shore and each wave has brought prosperity, growth and development. Each wave has had to live difficult experiences and each wave has been enabled by the concepts that are founded in our democratic process to grow and to prosper, but not without difficulty.

We have addressed those difficulties at many different times in different ways because we have been a growing and emerging democracy.

In that spirit that moved thousands upon thousands of volunteers to respond, to reach out and to work for social harmony and social peace as their communities arrived here, it was the small groups that lent a hand to the business people, to the families in need, the Baron de Hirsch, for food, for coal, for heat; it was the organizations that came together to give food and lodging, shoes and clothing for the cold weather. Whether it was my community or the Christian community or the other communities, they gave a helping hand and enabled us to feel a sense of comfort and welcome and then we made the choice to stay, to move on, to integrate, to associate, to make our way of life here in Canada.

That spirit, that generosity is found in the charitable social and cultural organizations of today. They all need respect, understanding and they need and come for some form of support as they work to face a very changed dynamic in society. Society is a great big global village whose people have still not learned how to live respectfully in many of the lands from which they come.

We have an important job that is different than before because technology has changed. The world we now see is in conflict and those conflicts are now coming here and we must stop those conflicts. It is a different kind of situation.

It is important that these volunteer organizations help us work toward social peace and social harmony. If we reach out our hand in friendship and we welcome the newly arrived as the host society, we will have received them at our table with grace and dignity and we will help others integrate into our society under the value system that we have built into our society.

It is fairly new. When we talk about what we have put in here it is the spirit of multiculturalism that moved much of the change that we saw as we brought in our Charter of Rights and Freedoms, as we brought in the Canadian Constitution, as we signed international documents to eliminate all forms of discrimination, all forms of racism, as we put into place acts of employment equity.

I have said it before and I will say it again. It is time for us to get up to date, to understand and to explain to constituents just what multiculturalism means for Canada, just how important it is to the fabric of life here.

We have never been a static society. Canadian federalism is a growing and evolving modern society. It is governance that looks at and adapts to change. It is not frozen in any particular mode or model. It has guiding principles today that form the very core of this nation and it moves based on fundamental principles. It means that Canada has been and is now and will continue to be a host country and a home country for people from around the world, from a multitude of other cultures that all share the same goal of making a good life for themselves and their families within the framework of our laws and our princi-

Government Orders

ples of justice and fairness, of peace, order and good government at all levels of our society.

It is obvious that people see the structures we have in place and that is why they want to come here. As citizens we have adapted it, have adopted it and have allowed it to evolve because we do not all have in our hearts and our minds the goodwill we need to have to help ensure that the fundamentals are there and that we move forward with them.

It is very healthy that we have dialogue around the goals of multiculturalism. It is very healthy that we look at and analyse our society and recognize the ugly face of racism, recognize that those groups, Heritage Front, the Ku Klux Klan, are here, are out there, are spreading their poison and it has to stop. This is not a place where we allow them one seed from the maple tree to settle in the earth of this land.

(1140)

Community groups, social, cultural and educational groups contribute their skill, knowledge, expertise and creativity to Canadian life. It is the responsibility of all Canadians in the public as well as the private sector to encourage the conditions that allow all of us, regardless of our origins, to expect these principles of fairness and justice flourish and grow and that we support those initiatives.

The government's multiculturalism programs are in place to assist us in reaching this goal. It is not an unreasonable goal and it is not an unattainable goal to expect that all Canadians be integrated into our society and become contributors to the country's progress.

I did not say assimilate. I did not say that one should lose one's identity, but one should learn to live in co-operation with respect and understanding in our neighbourhoods. Those are the choices we have in this society. This is nothing more than good common sense. It allows for peace. It allows for civil society. The multicultural programs are there because unfortunately there are still barriers that prevent some individuals and groups from realizing their full potential.

Canada was founded on a tradition of democracy, decency and civility, values of fairness and justice associated with this system that have guided and shaped our social structures, laws and institutions.

We have strayed. We have erred, but we have also grown and learned to cherish the fragile form of rule that we have in place here which calls for constant vigilance. It is in civility and respect, it is in an appreciation of our diversity that we live. Pluralism, diversity, multicultural and multiracial backgrounds are our reality. Together we shall weave a tapestry that forms the fundamentals that is Canada, as we look in the House and see

how different we are, how different are the geographic regions, the backgrounds, the lands and the languages.

There is no one in the House who can look back more than two or three generations, maybe four. There are some here who tell me they have been here for six generations, but that is not the lifetime of this nation. We are all different and learning to live together, respecting each other. We do not have to love each other, but we have to respect each other for our differences and yet for our Canadian appreciation of the values of life.

To live with this reality, to ensure social peace and cohesion will not happen by wishing. That only happens by working for it.

[*Translation*]

Multiculturalism is not incompatible with Canadian values. On the contrary, it is based on the principles of the rights and responsibilities set forth in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the Canadian Human Rights Act, the Official Languages Act, the Citizenship Act and I might even add the Employment Equity Act.

Canada's multiculturalism policy makes it possible to overcome obstacles more easily and to promote institutional change.

It recognizes the richness found in cultural diversity. It is modeled on the values which guide us, are essential to our way of life and underlie what we aspire to as Canadians.

(1145)

When I visited numerous cultural communities across the country, I had the opportunity and the privilege to meet many men, women and young people who were all representative of today's Canadian society. Some are proud that their ancestors were among the first ones to step on Canadian soil. Others take pride in their dual citizenship, or in their newly acquired citizenship.

I met members of organizations and associations involved in many sectors, including business, health care, education, law enforcement, as well as municipal and provincial administrations, to name but a few.

[*English*]

The message is always the same. The Government of Canada must help Canadians of all backgrounds to build a society where we can live in our neighbourhood in peaceful respect, united in the common purpose of securing the well-being of our families. That is what they told me. They recognize prejudice, they recognize bigotry, and they recognize the need to ensure that we stamp it out.

I believe that the government's multiculturalism policy and the programs it supported can help to achieve this goal but only in participation with the private sector and community based groups that speak for all Canadians. Those multicultural councils are vital to our well-being.

Government Orders

To do this successfully we are going to have to meet a number of challenges. First, we must recognize that pluralism does not contradict our assured sense of national identity, nor does it prevent social cohesion. We must not confuse national values with cultural pluralism because values cut across religious, cultural and ethnic and racial lines.

Second, we are going to have to work on ways to facilitate the long term integration of first generation Canadians. We must give new citizens the tools to be effective, responsible, and informed so that they can contribute to Canada's development and become full and active participants in building a stronger country.

Long term integration starts with learning about Canada, starts with civics. So many of the countries from which people are coming and have come do not understand democracy as it is lived here in Canada today. They do not and have not lived in democratic states. They have fear of speech. They have fear of police. They have fear of neighbours. They have fear of difference. It is our job if we want to live together in peaceful harmony to enable them to understand they are welcome, as I said earlier, at our table as part of the family.

We teach that Canada is a democratic country. That is what we do in multiculturalism. We teach that we welcome the expression of opinion. We teach that we welcome difference while ensuring that racism and bigotry find no home here. Otherwise it is pointless and it would be a pointless lesson if we do not practise what we preach.

Democracy requires that all citizens feel they are valued in this society. They must know that the opportunities to participate are available to everyone and should be available equally. We have to stop creaming those societies of their top intellectuals, bringing them here and not recognizing their academic qualifications.

We must recognize that we must teach one of the official languages of this country. If we do not do that you cannot participate in a democratic society. You cannot shop in knowledge. You cannot look after your children and apply medications and buy medications. You cannot understand political parties. You cannot make rational decisions if you cannot read and speak one of the official languages of this country, depending on where you live and in what region you live and from where you came and what seems to adapt best to you. One of the official languages must be a part of the background of training.

There must really be no barriers to participation based on race, religion, ethnic background or language.

[*Translation*]

All Canadians must be able to express their views so as to be understood by others. This is why, as I just said, we have made education in both official languages a priority. This is important, because Canadians must have a decent standard of living, and they must participate in the daily activities of our society.

Otherwise, people feel isolated; they can be manipulated and they may not lead the life they should be able to, here in Canada.

(1150)

[*English*]

The multiculturalism program is therefore organized around four key objectives. First is to facilitate community participation and integration into the fabric of Canadian society.

Second is to help those who render services in our hospitals and health institutions and those who receive the services; the police, the municipalities and the schools as well, to ensure that their policies and programs adjust to the reality of our diversity.

Third is to strengthen social cohesion by promoting harmonious cross-cultural, intercultural and interracial group relations.

Fourth is to promote public awareness of the economic and social benefits of pluralism.

We know already that we have the support of many major Canadian organizations and institutions that understand the value of a respectful, open and participating society. One example I would give is that peaceful harmony means good business. Therefore, removing racism and acts of racial prejudice undertaking is valuable.

We thank the Canadian Association of Broadcasters which has produced \$10 million worth of air time which has been devoted to the fight against racism. In our schools across this land, parents and teachers associations have helped us fight prejudice and misunderstanding in the schools and have distributed very valuable materials that are lessons in civicism and civility.

Other partners, the Conference Board of Canada and the Asia Pacific Foundation, have made it clear that diversity has an economic benefit and that pluralism gives us a natural competitive advantage in a global economy that is in itself multicultural and multilingual.

The Canadian Advertising Association has done some excellent research and has put out a document called "The Colour of Your Money" that enable us to understand how important it is to be able to deal with the customers who live on our street and in our district.

Our broad range of partners also includes the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, the Multicultural Help Association, the Canadian Advertising Council, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the Canadian Association of School Board Trustees, the Canadian Teachers' Federation, and the Canadian Conference on the Arts.

These are not song, dance and festivals. Although I would love to be able to finance them, we do not do that. They are partners that help us ensure an open, respectful and understanding society where we all have choices to live, choices to choose where and how we want to live within the laws of respect in this land so that we live in an integrated milieu that makes Canada the best place for all its citizens.

Government Orders

These are the partnerships along with the volunteer sector that open more lines of communication to provide all Canadians, men and women and our youth, with a greater knowledge of the richness and benefits of our diverse population.

We are working to change government from the inside as well as to ensure interracial understanding. The same way we work with shop foremen to prepare that floor as the host community to the new arrivals, so we are doing within our own house. For example, we worked and are working with the Departments of National Defence, Customs and Excise, and the RCMP to help ensure they are sensitive in their response to Canada's reality.

[Translation]

Our programs related to interracial relations and cultural comprehension, and also to the integration of first generation Canadians, help all Canadians, through community support, to work together to build an economically sound and socially just country.

Multiculturalism is not based on compartmentalization, nor on division.

[English]

It is not based on being a hyphenated Canadian.

[Translation]

It seeks to build an integrated society where everyone has an equal chance to succeed, as well as an opportunity to understand and apply the principles governing citizenship.

(1155)

[English]

It is also not as I said before about funding song and dance, and unicultural festivals, as important as they are.

[Translation]

When we see the tragedies which occur every day in the world, we have no choice but to cherish human life, and that includes all men and women—Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Hindus, Sikhs, Muslims, be they black, yellow, brown, red or white—who adhere to the democratic values of the Canadian society.

[English]

With an investment of less than \$1 per year per Canadian, the federal government helps to promote a fairer society.

In a society with a government that spends less than \$1 per year but depends on additions to that dollar through the voluntary sector and through voluntary effort, the federal government helps to promote a fairer society in which all Canadians have a chance and a choice to participate equally and with respect.

This is an investment we cannot afford to ignore. The value of our multiculturalism programs to Canadian society must be confirmed by ensuring that they can work effectively within the Department of Canadian Heritage. All of us, whether in this House or not, must be ever vigilant in our defence of the values of a democratic, free and open society.

[Translation]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Madam Speaker, the bill before the House today, on third reading, is Bill C-53, an Act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage and to amend and repeal certain other Acts.

The Bloc Québécois has five major reasons for voting against this bill. First, through this bill the Government of Canada denies the existence of Quebec as a nation and the existence of its culture.

Second, nothing in this bill points to any major changes in federal policy on defending the rights of francophones in Canada, although anyone who can read and use a pocket calculator will see that the federal government's policy on bilingualism has failed.

Third, this government has forgotten its commitment made to creators during the last election campaign with respect to patriating copyright legislation to the Department of Canadian Heritage.

Fourth, at a time when there is a growing trend towards amalgamation in the communications sector, the government has decided to confirm the separate status of telecommunications and broadcasting by making the Department of Industry responsible for the former and the Department of Canadian Heritage responsible for broadcasting.

Fifth, nothing in this bill gives the Department of Canadian Heritage any real power to control foreign investment where cultural products and industries are concerned.

I will now comment on these points one by one, to demonstrate the major weaknesses of this bill. In his speech on second reading of the bill we are now considering at the third reading stage, the Minister of Canadian Heritage defined the word "heritage" as, and I quote: "the set of signs that enable us to recognize ourselves as individuals who belong to a group or even a country".

On the basis of that definition, it was reasonable to hope that the Canadian government would recognize in law what has been a fact since the beginnings of this country and what the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission recognized, and I am talking about

Government Orders

the existence of two founding peoples equal before the law and of several nations. Unfortunately, this bill makes no reference to the signs that would enable Quebecers to recognize themselves as belonging to this country. This bill recognizes only one nation, the nation of Canada, and gives the Minister of Canadian Heritage the authority to promote one identity: the Canadian identity.

(1200)

There is worse. The heritage minister, who sponsored this bill, testified before the Standing Committee on National Heritage on December 1. My colleague, the hon. member for Québec, asked him at that time why his bill made reference to only one nation, namely the Canadian nation, instead of two, that of Quebec and Canada. With the arrogance and ignorance that have come to characterize him, he replied: "I would be grateful if you could tell me, or if there is not enough time, my officials who will be testifying before you at a later date, which clause exactly refers to a single Canadian nation. All I can see in this bill is references to Canadian identity. And that is not the same thing".

Again, the minister is playing games. He is insinuating that my hon. colleague from Québec did not understand a thing.

Let me explain to the Minister of Canadian Heritage a couple of basic rules of grammar. When you write "nation", it is a singular. And singular means one, not two, because then you would have a plural, meaning more than one. When you write "Canadian nation", the word "Canadian" is used as a qualifier or adjective and, in French, the function of the adjective is to modify the word it is combined with. In this bill, we are not talking about just any nation, but the Canadian nation.

Let us take a closer look at clauses 4 and 5 of the bill, which specifically give the minister the mandate to promote the Canadian nation.

Clause 4 reads, and I quote:

4.(1) The powers, duties and functions of the Minister extend to and include all matters over which Parliament has jurisdiction, not by law assigned to any other department, board or agency of the Government of Canada, relating to Canadian identity and values, cultural development, heritage and areas of natural or historical significance to the nation.

As for Clause 5, it reads as follows:

5. In exercising the powers and performing the duties and functions assigned to the Minister by section 4, the Minister shall initiate, recommend, coordinate, implement and promote national policies, projects and programs with respect to Canadian identity and values, cultural development, heritage and areas of natural or historical significance to the nation.

In this case, there is no room for interpretation in the French version of the clause, as the word "canadiens" is spelled with an "s". If you go back to the grammatical rule I just gave, this means that the qualifier "canadiens" modifies every noun that

precedes it in the sentence—the same way that "Canadian" modifies every substantive that comes after. The meaning of Clause 5 then is the following: "In exercising the powers and performing the duties and functions assigned to the Minister by section 4, the Minister shall initiate, recommend, coordinate, implement and promote national policies, projects and programs with respect to Canadian identity and Canadian values, Canadian cultural development, Canadian heritage and areas of natural or historical significance to the nation—that is to say the Canadian nation".

You will have noticed that this entire bill is predicated on the concept of a Canadian nation. For the Minister of Canadian Heritage and the cultural agencies under him, there is only one nation, the Canadian nation.

In the brief he tabled with the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, Mr. Monière reported to us the results of polls conducted by Léger & Léger and related by Maurice Pinard, a renowned McGill University professor whose integrity, credibility and intellectual honesty are unquestionable.

These polls show that Quebec's national identity has evolved considerably and that Quebecers are more and more likely to identify themselves as Quebecers first and foremost and not as French Canadians, much less as Canadians. In 1992, 54 per cent of respondents of all linguistic origins—this is important—referred to themselves as Quebecers, 26 per cent as French Canadians and 20 per cent as Canadians. These figures clearly point to the existence of a Quebec culture, a Quebec identity, a Quebec nation, which the bill before us does not reflect.

(1205)

Many things were said in committee on this concept of nation. When department officials came to testify, they told us that since this bill was not a constitutional document, it did not have to mention the two founding nations of this country. I must humbly admit that I did not have time to verify this statement from a legal standpoint. But I know very well that at the time of the "beautiful risk", we tried to have Quebec's distinct society recognized in the Constitution, but the rest of Canada turned us down.

We are on the horns of a dilemma, the one about the chicken and the egg, which will be much more simple and easy to solve through Quebec sovereignty, since the government refuses to make any amendment to this bill which would have helped us feel at home in this country, even though we were the first to arrive in this country named Canada by Jacques Cartier, a country whose national anthem was composed—lyrics and music—by two Quebecers, Calixa Lavallée and Basile Routhier. We are being denied the right to feel at home in this country, so the only alternative is to leave.

Government Orders

Mrs. Finestone: I feel right at home, and I refuse to leave.

Mrs. Tremblay: I listened to you, Madam, so try to listen to me while I speak. Thank you.

In summary, what the deputy minister, cultural development tells us is that the Canadian identity includes the Quebec identity. He said in committee that their general vision is that the Quebec identity is a fundamental component of the Canadian identity.

This vision, which would wipe out Quebecois culture as if it did not exist by itself but was only an integral part of Canadian culture, was denounced by many groups that appeared before the Committee on Canadian Heritage during the marathon hearings which, by using dilatory procedural tactics, we were able to force the government to hold.

François Rocher, a political scientist at Carleton University, said that what the government was doing was part of an incomplete process of nation-building, based on a denial of the national realities that already exist in Canada. Establishing a heritage department is part of a much broader plan to refashion the way that Canada's identity is to be understood and expressed. Mr. Rocher thus shares the idea expressed by his colleague, Mr. Monière, who said that the heritage department was really a propaganda department.

In fact, what the government is doing is, first, to deny the social and historic reality of an existing Quebec culture and nation; second, to imagine a fictitious Canadian national community to hide the lack of a common sense of Canadian identity; third, the government wishes to promote this made-up identity and even impose it on all communities in Canada.

It is quite obvious that this is intended particularly to counter Quebec nationalism. To oppose the growing demands for particular identities, the government proposes a homogenizing national vision. However, building a national identity on the denial of already existing identities that are strong and politically articulate can only exacerbate the tensions that exist in Canada.

It must be pointed out that all the efforts of this department consisted and from now on will consist in denying the existence of a culture other than the Canadian one and furthermore in using our taxes to promote this Canadian culture on Quebec territory. Why do the Bloc Quebecois and most of the witnesses who appeared before the heritage committee so strongly denounce this denial of Quebec culture by the federal government? Quite simply, because failing to mention it in the bill means denying its existence.

Mr. Rocher said that three conditions are essential for a culture to exist. First, it must be able to express itself; that is, it must be rich and flourishing. Second, it must be able to fulfil itself, that is, be used and valued in economic, social and

political activities. Finally, it must be recognized, that is, accepted and taken into consideration by other communities close by.

(1210)

The right to exist is part of one's identity. The identity must represent something, not only for the individuals which make up a community, but also for the other communities which recognize the legitimacy of that identity.

Let us now come to the second reason why the Bloc Quebecois will oppose this bill, namely the failure of the federal government's official languages policy.

This legislation provides no major change regarding federal policies on bilingualism, as was confirmed to us, in committee, by the responsible deputy minister at the Department of Canadian Heritage. According to paragraph 4(2)(g) of the bill, the minister is responsible for, and I quote:

(g) the advancement of the equality of status and use of English and French and the enhancement and development of the English and French linguistic minority communities in Canada;

Also, clauses 23 and 24 of the bill amend the Official Languages Act to confirm that the Minister of Canadian Heritage will be the one responsible for the implementation of sections 41 and 42, Part VII, of the Official Languages Act, which relate to the co-ordination and the implementation of linguistic policies within federal departments.

So, there is nothing new under the sun. Yet, the government should really have brought major changes to its linguistic policy. It should have clearly indicated its intention to salvage what can still be salvaged.

Let us take a look at some figures, 25 years after the Official Languages Act took effect. First, the percentage of Canadians whose first language is French is dropping drastically, and the official languages policy implemented in 1969 has done nothing to stop that trend.

According to Statistics Canada's latest census, 6.5 million Canadians, or 23.8 per cent of the population, have French as their mother tongue. In 1951, that proportion was 29 per cent.

Let us look at the assimilation rate, which is the ratio between the number of those who say French is their mother tongue and the number of those who actually use French at home. According to the latest census, the average assimilation rate in Canada, excluding Quebec, was 35.9 per cent, which represents an increase of 4.5 per cent over the 1986 figure.

British Columbia is the undisputed champion with an assimilation rate of 75.2 per cent. Saskatchewan is in second place with a rate of 69.6 per cent, followed by Alberta with 66.9 per cent. Even New Brunswick, which is the only constitutionally bilingual province and which prides itself in giving special treatment to French, has an assimilation rate of 8.7 per cent.

Some say that Quebec has the most racist linguistic policy. Yet, its English-speaking community is growing.

In the 1991 census, 9.2 per cent of Quebecers said that English was their mother tongue, while 11.2 per cent stated that they spoke English at home. Instead of hiding its head in the sand, Canada should look at what is being done in Quebec.

Let us now turn to how the federal government implements its policy on bilingualism in its own Public Service. Take Foreign Affairs, a sector that is crucial when representing Canada abroad and helping business people from Quebec, for instance.

Recent reports released by the department indicated that only 42 per cent of Canadian diplomats were bilingual and that 23 per cent were francophones, of whom more than 95 per cent were bilingual. We can therefore conclude that only 25 per cent of English Canadian diplomats speak French, which is totally unacceptable in their position as representatives of a country that calls itself officially bilingual.

The consequences of the lack of bilingual Canadian representatives abroad are well known. A unilingual francophone client abroad, whether he is a businessman or a citizen in distress, is unable to communicate with about 60 per cent of departmental officers. He cannot read unclassified documents drafted in English only and can only communicate with a minority of the diplomats in Canadian embassies abroad.

With this many of our diplomats being unilingual English, the problem is compounded when the embassy is a small one.

And what impression do foreigners get when they find that the Canadian ambassador, a career diplomat, does not speak French? That Canada is a unilingual, English-speaking country.

(1215)

Turning to the Department of National Defence, 48.1 per cent of the total francophone establishment, both civilian and military, is bilingual, while only 6.9 per cent of the anglophone establishment is bilingual. Furthermore, 23.4 per cent of francophones are in English-speaking units and only 1.7 per cent of anglophones are in French-speaking units. There is no good reason for this. What makes these statistics even more depressing today is the closing of the Collège militaire de Saint-Jean. Both departments are, in fact, a microcosm of the situation in the federal Public Service.

In its latest report on the language situation in the federal Public Service, Treasury Board said that in Quebec, to serve a minority group that represents 10 per cent of the population, the federal government had an establishment that was of 52.7 per cent bilingual, or 15,945 positions out of a total of 30,234.

If we apply this ratio to the rest of Canada, the number of bilingual positions should be 30,666 instead of 7,465, which is the case today. So there is a crying need for 23,000 bilingual

Government Orders

positions, which is not being met. After the Yukon, the francophone minority least well served by the federal government is in New Brunswick, where the percentage of francophones is 33 per cent and the percentage of bilingual positions in the federal Public Service is only 39.4 per cent. Applying the same ratio we applied to Quebec, the entire federal Public Service in this province should be bilingual.

It is obvious to me that the view in Ottawa is that a francophone is not worth as much as an anglophone, because when it comes to being served in one's own language, the anglophone gets the service, while the francophone has to speak English. Studies have repeatedly shown that the inability to obtain services in one's own language is a factor that contributes generally to assimilation.

If the federal government really wanted to put the status and use of French and English on an equal footing in this country, it would invest in this principle, in other words, when awarding bursaries for language training, it would give preference to anglophones in Canada with a very poor knowledge of French instead of to francophones, who generally have a fairly good knowledge of English. But no, the Department of Canadian Heritage does the opposite. On page 13 of his report, the official languages commissioner notes that of the 7,301 bursaries awarded in 1992-1993 for summer language courses, 3,150 went to Quebecers. What this program, like many others, is designed to do is anglicize Quebec, not to make Canada bilingual.

Here, I cannot help pointing out the difference in the treatment of the English and French networks of the CBC. While the CBC spends an average of \$18,390 per production hour on its French network, it spends twice that amount, or \$37,496, on its English network, and it does so with the blessing of the federal government, the Department of Canadian Heritage and the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission.

In this regard, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation continues to be a clear example of what the federal government has in store for French in Canada and of the collusion of Canadian institutions in the implementation of this unequal status.

I could not close this chapter on the failure of 25 years of bilingualism policies without sharing with you some information that appeared in the summer issue of *Language and Society*, a magazine put out by the Commissioner of Official Languages. This particular issue looked at the accessibility of health services in the language of the minority. It contained the following lines: "The government of British Columbia has instituted a program of access to multilingual services. French is not included, however, even though francophones form the fifth largest ethnic group in that province. Language assistance is offered in Chinese (Mandarin and Cantonese), Punjabi, Spanish,

Government Orders

Somali and Vietnamese, even though Vietnamese is only the sixteenth largest ethnic group in the province”.

Surely British Columbia holds the gold medal for assimilation, since it does not offer any health services in French to its French-speaking population.

(1220)

The spokesperson for the provincial Department of Health, Mrs. Susan Gee, explains the situation this way, and I quote: “There are not enough Francophones in British Columbia”. Yet, there are more Francophones than Vietnamese. “They are not considered immigrants and they are expected to be bilingual since they are Canadians”. In other words, they are expected to speak English.

Other provinces have no policy regarding the provision of health services in the minority language. As one witness told the committee: “Call 911 just to see if you can get service in French”. When you think about everything the federal government said against user fees and its refusal to do anything to provide health services in French, there is only one conclusion to be drawn.

The third reason why we oppose this bill is that it gives the Minister of Heritage the power to legislate with regard to copyright. Let me remind the House that we have been waiting now for almost nine years for the Copyright Act to be amended. Let me also remind the House that the legislation was supposed to be amended under the previous government and that the current Minister of Heritage, when he was appointed, appeared before the Committee on Canadian Heritage, that was last April, and told us that the reform of the legislation was one of his priorities. At that time, he said it was only a matter of weeks before he could table the bill. However, creative artists will not even see the legislation before Christmas.

Why? Because the Copyright Act is essentially the responsibility of the Department of Industry. Every creative artists’ group has demanded that the act be transferred to the Department of Heritage. All those who came before the committee indicated that the Department of Industry is in a conflict of interests in this matter. Indeed, the department must protect the interests of consumers and corporations, which are in direct contradiction with the rights and interests of the artists.

Before the election, even the Liberal Party had recognized that this was inappropriate. In response to questions by the Canadian Conference of the Arts, the Liberals wrote: “The Liberal Party will have as a priority to review the Copyright Act. We will make sure that, above all, the writers reap the fruit of their labours, while easing the access to copyrighted material. Liberals understand how important copyrights are. That is why we will review the Conservative decision to share this jurisdic-

tion between two departments, when reorganizing the administration.”

This at least is one case where the Liberal Party has not kept its word and that is most unfortunate. In an almost unprecedented effort of manipulation, the chairman of the heritage committee did his best to make us and the witnesses believe that his government had, in fact, proceeded to review the Conservative decision but had finally decided that it was more logical to leave the responsibility of the Copyright Act with the Department of Industry.

His attempt to save face failed. Indeed, senior officials from the Department of Industry, who drafted Bill C-46 establishing this department, said before the industry committee that all they did was put into legislative terms Ms. Campbell’s reform. This evidence was corroborated by Heritage Canada officials who, during the briefing session given to our staff, stated that Bill C-53 was just a housekeeping bill whose sole purpose was to put into legislative terms the Campbell reform, and not to correct its flaws.

Officials from the Department of Industry went even further. When questioned by the committee chairman, they stated that it would not help to add a reference to copyright in the Heritage Canada legislation. They said that if we had to add this kind of reference every time the interests of two departments overlapped, we would never see the end of it. By saying this, these officials confirmed what many had told us in committee, that the government amendment to Bill C-53 regarding copyright does not give the minister any new powers.

As my colleague for Richelieu said in committee, since the legislative power with regard to copyright rests with the Department of Industry, the protection of the rights of creative artists comes down to a matter of credibility and the strength of individual ministers.

(1225)

Given the clout and credibility of the present Minister of Canadian Heritage, creative artists have good reason to be pessimistic, and they have the whole-hearted sympathy of the official opposition.

By its refusal to give copyright legislation to the Department of Canadian Heritage, the government has shown that it could not care less about creative artists. It sends an alarming signal to the artistic community and cultural industries. We all remember the decision made in the Ginn transaction, and we all know how that sorry saga ended.

I cannot conclude without saying a word on our last two reasons for voting against this bill. Against all logic, as far as the defence of our cultural industries is concerned, the Canadian government maintained another decision made by Ms. Campbell, splitting broadcasting and telecommunications.

Government Orders

At a time when convergence is critical to the activities of our cultural industries, it was important to rescind the decision separating two things that, by nature, belong together: telecommunications and broadcasting. The message this government sends to people in the communications business is that financial interests will take precedence over cultural interests in Canada and Quebec. That is a very serious problem because the value to be gained from the information highway will not be the physical network itself, but rather the information travelling through that network.

I would also like to say that today, we are witnessing another shift toward the industry department. Indeed, as for copyrights, the federal government chose to leave to the Department of Industry jurisdiction over foreign investments in cultural industries, thus giving to the Department of Canadian Heritage only the power to develop cultural policies. The former Department of Communications had that power. It used it to develop a publishing policy which the government light-heartily violated in the Ginn case and in the Maxwell-McMillan versus Prentice-Hall case, as well.

I am getting to the conclusion, which is simple: this government, with its Bill C-53, once again simply lacks vision.

At the dawn of this crucial year for our collective future, the Canadian government had a unique opportunity to send clear messages to the citizens of this country, whom the Department of Canadian Heritage has a mandate to protect. As a member of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, this saddens me. But as a sovereignist, I am very happy that the government did exactly the opposite of what Canadians were expecting, but exactly what Quebecers were hoping for.

It simply denied the existence of our nation. It does not suggest any move to frenchify English Canada and to stop the bilingualization of Quebec. On the contrary, in our opinion, clause 4(2)(g), which provides for the advancement of the equality of status and use of French and English, is not even worth the paper on which it is written. Finally, the government has not lived up to the expectations it had instilled in creative artists and an important part of the tools it could use to defend culture and creators is now in the hands of the Department of Industry. The government has just officially placed an important part of the Canadian Heritage under its administrative supervision.

For all those reasons, the Bloc Québécois will oppose this bill. It is narrow-minded, dangerous for the Canadian nation and disrespectful towards creative artists. There is only one hope for Quebecers, which is to choose to have their own country. Only then will they be able to express their own culture and have it recognized for the best of our collective future.

[English]

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I rise to speak at third reading of Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage.

(1230)

I must say it has been a unique experience to participate in the process of presenting this bill to the House, to hear the responses of so many of my colleagues at second reading, to acknowledge the efforts of all of us in committee and now finally to speak once again at this next step in its passage. In my view this represents the best of what democracy has to offer us: freedom of speech and the opportunity to disagree and present alternative points of view. Having said that, will we be left yet again with the status quo?

Speaking from this side of the House I believe that our point of view has enriched the debate as the government has continued its creation of a superministry of cultural identity. We have presented many arguments to challenge the new ministry. As I have said before, it denies us an opportunity to define ourselves as Canadians despite the insistence of some that it provides and promotes greater understanding and a greater sense of intercultural endeavour.

What is occurring is the legislative entrenchment of grants to a host of special interest groups. The total of all special interest group funding throughout all government departments is rumoured to be approximately \$500 million. The government has not been specific in terms of the cuts it plans to make to special interest groups. Responses have ranged from the preparation of guidelines to the anticipation of reduced funding. There is nothing explicit in that regard but to wait until the February 1995 budget.

It is obvious the government is not comfortable discussing expenditure reduction. This is odd especially at a time when Canadians are seeking a more open approach to governance. It is also odd at a time when the opportunity to present a model for change, as has been presented in the creation of the Department of Canadian Heritage, has not been seized. The circle of virtue is reduced to a vicious circle and the status quo remains.

The ministry consolidates several subcabinet departments: the Secretary of State; the Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship; the Department of Fitness and Amateur Sport; Parks Canada; components of Environment Canada; and the heritage component of the Department of Communications. I will focus further on a number of these departments in this presentation.

Given the unacceptable, incomprehensible and contemptuous personal attack made yesterday by my colleague from Carleton—Gloucester with no regard or relationship to Bill C-53, I will clarify for the member the Reform Party's position on languages. I hope he will be able to understand this clear policy.

Government Orders

The Reform Party supports the promotion of language policy centred on the following:

[Translation]

first, freedom of expression; second, recognition of the French language in Quebec and of the English language in other provinces; third, recognition of bilingualism in important federal institutions, including the Parliament of Canada and the Supreme Court; and finally, recognition of bilingualism wherever the number of people warrants the presence of services in both official languages.

[English]

Explaining further so as to be perfectly clear, let me quote the hon. member for Nanaimo—Cowichan. He explained during second reading of the bill that the official languages policy is divisive. For proof of this, one need only be reminded of the pejorative, anti-women comments that were hurled my way yesterday by the member for Carleton—Gloucester.

My hon. colleague from Nanaimo—Cowichan stated that “the mandate calls for the advancement of the equality of status and the use of English and French. Under this mandate the ministry will spend \$24 million this year on official languages in education. The Constitutions of 1867 and 1982 clearly state that education is a provincial responsibility. Why then is this ministry spending a quarter of a billion dollars in this area of provincial jurisdiction?”

(1235)

We oppose this bill for a number of reasons, only one of which is our opposition to the government’s official languages policy. I would like to quote the profound words of my colleague from Surrey North when she questioned the need for this department.

The hon. member stated: “Webster’s dictionary defines heritage as something that we inherit at birth; in other words it is like a legacy. It is something or anything that is derived from the past or from tradition. By definition then, heritage of an individual or a group or a country is what we actually inherit at birth, that which was created and moulded by the actions of those who preceded us just as what we do now in our lifetime will become the heritage or the mould of the lifestyle for those who come after us”.

She went on to say: “Those in the present inherit a base from the past to build on for those in the future. Instead of there being a specific Department of Canadian Heritage, all departments or ministries should be responsible through the legislation they propose for the development and maintenance of everything we do, of the heritage for those who are to follow, not just a single department”.

Let me share with the House a story about a man by the name of Glenn Bradley. I found his story in the book *Worlds Apart: New Immigrant Voices* written by Milly Charon. His story is titled “The Dilemma of Multiculturalism”. This is Glenn’s story and it constitutes the bulk of my remarks today. There is a poignancy to this story that I will leave with the House.

Language and nationality are current issues in today’s society. In view of the laws and general social outlook in Quebec, one has to realize that to survive here, one must become French. Many of the language problems exist today because the younger generation did not want to learn to speak French, perhaps because of their parents who may have been immigrants and wished to keep the old ways and mother tongue dominant.

I grew up under the new age of political reform in Quebec. The social phenomenon of the quiet revolution and le Front de Libération du Québec were part of my childhood surroundings. These events played a part in the rise of the supremacy of the French language in Quebec.

My parents witnessed these social reforms and decided that if I was to have a future in Quebec I would have to learn to speak French.

They could have rebelled in their own way. They could have brought me up with all the Scottish traditions they had been raised with. However, teatime, the clans, and Robert Burns were not to play a part in my childhood education.

My family roots are deep in Scottish soil. My parents and all my ancestors were born in Scotland. My parents decided to leave their homeland in the late 1950s. At that time, Quebec was looking for skilled workers.

My father, who had been an engineer on merchant ships sailing out of Scottish ports, decided that Quebec would be the ideal place in Canada where his skills would land him a job without too much difficulty.

Quebec City was my parents’ first stop, but when they realized that Montreal was the industrial centre of the province, they moved to St. Michel, a suburb.

My father worked in the oil refineries in the east end of Montreal and continued to do so even after the family moved to Duvernay, a predominantly French Canadian sector of the city of Laval. They chose Duvernay deliberately because they realized that the children they were planning to have one day would be able to learn French by association with the other people in the area.

During my early school days in the late 1960s, my father had decided that the shift work in the refineries would interfere with his responsibilities as a parent. Education was booming in Quebec, and the need for technical teachers was great. My father capitalized on this and easily landed a job with the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal as a metalwork teacher for Monklands High School in Notre-Dame-de-Grâce. At the time, my mother was the vice-principal of Laval Highcliff Elementary School which I would attend.

Because both my parents were involved in education at different levels, it made them realize that if their offspring were to flourish in this country, they would need a good education.

In the late sixties and seventies the Laval school started testing its program with bilingual classes for elementary school children. Highcliff was chosen as the test school, and a group of students who were considered above average would take their classes in French. I was lucky to participate in that program.

Government Orders

My interest in the French language actually had started almost from the moment I could talk coherently. Living in a French neighbourhood meant that whenever you went out into the street, nine times out of ten the other children were speaking what I thought was a strange language. Little did I know that "ballon-chasseur" was dodgeball and that "cache-cache" meant hide and go seek. From then on I was determined to learn what they were saying so that I would not be at a disadvantage when playing with them. Oddly enough, this decision made when I was five years old would dominate the rest of my life.

Since English instruction in the French school system left much to be desired and I was already starting to learn French, I decided I would play ambassador. Just as an ambassador is a liaison in another country, my role would be liaison between the two languages. Imagine my surprise when I confronted the children in the street with my first garbled speech in French, my strained "bonjour, je m'appelle" was returned with "maudite bloke" a reference to the somewhat square-headedness of the English population. Chalk up one for French Canadian nationalism, I guess.

Good old Scottish stubbornness, or whatever you want to call it, made me decide to beat them at their own game. I excelled in my French studies through bilingual and immersion programs to a degree where my knowledge of the language and grammar was perhaps better than that of the French children themselves.

Unfortunately, the responses I received had gone from one extreme to another. Although I got along with the other children, I was never really accepted by them. I finally discovered the reason why. French Canadians hated the French from France almost as much as the English. My French accent was almost like that of the people French Canadians called "les snobbes".

By the time I was 13 I realized that French Canadian was a proper language and a culture all of its own. I decided to treat what I had already learned as a separate language and discover exactly what French Canadian was and is.

In my final years of high school I delved into dozens of written novels, the works of Savard, Thériault and Vallières, the plays of Tremblay and Gélinas and the poetry of Vigneault and Nelligan. From these pieces written by prominent French Canadian authors I was able to obtain a good grasp of the emergence of the French Canadian culture in Quebec.

It was interesting to witness the transition in myself. I was so involved with these studies that a few of my high school buddies started calling me Frenchie. I graduated from high school feeling very comfortable with my knowledge of French Canadians. As strange as it may sound, perhaps I had too much knowledge.

Just before heading off to Carleton University to study communications, something in my brain snapped. I began thinking I was French Canadian. I did everything to convince myself that I was. I had become a staunch Parti Québécois supporter. I even cried when René Lévesque lost the sovereignty association vote. I defended everything that was considered French Canadian.

At Carleton I was elected president of the Francophone Club. My plan for assimilation might have worked except for two things: my name and my ancestors. Once again my wise parents from the old country came to my rescue. They were able to grind into my thick skull that should the situation in Quebec worsen, my name alone would make me stand out like a sore thumb.

For most people it might have been too late to change, but at 18 I began learning about my own cultural history, the glory of the Scottish clans and all the benefits that Quebec and Canada enjoy today because of Scottish immigrants. Robert Bruce, Mary Queen of Scots and the poet Robert Burns are well-known names in Scottish history, but what of those who immigrated to Canada and gave so much of their time and efforts to build this country?

Lord Selkirk, a Scottish philanthropist and colonizer was responsible for bringing immigrants to Prince Edward Island. They later spread to Nova Scotia and established a colony there. Selkirk opened the west with his settlements in the Red River Valley in Manitoba.

Scottish immigrants were instrumental in the establishment of the fur trade in Canada and played the greatest part in the foundations of education in this country.

Early Scottish settlers placed top priority on education. The first non-sectarian school for higher education in Nova Scotia, Pictou Academy, was founded by a Scot. Dalhousie University, McGill University in Montreal, the University of Toronto, Queen's, St. Francis Xavier and the University of New Brunswick all owe their establishment to Scots.

Sir Alexander Mackenzie, trader and explorer, discovered the Mackenzie River and was the first white man to cross the northern part of the American continent to the Pacific Ocean. Simpson and MacTavish are other names synonymous with the building of our country. Alexander Mackenzie, a Scot, was Prime Minister of Canada between 1873 and 1878.

In addition, Scotsmen and Canadians of Scottish origin have played formidable roles in communications and journalism. There has been George Brown, founder of the *Globe*; William Lyon Mackenzie, founder and editor of the *Colonial Advocate* and one of the leaders of the 1837 rebellion; John Nielson, editor of the *Quebec Gazette*; John Dougall, both father and son, of the *Montreal Witness*; and Hugh Graham, Lord Atholstan of the *Montreal Star*.

Suddenly a new dimension was added to my research for cultural identity. I realized that I was neither Scottish nor French Canadian. Talk about an identity crisis! Because Canada is not the melting pot that characterizes the United States, there is really no distinct Canadian culture. Therefore, I didn't consider myself to be a Canadian. I was a mixture, a part of three great nationalities.

After much deliberation I decided that the only way out of this dilemma was to combine the best parts of all three nations. To become a part of the French Canadian culture, to be accepted as an equal, I needed more of the expressions in daily use.

To accomplish this I spent the summer of 1981 working in a French children's camp. That summer was the turning point in my life. I not only picked up the oral requirements but also a large group of French Canadian friends.

I learned more about Scottish culture by reading books and poetry by Scottish authors, as well as the stories of the clans. I joined a curling club to get a taste of a Scottish sport and social gathering.

In order to become more of a Canadian, I relaxed my hard line views on independence for Quebec. I now try to picture Canada as a whole and am more sympathetic to the feelings of the people in other provinces.

I thought I was all set—I had satisfied my goals and those of my parents. The one thing I had forgotten to consider was my friends.

Each group of friends I had made in the past few years had accepted me in the way I related to them. I was the one who had adjusted easily to each group by simply changing my frame of mind and attitude to what each group was interested in and expected of me.

I went partying with my French Canadian friends, bar hopping with my anglophone high school buddies and was involved in intellectual stimulation with my university associates. Each world was different, yet I fitted easily into each one. What I had failed to consider was the interaction between the groups.

I soon discovered through trial and error that my old high school friends would not be accepted by my university buddies; nor would my English friends be accepted by my French Canadian friends and vice versa.

This created a situation which is similar to the problems of Quebec society today. Because of my personal experience, I feel French Canadians and English Canadians will never associate unless some concessions are made by both sides. We will always run into people of both cultures who will refuse to speak the other's language. There is animosity even within each cultural group—animosity caused by intellectual, social and economic differences.

If only we could learn from one another, if we would be willing to mingle, we could absorb a great deal by association. With understanding comes acceptance. Unfortunately the situation may not be resolved in my lifetime. To keep the peace, the cultures may have to remain apart.

I don't favour apartheid in the South African sense, where one culture is discriminated against on economic, social, political and colour levels. I do believe, however, that many cultures can coexist in one province as long as there is agreement on the equal value of each.

My plight is understandable. I enjoy the knowledge of many worlds, yet to keep harmony among them, I have to keep them separate. Therefore, in a sense, I am trapped in the middle of all three groups.

Because I can't combine all these worlds, despite the fact that each has so much to offer, I have to spend an equal amount of time in all of them.

Although it is satisfying to experience the diversity, you can't give 100 per cent of what we have to share and at the same time receive 100 per cent of what everyone else has to offer. The basic explanation for someone in this dilemma is that you can be acquainted with many, but totally involved with none.

It is another way of explaining and learning to live with loneliness.

Government Orders

(1250)

That is the end of Glenn's story in *The Dilemma of Multiculturalism*. We will notice in all the text there is no mention of dollars spent but one man's effort to become more familiar with his own identity, his own cultural roots, and to try to find a way in which he could fit into a culture in Quebec and still remain associated with the rest of Canada.

I leave the story with the House without further analysis. I think it is worthy as a reflection on what it means to be a Canadian living in this country of ours today.

I am going to move now to an experience I had as a member of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage when we had one of our witnesses come to speak to us about the issue of multiculturalism. His name is Dr. Rais Khan and he addressed the issue, stating that both the act and the department were evidently intended to facilitate integration of the different cultural groups into the Canadian society. But the policy of multiculturalism has become subverted in this noble intent. It has encouraged ethnic and cultural groups to perpetuate their distinctiveness and has thus prevented them, even though inadvertently, from integrating into the mainstream of society. Official bilingualism has erected cultural barriers and gender discrimination and encouraged social ghettoization.

Let me give an example of how multiculturalism goes wrong, an example with which my Liberal colleagues will most certainly agree, as did the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

Multiculturalism gets twisted to such an extent that groups of individuals believe that by virtue of being a member of some identifiable group they deserve special funding and privileges. This is clear as was the case with the Writing Thru Race conference which was hosted in Vancouver by the Writers Union of Canada. This conference refused to allow anyone of non-colour to attend, that is to say whites were barred from attending a conference which received funding from the Canada Council. Thankfully the minister heeded my advice and took away part of their funding.

Dr. Khan, as he continued in his presentation to our committee, explained:

The exotic multicultural concept of the everlasting immigrant has come to function as an institutional system for the marginalization of the individual. While this is not hopefully the intent of official multiculturalism, it certainly is its consequence. Culture is not only a selective demonstration of exotic events; it is how people live and interact with one another in their daily lives. Canada in the next century will not even have a dominant plurality. What is especially puzzling is why the advocates of multiculturalism, many of whom are so-called leaders of ethnic communities, have embraced such a discriminatory label. The misdirected and shortsighted actions and propositions in the name of official multiculturalism have generated mounting criticism of both its intent and direction. The voices of criticism come from both old Canadians and new ones, from intellectuals and ivory tower academics, from writers of colour and those who lack colour, from respondents to several recent public opinion polls and from government appointed commissions.

Dr. Khan also drew our attention to the Keith Spicer citizens' forum which, in recognition of the inherent deficiencies and drawbacks of official multiculturalism, called upon the Government of Canada to eliminate funding for multicultural activities except those serving immigration orientation, reduction of racial discrimination and promotion of equality.

I believe this is the crux of the problem. Even the proponents of multiculturalism support the policy because in their view it contributes to immigration orientation, reduction of racial discrimination and promotion of equality.

It is a curious situation of people from opposing spectrums—those who oppose multiculturalism as well as those who support it—agreeing to a common set of objectives.

(1255)

It is not just the Reform Party that has expressed what so many other voices are saying. The objectives that multiculturalism seek to promote are immigration, orientation, reduction of racial discrimination, enhanced participation and promotion of equality.

These can be just as effectively achieved through the implementation of the provision of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms supporting the Canadian Human Rights Commission and the acknowledgement of the opportunities offered through the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

Special treatment to some at the expense of others is discriminatory in and of itself. No one is saying that ethnic groups should be suppressed in the Canadian context. Rather, our vision of Canada should be committed to the goal of social and personal well-being that values individuality while emphasizing themes like family, community assumption of responsibility, problem solving and communicating these value sets to a means of better group life. However at no time should the rights of a group supersede the rights of individuals unless the group happens to consist of a majority within Canada.

As I said earlier, I have concentrated most of this presentation on multiculturalism because it is something about which all of us in the House feel deeply. I also have to say that I am looking forward to 1995. We definitely have challenges lying before us in the new year. My wish for all of us, as we enter the new year, is that we use our collective wisdom in the decision days of 1995 that lie ahead of us.

Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Oakville—Milton.

On behalf of the Minister of Canadian Heritage I am pleased to have the occasion to speak on the third reading of Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage.

Our debate has underscored the importance that the legislation be swiftly passed to establish in law the Department of Canadian Heritage. We are marrying programs that have been living together for more than a year. The departmental programs

are working well. The job of Parliament is to formalize its name and its existence, enabling the Minister of Canadian Heritage and the department staff to carry out, in a single ministry, related mandates previously held by a number of separate government departments.

In reference to why the Department of Canadian Heritage is so vital, we like to use the term synergy. We believe the combined impact of the whole of the department exceeds that of its individual parts. We believe the formation of the new department has enhanced and strengthened the effectiveness of many of its programs.

The Department of Canadian Heritage brings together important common elements of the federal government, those elements which define Canada as a multifaceted dynamic nation with a rich cultural and natural heritage.

The department is responsible for everything relating to Canadian identity and values, cultural development, heritage preservation, and areas of natural or historical significance to Canada and to Canadians, values that we share and that unite and define us.

While the discussions concerning Bill C-53 have been interesting, many of the arguments put forward against the formation of the department are fundamentally flawed.

Opposition members have tried to erect roadblocks in what should have been a routine legislative exercise. Those roadblocks were reduced to speed bumps as the necessity for the legislation became clear. It is an important and vital tool for the effective and efficient government Canadians want.

The leader of the Reform Party of Canada has argued against Bill C-53. On December 7 he spoke before the Standing Committee of Canadian Heritage. He expressed the view that multiculturalism, one of the components of the new department, is the responsibility of individual private associations and, interestingly enough, where necessary lower levels of government: not the role of the federal government.

(1300)

Conversely, he also stated or asserted his belief that the federal government should confine itself to combating racial, linguistic and cultural discrimination. While as usual condemning the whole program, he supports most of our multicultural activities. He is the master of contradictions.

Assisting all Canadians to participate in Canadian life and access the same rights helps them to contribute to and ultimately change society so that it reflects the lived experience of all Canadians. Yet there are always going to be individuals who will

Government Orders

blame one identifiable group for whatever social or economic ills that disturb them.

As the government and as individual Canadians, we must recognize that understanding and respect between peoples is central to combating racism and other forms of discrimination. We have to build that awareness into our social structure at all levels of society.

At the federal level there is an important and essential leadership role to play. In its 1992 report the Canadian Human Rights Commission stated that "economic hard times and human rights make uneasy bedfellows".

Tolerance for diversity and human difference becomes diminished during times of fiscal difficulty. In times like these the temptation is to make choices: economic over equality issues. If our mandate is to create opportunity then it must be for all and not just for the privileged, well positioned and fortunate.

[Translation]

The criticisms of Bill C-53 voiced by the leader of the Reform Party clearly shows that his party's policies are not rooted in the life and the future of all Canadians.

The minister's multiculturalism programs support a wide variety of activities which promote the integration of first generation Canadians, irrespective of their origin, into the social, cultural, economic and political life of Canada. We all benefit from the contribution of each Canadian to the growth and development of our country.

The contribution of all Canadians is an integral part of the strength and diversity of Canadian culture. Culture is the very basis of Canadian identity and sovereignty. As a whole, the arts and our cultural industries contribute over \$24 billion to the gross domestic product, and this is about 4 per cent of the GDP and 660,000 jobs. This is no accident; it is the result of the commitment and determination of successive governments, and of the enormous pool of talent in Canada. The Department of Canadian Heritage will be at the centre of government action in the area of arts and culture.

To help artists and creators even more, the heritage minister announced an amendment to Bill C-53, which would give the department significant responsibilities in matters of copyright. Copyright legislation, which determines the ownership of works of art, is vitally important to artists and the income they derive from their work. This is a most timely measure for artists and creative artists, some among whom earn the lowest wages in the Canadian economy. This is a positive, effective and efficient change.

Change is also part of the life experience of Canada's First Nations. Native culture is part of our history and our heritage, and it enriches the Canadian identity significantly. At the present time, more than a million aboriginal Canadian citizens, members of our First Nations, are at a crossroad. In 1986, Bill Erasmus, then Grand Chief of the Assembly of First Nations, said that native people would have a lot to contribute in the next century. "It is our turn", he said.

Government Orders

(1305)

[English]

The Department of Canadian Heritage is a proud partner in this process, administering a number of important programs to support aboriginal citizens in defining and participating in addressing the social, cultural, political and economic issues affecting their lives in Canadian society.

Aboriginal peoples launch and manage the programs which are community based and include such initiatives as the aboriginal friendship centre program, the northern native broadcast access program and the aboriginal women's program, aboriginal representative organization programs.

[Translation]

During the whole debate on this bill, Reform Party members have also expressed their opposition to the official and legislated recognition of both official languages in Canada. Canadians support the notion of two official languages for the very simple reason that these are the languages they speak and they are attached to them. For instance, in spite of the ever present threat of assimilation, minority francophone communities have gone from barely surviving to having their vested rights recognized. There is no way back.

On the contrary, the government recently embarked on a process which is the logical and unavoidable consequence of its vision of linguistic duality and of its action in this area. This process is aimed at involving all federal institutions in the development of minority official language communities, in accordance with section 42 of the Official Languages Act.

Obviously, the Department of Canadian Heritage is not the only institution able to play a critical role in the full development of official language communities. Interdepartmental consultation will help the machinery of government to promote the development of both official language communities, in every field of activity.

[English]

Canadians are open to the reality of the country with two official languages. The Reform Party opposition is a view that a majority of Canadians do not share. Sixty-four per cent of Canadians expressed support for the policy in an April 1994 Angus Reid survey. Provincially, support ranges from 88 per cent in Quebec to 73 per cent in the Atlantic region and a solid 59 per cent in Alberta. Over all, the last 10 years have witnessed stable and solid national support which continues both in principle and practice.

In addition, if one considers on the one hand the progress of official language communities in minority situations, thanks to their determination and the commitment of government, and on

the other hand the overall support of Canadians for the policy of official languages, it remains imperative to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage in law.

Under its official language promotion programs, the department encourages not only the development of official language communities throughout the country, but also the recognition and use of both official languages in Canadian society as a whole. The strengthening of our country's linguistic duality promises to improve opportunities for all. The Reform Party members would do well to recognize and accept this reality and join Canadians in the benefits accrued by it.

I commend the member for Calgary Southwest who went to St. Jean last summer to learn French. But the question remains how the member can oppose official language funding but does not mind using official language funding.

We all know that the 1993 reorganization of government was carried out with a view to streamlining the business of government and adapting the structure of government to improve the services it provides to the public. The aim of reorganization was to establish better, more efficient and more effective government. The Department of Canadian Heritage epitomizes that type of government.

I urge my colleagues to recognize the role the Department of Canadian Heritage plays in promoting Canadian values and support the efforts of the public service.

(1310)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The hon. member has about seven to eight minutes.

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Oakville—Milton, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak at third reading of Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage.

As a member of the standing committee, I have had an opportunity to review the legislation and to hear firsthand accounts from witnesses. I believe this bill to be an accurate reflection of the mandate, activities and role of the department in fulfilling the mandate of the Government of Canada on several important fronts.

The department's programs have an effect on our day to day lives and their relevance, be it cultural or economic, is felt by each of us. Within this department are the programs that speak to us regarding what it means to be Canadians, that set us apart from the rest of the world and that have helped Canada earn its top ranking by the United Nations for overall quality of life.

The new Department of Canadian Heritage embodies the democratic principles that are inherently Canadian. We are a nation forged on fundamental respect, respect for basic human rights and values, respect for the use and equal treatment of two major official languages, French and English, respect for cul-

Government Orders

tural diversity and respect for the traditions and contributions of our aboriginal peoples.

Today countries throughout the world are trying to discover the formula that will enable them to create a real sense of national identity among groups of different ethnic, cultural, linguistic and racial backgrounds. Many of these countries are now taking a serious interest in the 100 per cent Canadian model we have created which exemplifies respect for each other no matter what our backgrounds.

In the bill creating this department, the government undertakes to advance the equality of all Canadians in their country's social, economic and cultural life. It recognizes the need to eliminate the barriers that divide Canadians and to provide opportunity to establish bonds built on confidence and mutual respect.

We know that social cohesion and a strong national identity can only be accomplished where there is understanding, awareness and respect among all the people who make up our country.

As the Right Hon. Lester Pearson put it: "In a diverse federal state such as Canada it is important that all citizens should have a fair and equal opportunity to participate in the national administration and to identify themselves with and feel at home in our national capital".

I am proud to be a member of this Liberal government that believes in tolerance among its citizens and which strives to ensure that people of all origins who come to Canada have an equal opportunity to contribute to its growth, development and an evolving sense of identity.

Our diversity is one of the things that makes us stronger and more competitive in the global economy. The range of languages we speak, the cultures we know and understand provide us as Canadians with a distinct advantage from an international trade perspective. This has been recognized by the president of the Royal Bank who indicated that our future success as a nation depends on our harnessing the richness of diversity within the country so that we can become truly competitive in the global marketplace.

Dr. Barbara Ward, the British economist and writer, described us as the world's first international nation. We are admired abroad for the society we have built together and we can take real national pride in this accomplishment.

This bill provides the government with an opportunity to forge ahead in an area which has proven to be of real importance to Canadians time and time again. They want a government that will lead them forward in building a society that encourages all

its citizens to contribute economically, politically, socially and culturally to all aspects of life in this great country of ours.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Madam Speaker, Bill C-53 certainly has given rise to a lot of criticism for a bill that was supposed to be a simple housekeeping measure.

It must have become quite obvious by now that the Official Opposition is dead against this bill. And our reasons for opposing it are far from cosmetic. They have to do mainly with the very essence of our cultural identity as Quebecers as well as the necessity of ensuring the survival of our culture through a sensible handling of the copyright issue.

(1315)

First of all, after education and postsecondary education, the federal government has now extended its involvement to mass communication, even though this is clearly an area of provincial jurisdiction. In fact, the federal government is centralizing more and more, and this bill is but one example. That is why we denounce the deceit in calling the department to be established the "Department of Canadian Heritage", when this is just a disguised way of establishing a department of culture and to invade a provincial jurisdiction. The people of Quebec wonder why they should contribute financially to a scheme to deny that Quebec is different, unique, as a nation, when even the staunchest federalists in Quebec recognize this fact.

My hon. colleagues will be reminded that, equipped with international agreements, English Canada is now in a position to counter cultural invasion from the U.S. This is a totally legitimate concern, seeing how important it is to differentiate oneself from such a powerful neighbour and to manage one's cultural resources. But why can Quebec not have similar concerns? Why would the government not feel the need to also do something to protect the rights of creative artists on its territory?

Following government reorganization, copyright, which used to be with the Department of Communications and the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, would now come under the Department of Canadian Heritage and the Department of Industry. Instead of using this restructuring as an opportunity to concentrate copyright responsibilities at the heritage department, which is the only one mandated to protect the work and its creators, the government persists in its paralysing indecision with regard to copyright.

Such dichotomy only leads to divergent political priorities, especially when the officials of the two departments involved see the issue in totally different lights.

Government Orders

For instance, Paul Racine, Assistant Deputy Minister, Cultural Development, told the Canadian heritage committee: “—the fact is that the minister and the department set all copyright policies and oversee the drafting work—as was done in the past and will be done in the future with Phase 2. In other words, they do all the work from A to Z. As I told you, this was recognized by previous Prime Ministers through repeated formal ministerial delegation and it is, in my opinion, recognized in law for the first time through this amendment. It is a matter of fact. Whoever gets the ingredients, cooks and serves them may or may not be called a chef, but he or she certainly bears a close resemblance to one”.

However, there appears to be several chiefs, as Mr. Von Finckenstein, Deputy Minister at Industry Canada, told the Standing Committee on Industry something quite different. He said: “Before the merger, copyright was in the Department of Communications and the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, together with all other intellectual property, be it patent, trademarks or copyright. This whole division has now gone to Industry. It has not been broken up or changed. The people in charge of copyright are the people who once worked for CCA on this matter. As for their mandate, which is to develop copyright policy, the Minister of Industry is indeed ultimately responsible for the application of the law and for amending it, but policy decisions are obviously made at the cabinet level, where the Minister of Canadian Heritage, for instance, can put forward the cultural point of view”. That is what Mr. von Finckenstein said.

Therefore it is total confusion, the department of tutti frutti, as my colleague from Rimouski—Témiscouata calls it. Even the officials do not know who really is responsible for the Copyright Act.

The government is supporting a myth and confusion by letting people believe that the heritage department plays the leading role with respect to copyright, when the real power clearly resides in the industry department.

(1320)

It must be noted that the deadlock blocking revision of the Copyright Act is partly due to conflict between two ideologies: protecting the creative artist vs. protecting the consumer. Performing artists, creative artists and copyright holders do not benefit from this division; rather it is those whose concerns have nothing to do with cultural development, values and identity.

Furthermore, it is totally unacceptable and far-fetched to put the Copyright Act, which protects the economic and moral rights of creative artists and the holders of these rights, under the Department of Industry. It is ridiculous to put copyrights on the same level as trade-marks, patents, industrial designs and

integrated circuit topographies, as in paragraph 4(1)(h) of Bill C-46.

Those who propose that copyrights be under the sole jurisdiction of the Minister of Industry are wrong. Such a decision would greatly jeopardize cultural creativity in Quebec and in Canada. Obviously, the cultural sector is an industry, in the sense that it generates an important economic activity, but it is certainly not an industry like the other ones.

Cultural development depends on the Copyright Act, which allows artists to be associated with the economic life of their works. Consequently, if the current apathy persists, it could seriously hurt a very important cultural industry. The government approves enormous budgets to defend and promote Canadian identity. Is it not high time this government recognized the cultures which are part of that identity and are its very foundations, and show some respect for the artists who shape these cultures?

The government's apathy is all the more incomprehensible considering that the Liberal Party often insisted that even though culture generates economic activity, it cannot be treated like other industries. Moreover, the Liberals pledged, in their red book, to support production, marketing and distribution, so as to promote the circulation of Canadian books, films and recordings on the domestic market, to consider allowing investment tax credits to stimulate the production of such works, and also to consider the possibility of providing income averaging mechanisms in the Income Tax Act, for Canadian artists. However, the Quebec and Canadian cultural industries, and the artists, are still waiting.

Also, in answer to questions from the Canadian Conference of the Arts, the Liberal Party pledged, during the last election campaign, to review the Copyright Act and ensure above all that authors get their dues, while facilitating access to material protected by copyright. The Liberals claimed to understand the importance of copyright. It made a commitment to restructure the administrative organization and review the Conservative decision to split this jurisdiction between two departments. But again, our artists are still waiting!

These facts and the delayed amendment minister Dupuy put forward when he appeared before the committee show the lack of interest and the total lack of respect of the government for Quebec and Canadian artists and cultures. Allow me to describe the disrespectful attitude shown by Liberal members of the committee. I have already mentioned the last minute amendment put forward by the Minister of Heritage.

One of the committee members, a loyal and faithful Liberal, said that, when the amendment was proposed, everyone in the room applauded and commended the minister's decision. Not so, Madam Speaker! The members of the other parties did not applaud. The people representing the artists did not applaud.

Government Orders

either, especially since the same hon. member had just finished saying that these people had “pleaded” with the committee to have the opportunity to present their very legitimate requests. What a respectful attitude for the government members to have!

The artists are, in fact, far from satisfied with the minister’s amendment. That is what they told us. Several associations from both Quebec and English Canada, who were able to appear before the Committee on Canadian Heritage because of pressure by members of the Bloc Québécois, told us they were disappointed with and concerned about the attitude of the government.

Twenty-five Quebec and Canadian associations, representing more than 30,000 writers, creative artists and performers, sent an open letter to the Minister of Heritage asking to complete the review of the Copyright Act, in light of the following nine recommendations: the confirmation of the creative artist as the first holder of the rights to his or her work; the recognition of neighbouring rights; the adjudication of consequential rights to visual artists; the protection of works for the rest of the life of the author or the copyright holder; the use of technologically neutral definitions; compensation through private copy; the establishment of a rental right; the elimination of all exceptions to the protection of works; the adoption of adequate sanctions to protect the rights of creative artists.

(1325)

These demands are far from being unreasonable since numerous countries have included them in their legislation. Germany, Japan and France have all adhered to the 1961 Rome Convention, but Canada has not. These G-7 countries have recognized the need for royalties on private copy, but Canada has not. France and Germany have legislated on neighbouring rights, but Canada has not; it does not seem to find it appropriate to do so.

In conclusion, I would say that it is through copyright and neighbouring rights that creative artists and copyright holders can ensure the continuity of their creative work by receiving just compensation for the use of their work. The present situation has to change. Not only is this situation unacceptable in the context of a society that claims to respect the people who are the source of its cultural heritage, but its national and international notoriety makes it embarrassing for Quebec and Canada.

This government will soon prove to us that it sees culture only as a symbol that can generate money.

The least we can say is that, with such a policy and such a government, the future is certainly not bright for the pillars of Canada’s and Quebec’s cultures. Let us be realistic and not mince words: the government is showing once again that it is totally incapable of taking a stand in favour of artists and understanding the interests of creative artists.

Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to comment on the speech made by the hon. member for Québec.

I would like to know her definition of a Quebecer. I often hear the Quebec nation defined as including the English, the Irish and the Scots. Does it include the Jews and other groups or are we talking about old French Canadian families exclusively? I would appreciate her comments on this definition. How does she see the Quebec nation?

Mrs. Gagnon: Madam Speaker, I am a little surprised the hon. member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine should ask this question. As a Quebecer himself, he ought to know.

A Quebecer is, first of all, someone who lives in Quebec and is defined as such by his language and culture. I am not going to make a long speech about what it means to be a Quebecer. If the hon. member has trouble explaining what it means to him to be a Quebecer, then he is the one who has a problem.

Mr. Gagnon: Madam Speaker, I have no trouble defining what I am and explaining who I am.

However, in this debate on Quebec nationalism, which has been going on for some time, there are people who claim that Quebec includes all minorities. But all I keep hearing from the opposition is that there are Quebecers whose ancestors settled here long ago and that the partnership and participation of other cultures has become irrelevant.

I am not asking the hon. member to tell me where I fit in but to tell me whether the English, the Irish and all other minorities are part of Quebec as we know it today. That is all I want to know.

Mrs. Gagnon: Madam Speaker, a Quebecer is someone who believes in Quebec values. He believes he can identify himself as a Quebecer. A Quebecer is someone who travels. I heard Mr. Dupuy say that when he is in Canada, he says he is from Quebec, and when he is in another country, he says he is from Canada.

I have no trouble identifying myself. When I travel throughout the world, and I have had several opportunities to do so, when I am outside my country, outside Quebec, I say I am a Quebecer. When I say I am a Quebecer, people realize I am a francophone, because outside Canada, people know there is a francophone majority living in Canada. This is a way of identifying myself as a Quebecer.

A Quebecer is also someone who believes in his or her values. I think Quebec must have all the tools it needs to be able to decide its future.

(1330)

Centralizing all decision-making authority and standardizing all programs the way the government is doing today is not going to help Quebec find its identity.

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Five minutes left for questions and comments. Any more comments?

Resuming debate. The hon. member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine.

Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General, Lib.): Madam Speaker, of course I intend to support the government's new proposals for Canada's cultural sector.

When I hear the opposition condemning the very existence of Canada and the fact that Canada has done nothing for the French fact, I think that is absolutely untrue and unacceptable. Some people are looking for a definition of the Canadian nation, and it seems that originally, Canada was a word that meant "village" in one of the aboriginal languages. A village is a community where people live together, and these people have worked together to build a country.

I may remind the opposition that this Canada, this village we have created is the envy of the world. I could refer again to the view shared by the United Nations that Canada still ranks first as the best country to live in.

Consider how Canada developed. The first colonists who came to Canada wanted to make a new life for themselves. My ancestors, as those of the member for Quebec with whom I share the same surname, landed on the île d'Orléans in 1642. My ancestor, Maturin Gagnon, one of the first French settlers, wanted to start a new life. Obviously, through the years, there has been many changes and historical upsets, but I believe that Canada and its very existence as a country, has made it possible for the Canadian Francophonie to thrive.

I believe that this fact must not be ignored. I believe that the nature of Canada, as a state, resides in its linguistic duality, and the generous reception given to the cultures which have contributed to the development and the building of this structure called Canada. Among those who came were the Irish, the Scots, the Jews, the Asians and the Europeans, to name a few. People from 160 countries have contributed, in one way or another, to the creation and the building of the Canadian federation.

There are 6 million francophones in Quebec, more than one million of whom are new Quebecers, and anglophones who also contributed to the development of Quebec, as part of Canada, of course. Everybody was the better for it: Montreal became the first metropolis of the Canadian federation. The river brought people to Montreal, but I do not want to focus on the past, I want to speak of the future. This is the spirit of a true Canadian: someone who looks towards the next century.

And there are over half a million francophones in Ontario. A third of the population of New Brunswick is made up of francophones. There are tens of thousands of francophones in Manitoba and in the western provinces. They are there, they exist, they are counting on the support of francophones in Quebec to keep this country united.

(1335)

I would go even further. Unfortunately, nationalists never take into account the contributions of francophones outside Quebec. Carmen Roy was not even mentioned. There is Angèle Arsenault, Édith Butler, even Roch Voisine. These are francophones outside Quebec who not only ensure in some way the French presence outside Quebec but could also be considered as some of the greatest figures of French culture in Canada.

I told you about the francophones outside Quebec but not about the success of bilingualism. Some vainly tried to prove quasi scientifically that bilingualism does not work. But there are more than 4.4 million Canadians who master both languages. I had the opportunity to go to Vancouver, where I made a speech to young people who, much to my surprise, spoke a more than proper French. This was music to my ear. I also received well written correspondence in French.

We must not forget that, in 1977, 237 schools offered an immersion program to 37,835 students. In 1988—these are Anglophone students registered in immersion programs—there were 1,500 schools and 241,140 students. Within ten years, bilingual and immersion programs increased by 700 per cent. I think what makes French so vital and attractive is the growing interest of many young English Canadians for the beautiful language of Molière.

Certain people have attempted to minimize and trivialize the efforts made by some provinces, but they overlooked the fact that more than 27,000 students in British Columbia, more than 26,000 in Alberta, 18,000 in Manitoba, and even 115,000 in Ontario go to immersion schools. It is very interesting to travel in English Canada and meet these young people who were able to benefit from this program. And believe me, Madam Speaker, these young people are very grateful for it.

Canada has an international reputation as a leader, for the way it treats its minorities, be they francophones outside Quebec or anglophones in Quebec. Of course, there are other minorities and, to me, this makes the strength of this country. This diversity of cultures, this meeting place of ideas, Madam Speaker, that is what Canada is all about.

Some hon. members: They do not even have washrooms.

Mr. Gagnon: Well, my friend, let me tell you something about washrooms. In the Magdalen Islands, there is a small English school for which the province of Quebec is responsible but it refuses to grant the money needed to rebuild this school used by English-speaking children. The school has water and electrical problems and the window panes are broken. It no longer meets the needs of the population but unfortunately the Government of Quebec is waiting for the Government of Canada to foot the bill and build a school for these English-speaking children. That is how some minorities are treated in Quebec.

But enough of that. I invite the members of the opposition to go to Grosse-Île, in the Magdalen Islands, and see for themselves in what condition that small English school is today. I am sure the story would make the front page of Quebec newspapers.

(1340)

We were talking about a meeting place of ideas. We know that English is spoken by more than 800 million people in the world and that there are more than 20 million who speak it right here Canada. That is where this meeting place of ideas, new found solidarity comes from. That is what we find in Canada. When you have a chance to travel, as I have had the privilege of doing for decades, you can always appreciate the bilingualism, the biculturalism, the openness and tolerance of Canada. This is something we must never forget.

When I see how weak the nationalist philosophy, the separatist philosophy is, I find it sad that they do not realize that it is because of the federal presence that Quebec has been able to find its identity. We never hear the opposition talk about the contribution of the Canadian government to Telefilm Canada, the National Film Board, the CBC or independent productions. We never hear the opposition talk about that. All it does is constantly deny the facts and knock what makes this country what it is.

There is much to be done and I think it is interesting that the learning of the second language, as I have said earlier—in survey after survey, we realize that more than 75 per cent of Canadians are in favour of institutional bilingualism.

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac): You should come to my riding and see if that is the case.

Mr. Gagnon: Madam Speaker, it is the hon. member of the opposition who should come to my riding.

[*English*]

I am going to turn to the English language. I have been privileged and I hope I am sharing this with a number of other young Canadians. I have seen here a number of anglophones who have names like McClarty, McPherson, who have names that are of Asian origin, who are now taking the leap toward bilingualism, who are now moving beyond bilingualism because they can now master three and four languages. That is the strength of Canada.

It is a privilege to speak in this forum today in both official languages because bilingualism is not only a tool for our regional and economic development but is also a part of who we are. In doing so we now can pick from the French culture, from the English culture, from the other cultures around the world that have come here to work as one. That is one of the fundamental issues that will be discussed in the upcoming Quebec referendum.

Government Orders

It will be up to the separatists to prove that Canada does not work. I am from the Gaspé peninsula which is 96 per cent French speaking. I attended French schools but I had the opportunity of mingling with English friends. I have had the opportunity of moving on. I have had the opportunity of exchanging with all Canadians from all walks of life. There is not one person in Canada I have met whom I do not like.

I think Canadians are understanding. We are a tolerant society and regrettably the opposition, including some members from the Reform Party, is not aware of the fortitude, of the fact that being a Canadian is more than a privilege, it is something other countries wish they had.

Obviously the opposition will have the opportunity to react, not only following this speech but in the upcoming referendum.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lebel: Start with liking Quebecers.

Mr. Gagnon: “Start with liking Quebecers”—Madam Speaker, can you beat that? It bothers them to hear a young person like me identify himself as a Canadian of French origin, a Canadian who went to the trouble of learning the second language, who took the trouble to travel, visit and study with English Canadians. Sometimes it hurts the separatists to hear that. Unfortunately, we live in a changing world and unfortunately the opposition is unable to meet the challenge of Canadian federalism.

I have heard all kinds of speeches from the opposition, on Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, St. Laurent, on real French Canadians, good Canadians who built and implemented programs from which I benefit.

(1345)

This brings me to an important point on the official languages in Canada. Let us look at the efforts made by Pierre Elliott Trudeau to have the French fact recognized, to be served—yes, maybe not as well as we would like in Bonaventure or Montreal or other places—but I think this recognition of the French fact by the rest of Canada, of the existence of French, and promoting the language—it is an incredible achievement of our Liberal predecessors.

Let us talk about another great Canadian, a great Quebecer—

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac): René Lévesque.

Mr. Gagnon: René Lévesque. You have it: René Lévesque, who grew up about 30 kilometres from my home town of New Carlisle, in the Gaspé peninsula.

Like René Lévesque, I come from Gaspé but, unfortunately, none of us can pretend to be Gaspésians first and foremost. This is very interesting. I can tell you that: René Lévesque was among the first to recognize the importance of speaking both French and English. He was open to the world.

Government Orders

I must say, however, that it is thanks to Pierre Elliott Trudeau and those who followed in his footsteps that Canada has become the country that we know today.

I will not talk much longer because I am anxious to hear the slanderous and malicious criticisms of the opposition throughout the afternoon. I challenge the opposition to find a better country than Canada.

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac): Quebec.

Mr. Gagnon: Quebec is part of Canada. No independent country enjoys a reputation such as that of Canada. Unfortunately, we only hear hogwash from the opposition. And that is unfortunate.

I invite opposition members to make a comparison. I am speaking to you as a Quebecer, a Gaspé native, a francophone. I am asking you to take into account the efforts made on this side of the House, to recognize the efforts made by this party, the efforts made by some English-speaking members.

I see the hon. member for Ontario, who is an English-speaking Canadian. I do not always share his views, but here is a young man who went to the trouble of learning French. There are others too. I do not know them all, but several have made the effort. I believe this is the beauty of our country. This is what makes it interesting.

We will overcome each of the obstacles set up by the opposition, starting with the upcoming referendum.

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Madam Speaker, I wonder in what country my colleague from Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine lives. It must be a country somewhat different from ours.

I too live in Canada. I must agree with him that, as long as the referendum is not a done deal, I still live in a country called Canada. I think he does not live in the same country as the rest of us, because he may speak English, but he does not read it. Last week-end, there was an article in the *Globe and Mail* depicting the bilingual situation and the assimilation level of French-speaking Canadians. I referred to it this morning in my speech, and I believe the hon. member was here at the time.

The assimilation rate throughout Canada is 36 per cent. Bilingualism is highly praised and my colleague can be proud to be Canadian as much as he wants to. He has the right to be proud, I do not deny it. But what is surprising is the fact that he does not better understand the country, or the part of the country he comes from.

(1350)

He told us about a school in the Magdalen Islands which was in bad shape, but he must not forget that Quebec is just getting out of its torpor after nine years under a Liberal government. Liberals were in office for nine years. So, if the people in the Magdalen Islands were not able to fix the windows in their schools or make any renovations, it is because of the Liberal government which has been ousted in Quebec. There is no doubt that Mr. Garon, to whom we will forward your complaints, will hasten to find a way to solve this problem, because he has solved many problems in other small schools.

The hon. member said he had never heard the official opposition make any positive comments about federalism, but I think all my colleagues have heard me say how much we owe to the CBC. That corporation helped us get out of the hole and believe in what we were. It also helped us define what we were and get over the Dark Ages in Quebec, all thanks to a great Liberal federalist, Jean Lesage, who was a federal minister here, in Ottawa, before returning to Quebec to tell us: "Come on, Quebecers! Let us be masters in our own house!"

Mr. Gagnon: Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to discuss with the hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata. I think she does have a lot of respect for my region, for the Gaspé peninsula, and for the problems, mainly economic, that we have in my constituency of Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine.

Unfortunately, I do not agree with her option, which is legitimate in a way—Quebec's separation. But as a federalist, I will tell you that the CBC's achievements she talked about are precisely the result of co-operation among all Canadians, between anglophones over there, anglophones over here and francophones across the way. That is what has made and will continue to make the strength of Canada.

That is why, with the recognition of the CBC's achievements, and the commitment of the federal government to defend, promote and ensure the development of the French fact in Canada, the next century is most promising for Canadian unity.

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Madam Speaker, let me remind the hon. member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine that we are paying 25 per cent of the CBC budget, but we cannot say that the English network is of much use to us. I would like to go back to the remarks made by the hon. member, who said that all official opposition's comments were hogwash.

I think the hon. member has no respect for the vote of confidence given the elected members of the Bloc Québécois, for the mandate they were given to come to Ottawa to work after Quebec's interests. That is exactly what we are doing today, defending Quebec's interests. I think the hon. member does not respect our mandate.

S. O. 31

After all, we are a majority in Quebec, a majority of Quebec MPs. I hope very many Quebecers will have heard the hon. member say in this House today that our comments are only hogwash and I hope they will draw their own conclusions from his disrespectful remarks.

An hon. member: Downright insulting.

Mrs. Gagnon: It is not the first time I hear the hon. member speak that way. He talks as if the world revolves around him. He is the centre of the universe and says: "Just look at me; I am well-travelled, I am fantastic."

An hon. member: Yes, he is an only child.

Mrs. Gagnon: I do not think it is fitting for a member of this House to say: "Just look at me; I am well-travelled, I am fantastic".

An hon. member: Yes, indeed. "Look at me. I have risen to the top of the heap".

Mrs. Gagnon: A member should represent the public, be the voice of the people. The people of Quebec have given us a vote of confidence and sent us to Ottawa to defend their interests.

We defend positions that are not being defended by federalists living in Quebec, who want to repatriate powers, who want full control in Quebec. We did not invent that.

Mr. Gagnon: Madam Speaker, I think it is uncalled for to call someone—I will not repeat the words that were used to describe me.

(1355)

I am criticized for having the intellectual curiosity to be interested in what is happening elsewhere and for wanting to share this with Quebecers. I have always recognized the existence of the Official Opposition. It hurts them to hear this voice from the Gaspé, this young federalist, because, and you know this as well as I do, we represent the majority of Quebecers.

Look at the results of the last election in Quebec. Scarcely 44 per cent of Quebecers supported the Parti Québécois. Unfortunately, the opposition, and especially its home base, are not so sure they want to have their referendum as soon as possible. Increasingly, Quebecers are recognizing Canada's role and the generosity of the Canadian federation.

An hon. member: Token Quebecer.

An hon. member: Opportunist.

Mr. Gagnon: I hear terms being used like "token Quebecer" and "opportunist". I hear all kinds of things from the opposition. I am proud to be the member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, I have the confidence of my riding and I am working in the best interests of my constituents, and this means being in Quebec, a Quebec that is part of Canada. Is that clear?

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

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Paul Steckle (Huron—Bruce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at yesterday's meeting of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food I tabled a report entitled "Future Directions for Canadian Agriculture and Agri-Food: A Huron—Bruce Perspective".

This report is the result of a series of intensive meetings which I organized in my riding with the objective of taking stock of where those who work in the agri-food sector today see their industry going tomorrow.

It was designed to support and enhance the objectives of the study on the future of agriculture on which the committee, together with its colleagues from the Senate, has been working since August, and which as a result of those who claim to represent the interests of the grassroots community has been effectively blocked from undertaking its most important phase, consulting directly with Canadians who work in Canada's agri-food sector in their workplaces.

I would encourage all members to initiate something along these lines to complement the work that is being done for what is after all one of Canada's major bedrock industries.

* * *

[Translation]

FRANCOPHONE COMMUNITIES

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last week, in its Saturday issue, *The Globe and Mail* revealed alarming statistics concerning francophones outside Quebec, despite the Official Languages Act passed 25 years ago.

In fact, francophones have never been so vulnerable. More than a third of francophones outside Quebec speak English at home and their rate of assimilation is at 36 per cent. It is as high as 75 per cent in British Columbia and 70 per cent in Saskatchewan.

Instead of helping francophone and Acadian communities in Canada, federal institutions are speeding up their assimilation. The refusal of the Minister of Canadian Heritage to put pressure on cable companies such as Rogers, Laurentien Cable and Cogeco, which recently decided to eliminate several

S. O. 31

French-language channels from their basic service, paints an even darker picture of Canadian federalism.

* * *

[*English*]

WORLD CUP SKIING

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this past weekend the 1994 Women's World Cup alpine races were held in Lake Louise, Alberta, the heart of Wild Rose country. I would like to extend my sincere congratulations to the organizers of this prestigious event. With their tireless efforts Lake Louise has proven to be first class on the world skiing stage once again.

There are four individuals who must receive special recognition: John Cassels, race chairman; Bruce Hamstead, chief of race; Bill Webster, president of Alpine Canada; Brien Perry, president of Alberta Alpine.

On behalf of the constituents of Wild Rose we are all proud of the contribution they have made to the sport of skiing in Canada.

Well done, Lake Louise.

* * *

(1400)

CANADIAN CHILDREN

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Guelph—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Christmas is a time for hope and renewal. As we prepare to leave the House of Commons in order to return to our families and friends in our ridings we should be mindful of the children of Canada, symbols of hope for our future.

Children are the ones most impressed with what Christmas is all about and unfortunately they are sometimes the most disappointed and discouraged because of circumstances beyond their control. Poverty, hunger, illiteracy, domestic problems and other challenges often get in the way of what should be a season of joy and happiness.

As we leave here this week, let us rededicate ourselves to our children, always treating them with care and giving encouragement. Our children are our future and we can make a better life for them by remembering every day that they hold in their hearts the special meaning of Christmas.

To my colleagues and to you, Mr. Speaker, Merry Christmas.

* * *

PEACEKEEPERS

Mr. John Bryden (Hamilton—Wentworth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to read from a soldier's letter I received not long ago:

I am in the Canadian Armed Forces and have been for 10 and a half years. I have been to Cyprus, Somalia and at this very moment am in Yugoslavia. I am sure you

get hundreds of letters per day from people expressing their views on every type of situation going. My letter is just a get to know you letter.

I read in your 1994 fall report that a Yugoslavia family received a Canadian flag as part of their welcome to Canada. The only Canadian flag I've seen is on our sleeves. Could you please send me a Canadian flag for over here and also a calendar to mark off the days left on my tour.

Waiting to hear from you. Yours sincerely—

I immediately sent this young soldier every Canadian flag I could lay my hands on plus 100 pins.

As we approach Christmas, let us remember it is not enough just to talk about how much we value those who help and serve us, we must also show it by our deeds.

* * *

RAOUL WALLENBERG

Mr. David Berger (Saint-Henri—Westmount, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, January 17, 1995 will be the 50th anniversary of the arrest of Raoul Wallenberg by the Soviet army.

In 1944 Wallenberg, a Swedish diplomat and businessman, persuaded his government to send him to Budapest where he rescued thousands of Jews by sheltering them in protected homes, flying the flags of Sweden and other neutral countries.

After his arrest Wallenberg disappeared in the Soviet prison system. Over the years various human rights groups have acted on his behalf and tried to get from the KGB information about his whereabouts.

No one knows definitively whether he is alive or dead. The Government of Canada should persist in its efforts to obtain from the Russians the real truth about what happened to Raoul Wallenberg and a public acknowledgement of his contribution to humanity.

As Elie Wiesel has written, Wallenberg will forever testify for man's need to remain human and his ability to succeed.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for over a year, subject to a great deal of blackmailing and arm-twisting, this government and its international trade minister have completely given in to the United States in every trade dispute opposing Canada to that country. For instance, the government reneged on its solemn promise and accepted to limit the exportation of Canadian wheat to the U.S.

In the case of uranium, the government let the Americans cook up an agreement with Russia which is discriminatory for Canadian producers. As for sugar, it knowingly sold out our producers who are now excluded from the American market. And now, the government is once again giving in to American pressure by accepting to make the payment of \$800 million owed to Canadian lumber producers conditional to the signing of an agreement between the two countries.

S. O. 31

After being in office for over a year, the Liberals have proven, beyond any doubt, that their strategy regarding trade with the US is an utter and complete failure.

* * *

[English]

BILL C-226

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to participate in the debate of Bill C-226 and in a free vote last Tuesday night which sent Bill C-226 to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. This bill would strike section 745 from the Criminal Code, thereby denying those sentenced to life imprisonment the opportunity for early parole.

The bill passed by a vote of 136 to 103. This bill demonstrates how the use of free votes can make meaningful input from all parliamentarians and it also demonstrates the value of a truly representative legislature.

(1405)

I must commend the member for York—South Weston for having the conviction to put this bill forward. I would like to commend all those in the House who voted in favour of this bill.

This is truly a victory for free votes and truly a victory for Canadians who demand a safer society.

* * *

RAILWAYS

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the decision by the Minister of Transport to turn down the offer by CP Rail to purchase the CNR east of Winnipeg.

I want to suggest to the minister that what he should do now as a second step is abandon his plans to privatize or commercialize the CNR in some way and rather turn his attention to how to create a larger policy environment in which railways can once again thrive in this country.

We need to do things about the tax system. We need to look at ways in which the costs that the railways incur are incurred by them directly in a way that other transportation modes do not have to do similarly.

There are a lot of things that the minister could look at to return railways to the prominent place that they once had, not for the sake of a romantic vision of the past but for the sake of the environment, for the sake of the future.

I believe that rail is the transportation mode of the future. I would ask the minister to consider ways in which he could strengthen CN and railways in general in this country.

* * *

FRIENDSHIP CENTRES

Mrs. Marlene Cowling (Dauphin—Swan River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contribution of the 114 friendship centres across Canada.

These centres provide vital services to aboriginal peoples, including job training and placement, literacy, advanced education, child care and substance abuse counselling.

Forty years of experience and a large volunteer base provide friendship programs with the ability to address aboriginal needs in a culturally relevant and fiscally responsible way.

It is important that we continue to support our nation's friendship centres. We need to help strengthen the network of support services they have built. We need to ensure that friendship centres can continue to offer their important services to aboriginal Canadians now and tomorrow.

* * *

FIRST NATIONS POLICING SERVICES

Mr. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Vancouver South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to inform the House today that the Government of Canada has successfully negotiated a number of community tripartite agreements with five First Nations and the province of British Columbia.

Under these agreements aboriginal members of the First Nations common policing service will be dedicated to provide improved safety and security for the people living in the Haisla, Fort Nelson and Prophet River, Nanaimo, Nanoose and Nisga'a First Nations.

This RCMP First Nations community policing service will be able to provide policing services sensitive to the needs and culture of the people living in these communities.

These agreements were signed under the terms of the federal First Nations policing policy. Under this policy the federal government pays 52 per cent and the province 48 per cent of the cost of the police service.

I am sure all members will join me in congratulating the Ministry of the Solicitor General, the Government of British Columbia and the five First Nations.

S. O. 31

MICROCELL 1-2-1

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, MicroCell 1-2-1 is turning on. The personal communications system revolution in North America has started and Canada will be the first.

MicroCell 1-2-1 has the vision, the people and the technology and the \$500 million in capital required to start building the most advanced personal communications network in Canada.

The time has come to celebrate the launch of this new era and to do that MicroCell 1-2-1 invites every Canadian child and his grandparents on Christmas Eve to visit one of the following locations and call anyone they love in the world on their public network for free.

The freedom of expression sites are the Place Fleur de Lys in Quebec, Eaton Centre in Montreal, the Bayshore Shopping Centre in Ottawa, the Pacific Centre in Vancouver and the Community Info Access Centres of Toronto.

Free long distance calls for Canadian children and their grandparents on Christmas Eve; watch your local newspapers for further details and other locations to be announced.

Congratulations to MicroCell.

* * *

(1410)

[Translation]

SOCIAL PROGRAM REFORM

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we learned yesterday, on TV, that some people were flying to Finland on a Concord to meet with Santa Claus. Yet, I was always told that Santa Claus lived at the North Pole, and was therefore a Canadian.

Well, it is bad enough for Canadians to learn that RRSPs will be taxed and that the GST is here to stay. Social program reform, unemployment insurance cuts and tuition fee increases are nothing pleasant to put under the Christmas tree. New taxes, supposedly temporary, are no way to start the New Year.

As if we did not have enough bad news, the government is letting them take away our Santa.

Just one more thing: what happened to the red book reindeer in all this?

* * *

[English]

PETRO-CANADA

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in 1988 Petro-Canada entered into an agreement with Daly Enterprises of Saint John, New Brunswick. Four years later Petro-Canada, whose motto is “committed to Canadians”,

renege on its commitment, saying: “If you don’t like it, take us to court”.

In a blatant attempt to force Daly to sell its prime locations, Petro-Canada is demanding a 24 per cent interest charge on money it claims Daly owes. This is not an isolated case.

Many Canadians are appalled by this insensitive loan shark behaviour from a company that is still 70 per cent government owned.

Last Thursday in response to a question about the bullying tactics of Petro-Canada against the Curtis family, the Minister of Natural Resources seemed surprised and said she would look into this situation.

On behalf of all Petro-Canada dealers who believe they have been shafted, it is incumbent upon the minister responsible to launch a long overdue investigation into its questionable business practices.

* * *

[Translation]

MANITOBA ASSOCIATION OF BILINGUAL MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, about ten days ago, the Manitoba Association of Bilingual Municipalities held a forum in St. Boniface entitled *Think Globally, Act Locally* or *Vision globale, action locale*.

This seminar was organized to look for ways to improve economic development in our communities. Weaknesses, such as duplication and lack of planning, were mentioned and examined, but strengths were also found: a well-educated and well-trained bilingual manpower, and a deep commitment to improving the quality of life.

[English]

This is an excellent example of English and French-speaking people working together to improve the quality of life of their citizens.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN FLAG

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago, a resolution of the House of Commons approved the new Canadian flag. Today, we are celebrating this major event.

This flag originated at the Royal Military College in Kingston.

[English]

There one day in early 1964 the Hon. George Stanley, who was then the Dean of Arts at the Royal Military College, pointed out the RMC flag to a member of this House’s flag committee, the Hon. John Matheson, who was then the member for the county of

Leeds, for the constituency of Leeds, and is a cousin of mine. Mr. Matheson's design was subsequently adopted as the Canadian flag after a very long and bitter debate in this Chamber.

Today all Canadians are proud of our great flag. Long may it wave over a strong and united Canada.

* * *

SOCIAL PROGRAM REFORM

Mrs. Bonnie Hickey (St. John's East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents of St. John's East have given the discussion paper on reforming our social programs serious consideration. They have written and phoned me with their views and come into my office for meetings. Also, over 100 constituents turned out to a public meeting that I hosted on November 29.

I am pleased to say that this meeting was a success. It was good to see on a cold Newfoundland night that there was a good cross-section of people in my riding who had come out to express their opinions.

I am currently preparing a report which summarizes the points made at the meeting and will be forwarding it to the minister and the standing committee on human resources.

The government has asked Canadians for their views on social security reform. I have told my constituents that I will ensure their views on this issue are well known.

* * *

(1415)

SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise and submit my second Liberals copy Reform award.

Number two on the list is the hon. member for Hamilton—Wentworth who said: "The practice of using tax revenues to finance special interest groups with particular axes to grind has created a multimillion dollar system of bureaucratic patronage that operates with little accountability to ministers, MPs, the media, or the taxpayer".

It appears that Liberal backbenchers are finally beginning to see the light and have added the Reform blue book to their reading list.

Unlike the red book the blue book calls for the reduction and/or elimination of funding to special interest and advocacy groups. Unfortunately cabinet is not listening.

To date we have seen no action by this government to cut back interest group funding. To cabinet we say enough is enough.

Oral Questions

Listen to what the Reform Party is saying. Listen to what the Liberal backbenchers are saying. Stop funding special interest groups and start giving taxpayers a break.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[Translation]

TAXATION

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for 14 months now the Minister of Finance has been utterly unable to convince his Cabinet colleagues to take the measures necessary to bring about a substantial reduction in his deficit.

In an attempt to fulfill their commitments and reduce the deficit to 3 per cent of the GDP, Liberal members are proposing to further increase the burden of taxpayers, who are already weighed down with taxes, particularly those in the middle class.

Given that now is the time when taxpayers make decisions about the amounts they will invest in RRSPs, would the minister simply take advantage of this final question period to reassure worried taxpayers by undertaking publicly not to tax RRSPs in his next budget?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Roberval knows very well that we will have to wait for the budget. The Minister of Finance is not really in a position to make budget announcements here, in the House, even if Christmas is approaching. We will have to wait until the end of February.

That being said, I am sure the member will admit that if we wish to meet our objectives, cuts will have to be made. It would be of great help if his party would make constructive suggestions on exactly where we should cut.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this being the festive season, I will cordially remind the Minister of Finance that we have been suggesting tax expenditure cuts for more than a year now. What I cannot understand is why he does not implement our suggestions. We will make some more before the holidays, if he wants to keep an ear out.

I will even offer him a suggestion today. The national Treasury should make a priority of recovering \$6.6 billion in unpaid taxes owed to the government. We are not talking about people who have paid their taxes, but about unpaid taxes totalling \$6.6 billion. Since he should first recover this amount, could the Minister of Finance then undertake not to look at taxing group dental and medical plans, which have a particular impact on families?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, despite repeated efforts on this side of the House the Bloc still does not understand what accounts receivable are.

In the accounts receivable there are many Canadians who are having difficulty paying on time, but who have made arrangements with the government to pay over a period of time. They owe us money. No question. They pay it back with interest.

Also in that accounts receivable are certain Canadians who dispute tax questions with us. They say we do not owe as much as you say. When we examine their documents we often discover that they are right. I certainly do not think we should be collecting money from Canadians who do not owe it to us.

(1420)

The accounts receivable are exactly that. We are coming off a bad recessionary period, the Tory recession. We are coming on to the margin recovery. We are doing all we can to help Canadians who are having difficulty and who are now getting back on their feet.

The last thing we are going to do is force them into receivership and bankruptcy by the policies adopted by the Bloc Quebecois.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it may be that I do not understand what an account receivable is at Revenue Canada, but the Auditor General of Canada and I think alike. Neither of us understand. These members do not understand and neither does the public. The minister is the only one to understand.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Let me get back to my question to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I will get a serious answer. Does the Minister of Finance see the commitment his Prime Minister made during the election campaign not to raise taxes for two years, a solemn commitment made to all Canadians, as a commitment that should be honoured? And if so, why does he not come out and say so clearly, today, instead of letting uncertainty hang over the heads of taxpayers?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, more to the point, we have to ask ourselves: is our tax system, here, in Canada, entirely fair? Or does it have loopholes, a point that some of the hon. member's colleagues have already raised? Are there loopholes that should not be looked at?

If, contrary to his colleagues, the hon. member is of the opinion that the system is perfectly fair, that no changes are required, fine, no changes will be made in the next budget, but we think that the system is not entirely fair and that changes will be required. We certainly intend to assume our responsibilities.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I was happy to hear the Prime Minister admit that there are tax inequities. This, incidentally, is one of the proposals he will find in the report submitted to him by the Official Opposition, which suggests 10 ways to reduce his deficit problem. I would ask him to read these recommendations, which were tabled in both official languages about two weeks ago. It may be time for him to read them.

In order to meet their commitment to reduce the deficit to 3 per cent of GDP by 1996–97, the Liberal members on the finance committee are proposing higher taxes for all taxpayers through a supposedly temporary surtax. The Official Opposition, however, believes that the deficit can be substantially reduced without raising personal income tax, by making vigorous efforts to collect unpaid taxes and cut spending, including inappropriate tax expenditures.

Instead of raising taxes for all taxpayers, will the Minister of Finance finally decide to fairly and seriously consider all the proposals made by the Official Opposition to help him cut the deficit in an intelligent way?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, yes, I did read the Bloc Quebecois's report. I can assure the hon. member that we intend to consider these recommendations carefully. It should, however, be pointed out to the hon. member that these recommendations would help us with only a tiny portion of the \$42 billion deficit. I would ask the hon. member if he could make suggestions that will really help us solve the deficit problem and the structural problems facing us.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would calmly remind the Minister of Finance that, based on our calculations, which he has not contradicted, our 10-point proposal would amount to about \$15 billion in cuts and savings of all kinds and in new taxes that would make rich Canadians pay their fair share, if they do not already. I would invite him to reassess our proposals.

I put my supplementary question to the Deputy Prime Minister. Does she intend to reprimand her finance minister, as the Prime Minister did yesterday on the issue of high interest rates, so that the finance minister will reject the idea of a surtax that would hit all taxpayers, which would be totally inconsistent with the Prime Minister's own election commitment?

Oral Questions

(1425)

[English]

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois just said that it has given us suggestions in terms of deficit reduction of some \$15 billion. I hate to contradict their mathematics, but the number is nowhere near that. In fact it is not even one third of that.

That being said, what really must be done in this House by the opposition, and indeed the Reform Party have done it in part and have said they are going to do it before the budget, is to give us a comprehensive plan. It is quite easy to make great speeches. It is quite easy to set out targets with no background. But what is very, very difficult is to do the line by line study that allows us to deal with the profound structural problems of our economy and the way that governments spend.

In the month and a half that the opposition is going to have off, I would invite them to sit down and really work up a proper plan so that when we come down with the budget we can have an intelligent debate.

* * *

SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the SIRC report on the Bristow affair brought forward this morning is a whitewash. It does not adequately address the Reform Party's primary concern, namely that a paid agent of the former Progressive Conservative government allegedly tried to build links between Reform and extremist groups for the purposes of discrediting Reform in an election.

The Mulroney–Campbell administration may or may not have known what Grant Bristow was doing but they were certainly aware of his activities and they were in a position to use that information for political advantage.

Will the Solicitor General tell this House why SIRC did not more thoroughly investigate this particular concern and what he intends to do about it?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Security Intelligence Review Committee was created by an act of Parliament, adopted by this House and the other place, to operate at arm's length from CSIS, at arm's length from the minister, at arm's length from the government. In short, it operates very much like a permanent commission of inquiry. It presented its report. I tabled that report in the House today.

I understand the hon. leader's question. However, I think that question would best be put to SIRC itself. I understand its members are appearing before a subcommittee of the justice committee tomorrow. That would be a very good vehicle for asking such questions.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, sections of the SIRC report read like a who's who of the Tory party. Their names are sprinkled throughout the report: Lewis, Jelinek, Dobbie, Segal, Sparrow, Campbell. Many of these people were reported to have had meetings with key players in the Bristow affair and were involved in smear campaigns against the Reform Party. Yet, in interview after interview with these former Tory politicians, SIRC avoided asking the key hard questions.

Will the Solicitor General agree that a committee like SIRC composed of political partisans investigating alleged improprieties by politicians makes a mockery of natural justice and discredits the internal security system in this country?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the members of the Security Intelligence Review Committee are appointed by order in council in exactly the same way as a short term commission of inquiry. They have the fullest powers to investigate, to seek documents, to question people under oath and they are in a position to complete a full and comprehensive report into matters they look into. That is what they have done. That report is before us for questioning and also is before us to use as a resource to make sure that CSIS is operating in a way required by law.

I suggest to the hon. leader of the Reform Party that he take another look at the report. Its basic purpose was to investigate allegations about the conduct of CSIS not about the conduct of political figures. It has done this job. I suggest that he and his colleagues follow up their concerns by addressing their questions directly to the members of SIRC when they appear before the parliamentary subcommittee or for that matter, seeking out meetings with them directly.

(1430)

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today's SIRC report on the Bristow affair highlights the inadequacies of checks and balances on CSIS. It is also clear that the mechanisms for monitoring the activities of CSIS are ineffectual. They are open to political manipulation by virtue of the patronage appointments to the Security Intelligence Review Committee.

Will the minister agree that the highly political and completely ineffectual Security Intelligence Review Committee should be done away with? Will he agree that the parliamentary subcommittee on national security should be made the watchdog of CSIS and should be given the teeth to do the job?

Oral Questions

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I reject the premise and innuendo of the hon. member's question.

The SIRC was created by an act of this Parliament to operate at arm's length from the government, from Parliament itself and from CSIS. I really question why he thinks a subcommittee of this House made up of people linked directly to political parties is less partisan than the arm's length Security Intelligence Review Committee. There is a contradiction in what he says.

* * *

[Translation]

TAX CREDITS

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Revenue.

While the major Canadian banks are declaring record profits of over \$4 billion this year, we learn that these same banks will benefit from some \$300 million in tax credits for research and development, in particular for expenses to develop software used in current operations, such as automated teller machines. The Auditor General has denounced such tax credits as ineffective.

Can the revenue minister confirm that nearly \$300 million in tax deductions will swell the banks' profits, which already amount to \$4 billion, and that these credits are for so-called R&D expenses which are really nothing but current expenditures?

[English]

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can rest assured that there will be no payment on pseudo claims for tax credits.

We have a very strict procedure for dealing with the tax credits for scientific research and experimental development. The three criteria are: first, there must be advanced knowledge; second, there must be a real risk of failure involved; and third, the research must be undertaken by experts.

We are now assessing the applications. I might add that anybody can put in a request for such an application. It simply does not mean that Revenue Canada will accept it. We are looking at it closely with over 300 auditors and also a large number of scientific experts to make sure that in fact no money is paid under this scheme other than that which is due to be paid.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of Finance.

First of all, I would like to remind him that he started by saying that the Bloc Québécois had no suggestions. Five min-

utes later, he was up to \$5 billion. So that he can do his figure work better, I would like to remind him that we are talking about \$1.6 billion for defence, \$3 billion in corporate subsidies, and \$6 billion in unpaid accounts. The Minister of Finance should get his figures straight and by the end of Question Period, we may find that the deficit is much smaller.

Yesterday, the Minister of Finance asked us where to cut. Here is another suggestion. Does he intend to end the waste of public funds denounced by the Auditor General and reduce his spending by \$300 million, in addition to savings suggested by the Bloc Québécois?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I fully endorse what the Minister of National Revenue just said. The purpose of these tax credits for research and development is certainly to create new technology. It is not for companies to do things that they should do anyway as good management.

I think that the Minister of National Revenue answered the question very well and I can tell you that he has just stated the finance minister's position too.

* * *

[English]

SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the SIRC report on the Heritage Front affair is full of contradiction. It states that CSIS did not investigate the Reform Party or its membership. Yet in the same report it has acknowledged that a CSIS Ottawa region investigator searched the names of the contributing individuals and companies to the Reform Party leader's 1988 campaign against the CSIS databases.

I ask the minister if this does not constitute an investigation of the party and its membership, what does?

(1435)

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the report of the Security Intelligence Review Committee which is the report of the committee and not of the government said in part that the service had an obligation to investigate whether the government of the foreign country was involved in attempting to influence the outcome of a Canadian election. It also went on to say that CSIS did not investigate the Reform Party or its membership.

If my hon. friend does not agree with this, I suggest she question SIRC directly when it appears before the subcommittee. I understand her concerns, but the vehicle to which she should address her questions is the SIRC itself.

Oral Questions

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General cannot remove himself from the responsibility of representing Canadians on this issue.

I will be talking to SIRC tomorrow. This investigation on allegations was from an individual considered by the CSIS investigator as an unknown quality who was self-serving and very opportunistic. It would appear that investigations of this nature can be held with very weak probable cause.

What assurance can the minister give to Canadians that contributors to political parties today are not being investigated by CSIS?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I repeat that this report is a report of an independent commission of inquiry. My role is to bring the report to the attention of the public through this House in the fullest possible manner, which I have done.

With respect to the second part of the member's question, the law adopted by this Parliament makes clear that CSIS is not to investigate lawful acts of protest, dissent or promotion of a cause. I think that is pretty well clear. I hope it will give the reassurance the hon. member is seeking.

* * *

[Translation]

BLOOD SUPPLY SYSTEM

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health. On December 5, the minister said that she would rather wait for the public hearings on this issue to be completed before commenting on the blatant lack of rigour endangering the safety of Canada's blood supply system. These hearings were held on December 6 and 7.

Now that the hearings have taken place, will the minister tell us why the Bureau of Biologics does not comply with its own standards, given its responsibility to check the quality of blood products and facilities at all 17 transfusion centres of the Canadian Red Cross Society?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. member was going to wish me a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year, and also congratulate me for the good work I did this year.

Clearly, we worked well and we will continue to do so.

As regards the hon. member's question, I can say that we more than doubled the staff of the bureau. We implemented a number of measures. We are also spending \$11 million on the Krever Commission because we feel this is a very serious issue. Not only do we want our blood supply system to be as good as any, we want it to be the best in the world.

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, words fail me. How can the minister not take this recommendation seriously?

Our blood supply system is blatantly flawed and Canadians are at risk of being contaminated before the end of 1995. This is very serious. Some people are actually dying because of this.

Will the Minister of Health at least have the decency to immediately contact the head of the Bureau of Biologics, who is accountable to her, and clearly tell him that he has the duty to comply with his own safety rules?

(1440)

[English]

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I take the question very seriously indeed.

Since I became the Minister of Health we have done more in terms of blood safety and inspection of centres and increasing personnel than was done in the previous 10 years.

We did not and I am not waiting for the report of Mr. Krever to take action. We have done everything that we can and we will continue to do everything we can. Meanwhile we are anxiously awaiting to see what other new measures Mr. Krever will ask us to undertake. We will do whatever it takes to guarantee that the blood system in this country is the very best in the world.

* * *

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, five weeks ago the health minister threatened private clinics throughout Canada. She promised swift action and then she vanished, perhaps permanently.

The minister now knows that all provinces struggle to fund health care because this government withdraws from medicare funding.

Will the minister give every province a Christmas present by admitting her political blunder?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I seem to recall during the last election campaign a Reform Party committed to the medicare system in this country. As a matter of fact the leader said he was opposed to user fees and did not want to decrease access to the health care system. I have a quote here which says: "I want to make it absolutely clear that the Reform Party is not promoting private health care deductibles or user fees".

If there is a blunder that has been made during this year it is by the Reform Party. We have kept our word. I am keeping my word. We are going to have medicare in this country not based on how much you can afford to pay, but based on your need for care.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Oral Questions

Some hon. members: More, more.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Macleod.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, that applause was a nice farewell.

Informetrica did a study which states that by the end of the EPF freeze in 1995 the federal government will have offloaded \$29.4 billion unilaterally on to the provinces, \$10.4 billion on to Ontario alone. Some Canadians think this is a big problem.

What will the minister do? I ask her to stand up and answer if she has an answer but if not to stay seated preferably in the backbenches.

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): The hon. member can quote whatever studies he wants but Mr. Speaker, perhaps you can give this message to the hon. member. There has not been one study that says we need to spend more money in our health care system. Everyone knows we need to spend it differently and more effectively. That is the exercise every province has undertaken. It is not easy but it is necessary.

At the same time we should not ever forget average Canadians who need health care. We never want to go back to the days when people could lose their homes at the same time as they lost their lives.

(1445)

If the hon. critic would go four seats over and speak to his leader he might be able to get the policies of the Reform Party right in terms of what it said during the election.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture.

As of January 1, 1995, the United States will impose new restrictions on Canadian sugar exports. Because of this unilateral decision to change the classification of products with a high sugar content, Quebec and Canada stand to lose almost 2,400 jobs. Since the change was made before GATT was signed, the federal government now claims that it cannot intervene in this issue.

Can the minister explain to us why the Canadian government let the United States unilaterally change the classification of products with a high sugar content, when it knew full well that this would have disastrous consequences for the sugar industry in Quebec and Canada?

[English]

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the United States is proposing to take certain actions effective January 1 with respect to the importation of products containing sugar into the United States.

As the hon. member knows, Canada takes strong exception to the position being taken by the United States. We have made those representations abundantly clear at the officials level in dealing with the U.S. department of agriculture, the U.S. trade representatives office and the White House.

Representations by Canada to the United States continue to be made. In the past 24 hours the Minister for International Trade has been in touch with his U.S. counterpart to make the Canadian position abundantly clear. We will continue to pursue that position in the best interest of all Canadians, including those in the province of Quebec.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since the minister has confirmed that Canada is no match for the United States in bilateral trade negotiations, will he undertake to refer the issue to a GATT panel?

[English]

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian government will pursue all its options in defending the Canadian position in the face of U.S. action with which we may disagree.

However I want to make it fundamentally clear that in the process we will not engage in any game of trading off one region of the country against another or one commodity against another or one group of producers against another.

All these are separate and distinct issues. They must be dealt with separately and distinctly on their own merits and we will not trade off the Canadian—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

[Translation]

INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM

Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint-Denis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister responsible for the infrastructure program.

The recession hit Canadians hard, including the residents of my riding of Saint-Denis, and reduced their employment opportunities. Over the past year, the situation seems to have improved and people are starting to go find jobs again.

[English]

Could the minister responsible for the infrastructure program give us an update on the status of the program?

Oral Questions

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we reach the first anniversary of the launching of the program when the Prime Minister and the premiers came together on December 21 in Ottawa, I am pleased to be able to bring more good news to members of the House.

At the halfway mark of the program over 80 per cent of the \$6 billion has been allocated to some 8,400 projects, creating over 81,000 jobs for Canadians. We are well on our way to the creation of some 100,000 direct jobs in the program.

I am pleased to tell the member for Saint-Denis that in the province of Quebec we have created over 20,000 jobs and have contributed significantly to the economy of the city of Montreal.

One more statistic, because I know the Reform Party's interest in the matter: I have received from Reform Party members some 15 letters and 10 of them have been in support of the program.

* * *

(1450)

PETRO-CANADA

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last week in the House both the Minister of the Environment and Minister of Natural Resources said they would look into the circumstances of the tragedy suffered by the Curtis family of New Brunswick at the hands of Petro-Canada and report back to the House.

Since then the Curtises have received conclusive proof from the renowned environmental health centre in Dallas that indeed exposure to gas fumes was the cause of permanent mental and physical damage to their seven-year old daughter.

My question is for the environment minister. As Petro-Canada is not only responsible for the leak but actually knew about the leak two years before it took any action, what does the government plan to do about holding this corporate criminal responsible?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will follow up on the undertaking I gave both publicly and privately to the member last week.

Not only did I receive his question in the House. I subsequently went over to discuss it with him personally. He assured me that he would provide medical information that we would use in an attempt to personally intervene with Petro-Canada. I have discussed the issue with my colleague, the Minister for Natural Resources, and we have been awaiting the medical evidence the member says is now in his possession.

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. I have the documentation. We received it today. It will go to both ministers.

I have other documentation showing that the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of the Environment were both notified about the case by the Liberal member for Fredericton—York—Sunbury last January, nearly a year ago.

Since the minister knew about the tragedy a year ago, why did she not do anything about it then? Why has the minister allowed Petro-Canada, a government controlled company, to snatch this little girl's future away?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me say in relation to the statement just made by the hon. member that indeed a colleague of mine informed me of this set of circumstances. I intervened at that time. I believe, in part because of that intervention, a settlement was reached in relation to part of the claim raised by the Curtises. Therefore I take exception to the fact that the member suggests I did not act upon the request of my colleague.

The other matters raised by the hon. member in relation to the health of the female child in question I understand are presently before the courts, are being pursued in the courts, and therefore it would be inappropriate for me to say anything further at this time.

* * *

[*Translation*]

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. Laurent Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development. Everybody knows that the reform proposed by the minister for post-secondary education has met with strong opposition from the provinces and student associations.

Does the minister still intend to go ahead with his reform of post-secondary education funding, as proposed in his green book, when the provinces and student associations are very much opposed to this proposal?

[*English*]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if there is any broad unanimity in the country from one end to the other, I suppose it is the need for a substantial, major overhaul and reform of all social programs including those in post-secondary education. In the province of Quebec alone 95 per cent believe it is time for major reform in social programs.

As the hon. member knows, a Commons committee has been holding hearings. We have had widespread consultation through a questionnaire. We have now received 20,000 copies from Canadians. They will be analysed. There is an ongoing series of discussions and a wide variety of options.

Oral Questions

The hon. member, as a member of Parliament, would not want me to preclude the judgment of his colleagues who have spent a great deal of time listening to Canadians, or preclude the judgment of many Canadians who have bothered to take the time to write in to give their contributions, by simply making an arbitrary judgment, as it seems the Bloc has done, before listening to the Canadian people.

(1455)

[Translation]

Mr. Laurent Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that people have already been waiting for quite a while. Everybody is aware of the minister's proposal and even Ontario has expressed some opposition.

How can the minister claim to represent a flexible federalism when he threatens to retaliate against the government of Ontario if it continues to make public its resistance to the proposed reform?

[English]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the one thing that will never lead to co-operative or flexible federalism is the kind of fearmongering the hon. member has just engaged in. I have never made suggestions or threats of the kind the hon. member suggested. He should withdraw that remark. It is not based on any fact or any presupposition.

I would simply say to him that at this time the broad majority of Canadians want some change. They want governments to work together on change. They want us to find the best ways to spend our money.

I keep saying the only group that seems to be objecting continually without analysing or considering the options is the Bloc Quebecois. It is simply standing in the way of Canadians getting what they want, which is a much better, more effective social system that will help people get back to work.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Jake E. Hooppner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

In 1983 the government implemented the Western Grain Transportation Act that gave railways guaranteed returns on investments and operating expenses. Not only was it a licence to print money. It also allowed railways to become inefficient and non-performing since they were paid regardless of how they moved prairie grain.

Is the minister now proposing to offload past Liberal mistakes on to farmers in the form of a cash buyout?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member knows the Minister of Transport and I are working on a set of proposals for comprehensive reform of the Canadian grain handling and transportation system. That obviously includes a very detailed examination of existing legislation in the form of the Western Grain Transportation Act.

In terms of a consultative process, a very extensive process is now under way by both the Minister of Transport and myself consulting with farm organizations, farmers and all other stakeholders in the grain transportation system. Our objective is to collect all their recommendations and advice toward the end of this year or the very early part of 1995 so that early in the new year we can put before our cabinet colleagues a set of proposals to deal with some longstanding issues in our grain handling and transportation system.

Our objective, in the final analysis, is to ensure we position the country to compete with the rest of the world and win in our grain sector.

Mr. Jake E. Hooppner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the minister knows very well that three prairie premiers insist that the Western Grain Transportation Act represents an inherent right promised to prairie provinces. They also insist that none of these moneys go into the east and that they stay in the west.

Is the minister prepared to put these funds into a safety net program that will offset the effects of U.S. and European subsidized products in the form of a trade distortion adjustment program?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a variety of proposals are under consideration. Some of those proposals come from the producer payment panel, which was a consultative process that ultimately reported publicly in June of this year. There have been other proposals in terms of the structure of the method of payment that have come from the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Various farm organizations have come forward with other alternatives. There is clearly a difference in view among farmers and farm organizations in western Canada on whether the funds either partially or totally should be dedicated to some kind of a safety net system. That is one of the alternatives on the table.

However I must tell the hon. gentleman that thus far in the consultations we have had with farmers and farm organizations the recommendations and advice we are receiving are very much against the notion of folding the funds into any kind of safety net.

Tributes

(1500)

SOFTWOOD LUMBER INDUSTRY

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Thunder Bay—Atikokan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Minister for International Trade.

For several months Canadian lumber companies have been waiting for the United States to begin repaying the bulk of softwood lumber duties collected on Canadian exports. Can the minister tell this House when Canadian companies will begin receiving repayment of these funds?

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, those in the United States lumber industry who had challenged the NAFTA procedures have now agreed unanimously to withdraw their lawsuit.

Accordingly, with the removal of this final obstacle, I understand that the United States Department of Commerce will in the next days begin to return the deposits of Canadian lumber companies, totalling some \$800 million plus interest.

I should add that the Canadian and United States governments will join in a consultative process to facilitate trade in lumber on both sides of our border.

* * *

TRIBUTES

The Speaker: My colleagues, it is quite probable that this will be our last question period this year. Today, I want to do something that I know you will agree with. The House is saying goodbye to three of its House officers who have been with us for a great many years.

In offering tribute, I would like André Fréchette, the head page who has been with us for 42 years, to please come and stand with me on my right.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: I would also like to invite our two deputy sergeants-at-arms. They have always been at that end of the House but for today, gentlemen, I wonder if you would join me here in front of the Speaker's chair.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: I would first call on the member for Kingston and the Islands.

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is the last working day on the floor of the House for our chief page, André Fréchette. He has had an amazing term of service in this House. What is more amazing is that the 41 years he has worked here represents more than 80 per cent of his life and I do not mean working life.

Of the 10 Prime Ministers who have been in office since the beginning of his employment in this House, nine have benefited from time to time from his assistance. I am certain there is no

other living Canadian who can claim to have personally assisted nine Prime Ministers not to mention 14 leaders of the opposition, scores of cabinet ministers and probably more than 1,000 members of Parliament.

During his years of service he has learned more about the House and its workings than most members. He always seems to be the first to know what is going to happen in the House, often being able to provide helpful advice to members and to other staff.

Mr. Fréchette started his career with the House as a page when he was barely into his teens and it is only just that he should retire now while he is still a youngish man.

(1505)

We will miss him very much in this House, Mr. Speaker, but of course we will be reminded of his presence on a daily basis because of the very able staff that he has trained to function in his absence.

[Translation]

Mr. Fréchette, we wish you a long and happy retirement.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, three employees of the House of Commons are about to retire, namely Léo Robitaille, who has been with us since 1953, Sam Renaud, since 1954, and André Fréchette, since 1951.

Serving the members of this House takes dedication, patience and understanding, and we would be unable to do our job without their support.

I would like to comment particularly on Mr. Fréchette's career which kept him in the House for 43 years. He started working here when he was 11, under Louis Saint-Laurent. He has known 12 speakers and several generations of members. I think this is a record, and should be in the Guinness Book of Records.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Duceppe: I wish to thank Mr. Robitaille, Mr. Renaud and Mr. Fréchette on behalf of all members of the Bloc Québécois.

We wish you a long and happy retirement!

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[English]

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today it is both an honour and indeed a pleasure to pay tribute on behalf of the Reform Party of Canada to my friend, chief page André Fréchette, on the occasion of his retirement.

Mr. Fréchette was born in Hull and first came to work in this place in 1951. He became chief page in 1980. What are his plans for retirement? We know he enjoys bowling every week, and we wish him all success to bowl perfect games. In the summer he knows the many wonderful locations where he can pick every kind of wild berry around the area.

Business of the House

After 42 years as a page he has well earned a rest, but we have been informed that a friend has also invited him to form a partnership in a small business. Mr. Fréchette has a big decision to make ahead. But I know he will bring his special enthusiasm to whatever choice he makes.

What advice would he give to young people today? I would like to quote: "Do anything you can to become a page. It is the best experience in the world and it is wonderful for young people to feel they are contributing to their country".

I am sure his wife, daughter and grandson take special pride in the years that he has given to Canada. I want to express the appreciation and congratulations of Parliament and our personal thanks to chief page André Fréchette. We will all miss you.

Also, we would like to extend our best wishes on the retirement of Mr. Leo Robitaille who has served Parliament here since 1953, and Mr. Sam Renaud since 1954. We wish you the best of everything in your retirement and the best of the season.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a rather special day for me. As you know, I am the only staff member of the House of Commons ever to have been elected to this place since Confederation. That I consider special. What is even more special today is to say to you and to hon. members that I have had the opportunity of working with all three people we are honouring this afternoon.

[Translation]

At one time I worked in the parliamentary restaurant like Mr. Léo Robitaille, who is being honoured today. As a member of this House, I have always known and worked with Mr. André Fréchette. I also came to know Mr. Renaud.

(1510)

If I could pretend for an instant that I am still an employee of the House of Commons, as I was a long time ago, I would like to tell these three men that the members of the House wish them the very best. I am sure that, in my imaginary capacity as an employee of this House, I also speak for all the employees of this House.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[English]

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the New Democratic Party, I too would like to wish Mr. Robitaille, Mr. Fréchette and Mr. Renaud a very happy retirement and also thank them very much for their service to this House and to generations of parliamentarians and to young people throughout the years.

[Translation]

I want to wish them a happy retirement.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, there are many other employees in the House of Commons who are going to retire.

[English]

I would like to also thank all of those other employees of Parliament who are taking retirement on January 1 and to thank them as well for their service to this Parliament.

The Speaker: Léo, André and Sam, at long last the Speaker gets to speak. My colleagues, today is a very special day. It is very special for all of us because in a very real sense we who serve in this House and the people who help us to discharge our duties as parliamentarians know full well of the pressures and demands that are placed on all of us. I include here the officers of this House.

Today as we say goodbye to Léo and Sam, I must say that I had hoped in my tenure to never be able to avail myself of your services, but already once I have had to call upon you when one of our members would not withdraw. I have forgiven him long since.

My colleagues, today also we say goodbye to André Fréchette. I ask the pages who are here today to come and stand around the Chair. There have been many pages that André has worked with and whom he has helped over the years.

[Translation]

I am happy to see you are all here, our pages, my pages, the pages of all Canadians.

[English]

It is indeed fitting that at this time of the year, as we prepare to go home, as we prepare ourselves indeed to be with our families and friends that we, the family that is Parliament, and most especially these three men who are leaving us today, would say to them, and I do today claim my right to speak on behalf of all parliamentarians when I say to you: Thank you for a job well done. We appreciate you very much.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

[Translation]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ) Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that I could dispense with the Thursday

Privilege

question today, but it seems that my hon. colleague has a number of items to announce, so I would ask him to proceed.

(1515)

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a few offerings for my hon. colleagues, just before the holidays.

[*English*]

First of all, in my capacity as Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, I want to join in the congratulations and best wishes to Mr. Fréchette, Mr. Robitaille and Mr. Renaud.

This afternoon we will continue consideration of third reading stage of Bill C-53. I believe there is an understanding that we will vote on this today. However, there will be an interruption at around 4.30 or 5 p.m. when the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod will summon the House to the other place for a royal assent ceremony. I understand that will be the last formal activity in Parliament by His Excellency the current Governor General before he leaves office early in the new year.

Also, I understand there is some considerable desire on both sides of the House to adjourn for the winter adjournment provided for in Standing Order 28 after completing Bill C-53 and the royal assent.

I will announce the business for the day when we return during the week before that date, hopefully not in this House but directly to my hon. colleagues. I want to say that tentatively I am looking at Bill C-44 and Bill C-62 as the selections likely to be called.

Finally, I would like to extend to the other House leaders and all members of this House my non-partisan best wishes for the holidays and the new year.

The Speaker: My colleagues, if indeed we do break today, I invite all of you to join me for a reception in my quarters before you leave today.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

ORDER PAPER QUESTIONS

Mr. John Cummins (Delta, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as I informed you and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans earlier today, I rise on a question of privilege in relation to a discrepancy in the supplemental answer given today to Order Paper Question No. 82. The answer is again inaccurate and misleading. It misrepresents the facts and is contradicted by DFO enforcement documents which I have received under access to information.

I was prepared to meet with the deputy House leader and the minister as per your instructions to discuss a satisfactory answer to Question No. 82. I sought such a meeting. A meeting never occurred and instead, the minister tabled a supplemental answer this morning.

The question asked the effect the late signing of the aboriginal fisheries agreement had on enforcement of fisheries agreements and fisheries regulations in 1994. The minister's answer does not respond to the effect on enforcement.

The Speaker: Is this new information the member is giving the House, or is it a repetition of the information he put before the House previously? Can the hon. member clarify that?

Mr. Cummins: Mr. Speaker, the information is new. What I am doing is responding to the supplemental answer to Question No. 82 which was tabled this morning.

The minister's supplemental answer to Question No. 82 which I refer to does not respond to the effect on enforcement. The departmental documents received under access to information deal specifically with the effect on enforcement.

The minister's supplemental answer deals with the management of the aboriginal fishing strategy, not the effect on enforcement of fisheries regulations, that is, the Fisheries Act. Now is not the time to debate the aboriginal fishing strategy.

The answer implies that aboriginal guardians were on duty as usual and that licences were given out as required under the regulations. That is simply not true. Virtual chaos reigned on the west coast. Fisheries documents prove it.

The issue before this House is whether the minister's answer misleads this House and prevents me as a member from carrying out my duties.

Let me read a few short sections from the August fisheries enforcement document on early Stuart migration which clearly demonstrates that the minister's supplemental answer is inaccurate. In Steveston it was reported that "the ability to properly manage the Fraser River aboriginal fishery has been seriously compromised". It also states: "The late signing of the aboriginal agreements has also resulted in difficulties in respect to proper management of the fishery, and in many cases bands have not been able to abide by the terms of the agreement".

(1520)

In Fraser Valley East and Fraser Valley West the report states that the lateness in the signing of the 1994 aboriginal fishery agreement has resulted in the breakdown of effective management in the native fishery on the Fraser River. DFO officers were unable to perform their duties effectively because updated licensing data was not available, therefore proper gear and licence checks could not be done. Mandatory landing sites were not operational until late July. Arrangements were not made by

Privilege

the harvest committee as per agreement to recover landing slips—

The Speaker: The Chair is in a quandary. It would seem to me that what we have here is information which is deemed to be accurate by one side and deemed to be inaccurate by the other side. What we are into now I believe is a point of debate. I wonder if the hon. member could move to identify the specific point of privilege he is referring to.

Mr. Cummins: Mr. Speaker, in point of fact I asked the question: What effect did the late signing of the aboriginal fishing agreements in British Columbia have on the Department of Fisheries and Oceans' enforcement of the agreement and fisheries regulations in 1994?

The answer that was originally provided said that the impact was minimal. The documents which I received under access to information proved otherwise. The supplemental answer which I received this morning did not address the issue. Instead it addressed the issue of the management of the aboriginal fishing strategy. It did not address the question asked.

The breach of privilege as I suggested the other day for your consideration, Mr. Speaker, was the 1978 decision where the member for Northumberland—Durham raised a question of privilege in the House. The Solicitor General had written and provided information which later proved to be erroneous and inaccurate. The Speaker ruled as indicated in *Hansard* on page 1857: "I find therefore a prima facie case of contempt against the House of Commons".

I maintain that the same thing has happened again. If it was contempt against the House of Commons to provide a member with erroneous information, then surely to provide the House itself with erroneous information through a written reply to a question on the Order Paper would also be a prima facie case of privilege.

Should you rule—

The Speaker: Order. Colleagues, I think at least at this point from what I have heard we are in the process of debate.

The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans is here now as is the member for Kingston and the Islands. I am going to permit an intervention. After the interventions are over, I will hear what you have to say first and then I will decide where I am going to go from there. The hon. Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is not a question of privilege. It is not even a matter of being a good point of order. What we have here is the beginning of a debate.

The debate being proposed by the member opposite is a debate about the impact or the capacity of enforcement officers both departmental and aboriginal officers to conduct their responsibilities.

(1525)

This is very technical that there is a late signing of an aboriginal fisheries agreement. The agreement in question this year has been the subject of a lot of discussion, questions in the House, a great deal of media. It is now the subject of a review by a former Speaker and a public panel. There has been some acknowledgement of some problems. The agreement in question primarily is on the lower Fraser. The group in question is the Sto:Lo. But this is one of 47 agreements. There are 47 agreements.

If the member chooses to focus on some areas of difficulty and draw from them the conclusion that the entire program, the planet as we know it, the fishery as it has been conducted, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and every last fish are all subject to a totally uncontrolled situation, that is his right as a member of this House. But to extrapolate from it that the answer given is misleading when there are 47 agreements and not just one is improper. It is wrong and is an abuse of the whole principle of a question of privilege.

What we have here is a debate. Mr. Speaker, if you would like to provide for a debate, you well know in the years we have shared together in this place that I am always tempted to engage in such.

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I just want to draw your attention to words used by the hon. member in expressing his question of privilege.

I will quote only two examples. For example, he said that the minister's answer implied something. Different people may draw different implications from words that are used, whether in the question or in the answer. I think it is entirely proper for a minister to provide an answer to a written inquiry which may be an answer that is not agreed to by the member receiving the answer.

Sometimes that may provoke the member to ask more specific questions. If the hon. member had asked what was the result of the non-signing of an agreement in area *x* he might have received a different answer to the question he asked on the Order Paper for which a much more general answer was provided.

I note that the minister, in answer to the hon. member's point the other day, tabled a supplementary response. This is unusual but it is perfectly proper for the minister to do that. He did it in order to satisfy the anxieties the hon. member raised the other day when he suggested that somehow the answer was misleading.

I want to suggest when the government prepares answers to questions in this House it prepares them as of the date the question is asked. Occasionally when the answer comes to me a month, two months or four months later—and sometimes they are late, we have had that experience recently—the answer is wrong because events have changed in a notorious way so that even I know they are wrong. Then I say I think we should update

the answer and give an answer that is correct as of the date we are tabling the reply.

I suspect that part of the problem the hon. member encountered in this case is that the information available to the department on the date the question was put was different from the information when the answer was tabled some two months later. Additional or supplementary information was provided by the minister this morning. I tabled that on the minister's behalf.

In light of all that I do not understand how the hon. member can argue that his ability to perform his functions as a member of Parliament have been impaired by this answer. That is the nub of the issue on a question of privilege. If his ability to perform his functions are impaired, I suggest to him the thing for him to do is put more questions on the Order Paper and ask more detailed questions so he gets more detailed answers.

I am sure if he does that he will get the answers he wants. But reading from selective reports and then suggesting that because those reports are different from the answer when, as the minister has pointed out there are many reports, is not correct. It is not fair.

It is not impairing the hon. member's ability to carry on his functions. He is obviously able to carry them on because he has all the reports in his possession and is able to read and quote from them in this House. If that is the case how are his abilities impaired, and if they are not, there is no question of privilege.

The Speaker: Colleagues, I think that for my purposes at least at this point what I would like to do is review the answer which was tabled today. I would like to review the information the member put before us on another day and has brought back with more information today. I will have a look at the information. At this point at least, subject of course to my looking at it and reflecting on it, I am not convinced that there is a question of privilege.

(1530)

However, if the House will give me the time to review the documents that have been placed before me, I will come back to the House if necessary.

I move now to the second question of privilege of the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River.

PRESS GALLERY

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was denied access to press gallery room 130-S on two occasions. I understand a similar occurrence took place a few days ago with respect to another member; I was

Government Orders

informed of it by the member. Although I am prepared to move a motion, I state for the record that the essence of the privilege matter is the denial of access of a member or members to rooms on the parliamentary precincts.

In view of the season, our agenda this afternoon, and the fact that I would like to think it was a simple misunderstanding with the press gallery, perhaps I could suggest that Your Honour take the matter up with the press gallery to ensure that there are no misunderstandings about the rights of all members to have access to all open rooms in the parliamentary precincts, barring of course the other place beyond the bar, washrooms of the opposite gender and common sense things. If you would do that, Your Honour, I think it might clear up the matter.

The Speaker: It is a point of information; I am not sure it is a question of privilege. I will undertake to get more information on what precisely has been happening in the last few days especially with respect to room 130-S. I will give the information to the hon. member or indeed share it with the House if I feel it is necessary.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

DEPARTMENT OF CANADIAN HERITAGE ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Hugh Hanrahan (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, once again it gives me great pleasure to discuss Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage.

It would be useful to state unequivocally that the Reform Party does not support the bill. The reasons for this are numerous. Since I have spoken on the bill during first and second readings and have participated in committee and report stages, I feel most of what I have to offer has already been stated. Therefore I will not deliberate at great length on the issue.

However I would like to summarize the key aspects of the bill. First let us look at multiculturalism. As I mentioned yesterday in the House, as a member of the Standing Committee on Heritage I had the opportunity to listen to witnesses describe multicultural federal funded programs as divisive and that they focus on our differences rather than on our similarities. This is ultimately the opposite outcome to that which the government had intended for the program.

Government Orders

I truly believe the intention was noble enough when the multiculturalism legislation was passed by the Trudeau government. However it was an experimental program that has failed its goals. The program does little to unify and seemingly everything to separate. The government must stop the waste.

Multiculturalism is creating an entire generation of hyphenated Canadians by focusing on differences, not on similarities. The majority of Canadians believe there is nothing wrong with multiculturalism. Yet they believe it should not be funded by the government but by multicultural organizations. This is the position of the Reform Party we have been defending since the late 1980s. According to Neil Bissoondath, author of *Selling Illusions—The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada*:

Anyone critical of the multicultural policy—is immediately branded a racist.

(1535)

Moreover it is my perception that this type of attitude is present today and is carried by the media, as anyone who speaks critically of funding for multiculturalism programs are labelled meanspirited or ignorant and intolerant. This is not an answer to the problem we are encountering today in Canada. I can unequivocally say that the Reform Party is not racist nor is it intolerant. However it is fiscally responsible.

Multiculturalism programs cost Canadians over \$30 million annually. This funding could be better spent on health or education. I am sure everyone knows that education and not cash is the true way to break down barriers between cultures and individuals. Therefore I think it would be wise for the government to rethink its multicultural policy.

Next, overlap and duplication is a theme in which this Parliament will hopefully be remembered for decreasing, although for this to happen the Liberals must re-evaluate Bill C-53 as it is riddled with inconsistencies and duplications between departments, such as overlap and duplication between the Department of Canadian Heritage and the departments of industry, environment and transportation. Yet the Liberals seem quite content to allow the overlap to continue, which will only lead to confusion of responsibility and mismanagement.

To illustrate the point I will use national parks. They were in environment but have since moved to heritage. I am still wondering why. Recently one witness, David Day, managing director of the Association for Mountain Parks Protection and Enjoyment, was before the standing committee discussing this issue. It is important to illustrate what he said because he made a great deal of sense.

He spoke of the difficulty governments face in administering and managing our national parks because of the diversity of expectations. I could not agree more.

What is it that we as a society would like to see from our national parks? Specifically talking about national parks, Mr. Day said:

Many Canadians have questioned why the government moved Parks Canada from the Department of the Environment to a new and seemingly unfocused Department of Heritage. Over the previous 14 years Parks Canada has established a firm position within the Department of the Environment as a leader and innovator in matters affecting the environment.

With the increase in tourism in Canada national parks are more closely linked to industry and environment than they are to heritage. The question remains: Why are parks in heritage? Streamlining government activities not only makes financial sense but also creates accountability. Government should be held accountable for department mismanagement and project failures.

Bill C-53 simply reinforces the perception of the process of government that needs reform as well as Reformers more so now than at any time before. Perhaps one of the most important changes or reforms the House needs is true free votes, free from party discipline. The Reform Party suggests changes to parliamentary rules to allow for more free votes and to ensure that the defeat of a government does not automatically mean the government must resign.

Bill C-53 is a prime example of a bill that should be defeated because it is fundamentally flawed. However its passage is a foregone conclusion as we will see later this afternoon. What we are doing here is nothing more than an illusion. We have been constructively criticizing and proposing positive changes, yet our suggestions fall on deaf ears.

(1540)

What the Liberals have to understand is that less government will ultimately mean more freedom and more prosperity, not just for a certain few or a certain region but all Canadians. We as parliamentarians have an obligation not only to our constituents but to Canadians as a whole. We must start to make decisions that will enable the country to lower our deficit and ultimately our debt. Since the beginning of my speech Canada's national debt has increased \$1,443 per second which equates to approximately \$1,776,000.

An hon. member: Then you had better sit down.

Mr. Hanrahan: Whether I am standing or not does not matter; they are still wasting the money.

It is for these reasons I am opposed to Bill C-53. It does nothing to reduce government spending or waste, government mismanagement or incompetence, government overlap or duplication. Bill C-53 does not set an example for other ministries. Nor does it have the direction needed to lead the country out of the financial crisis we are presently facing.

Government Orders

It is for these reasons that we as parliamentarians should reject Bill C-53. We should send a message to Canadians that we are truly serious about parliamentary reform, deficit reduction, government streamlining and government efficiency.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when we talk about heritage, most people believe that we are dealing with ancient things, old things. However, this afternoon, I would like to show that heritage also means modern things, even highly advanced technology. I would like to do it from a cultural perspective, from the perspective of Canadian and Quebec culture.

At the present time, right above the Equator, there are two American satellites beaming down to South and North America. They were sent into orbit by the Hughes Corporation, a subsidiary of General Motors in the United States. These two satellites have been nicknamed "Death Stars". What does this mean?

These satellites can transmit TV signals nearly to every home from the North Pole to the South Pole. They can broadcast up to 200 channels simultaneously.

I must warn you that this is not science fiction; not only can these satellites do what I have just mentioned, they have been doing it for several weeks already. They now have customers mainly in the U.S., but also in Canada.

These American satellites belong to the Direct TV Corporation and can be used by a Canadian corporation called Power Direct TV, itself a subsidiary of Hughes and Power Corporation.

What does this have to do with culture? Think about it for a moment. These satellites broadcasts are, for the time being, totally foreign to what is happening on the cultural scene in Canada. Programs are produced in the US and the content is American, naturally.

In fact, just about anyone in Canada can obtain the necessary equipment to receive these channels, and I will explain how to illustrate how real a danger it is for Quebec and Canadian culture.

(1545)

In the United States, right now, you can buy a dish the size of large pizza and a descrambler, and get the signal coming from a satellite on your television set. Now Direct TV is a business concern and the signal is not free; however the company has to know that you are receiving their signal to be able to bill you for it.

How does it work? You go to the United States and you buy the box and the small dish for about C\$900. I should add that as soon

as the market picks up, the prices will fall to about half that much. You bring all this back to Canada, to Quebec, or any other province or to the Northwest Territories and you install your small dish outside, or even inside if you have a south-facing window. Next you connect your box to the phone line and you dial the 1-800 number.

You automatically reach the U.S. company and register as a new customer willing to use their services. The company then sends a signal to one of their geostationary satellites above the Equator telling it to talk to your box. These satellites always stay above the same spot on the Equator. This is not science fiction, this is happening now. Your box has a number, and when the satellite sends it the right signal, it comes to life. From then on, it gives you access to about 200 channels.

You can now view all the regular programming of the major American television networks and you can order up movies on a pay-per-view basis, which is like going to a video store, except that you do not have to get out of the house. You push a button indicating that you want to watch such and such a movie and, automatically, the box records the films that you ordered and your viewing time. At the end of the month, the parent company in the U.S. phones your box and reads the meter, so to speak. And the box provides the information. The company in the U.S. then issues a bill and sends it to you.

However, since you are in Canada, you will not receive the bill at your home. It will be sent to an American address that you were provided with, and you will get the bill from there. No GST, no provincial sales tax. I think that the Department of Revenue should realize that services are being provided to Canada without any international agreement.

I will quote officials from the American company working on the Canadian side. Mr. Kruyt, who works for Power Direct TV, appeared before the heritage committee on November 16.

What was the question I asked? I had asked him why the company tolerated that Canadian consumers receive the signal, knowing that it was not complying with Canadian consumer law. He answered: "We have no financial incentive to prevent these people from receiving the signals, but do have a financial incentive to charge them for doing so".

I then asked him what made him think that eventually, in providing the service legally to Canadians, signals could be screened to ensure that they receive Canadian rather than American signals. And the answer I got was that the American company would give them control over what they call the on-off switch if they could start business in this country. This is of course a situation where profitability is the only rule.

Government Orders

(1550)

Culture in Canada and Quebec is now at risk. What can and must be done about it? First, we need our heritage minister to be properly equipped, to have the proper legislative tools to act. Instead, we have the Minister of Industry saying: "Communications. That belongs to me".

At this rate, telephone comes under communications, television comes under communications, banking transactions, specially those made at an automatic banking machine, come under communications. What about education then? Will it also come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Industry, when it is televised?

When the medical profession will make use of telecommunication media, will it become one more thing under industry jurisdiction? Telecommunication can be such an area of responsibility, but only insofar as the equipment is concerned and at the exclusion of content, which much be the responsibility of other appropriate departments. My point is that there is nothing in the legislation before us, absolutely nothing, that gives the Minister of Canadian Heritage authority to act.

I would even go further. With this chunk of the electronic highway—and we know that this highway is coming and that it will take many forms—how can we prevent goods and services from crossing our borders electronically, when we know full well that we have legislation in place to prevent them from entering in material form?

Take hate propaganda, for example. In electronic form, we cannot do a thing about it. Terrorist instructions are already circulating on Internet, here in Canada and Quebec. This would never be allowed if it had to go through a border point. What will we do to stop this? Our heritage department must be able to negotiate GATT-type agreements with our global partners, so that all countries with approved electronic data links will agree to protect their mutual interests. Therefore, the Act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage should enable our heritage minister to tell the countries with which we will have electronic links: "If we receive a signal that should not be received, we expect you to take those responsible to task, and we will do the same for you".

We will thus be able to protect our cultural interests, first by avoiding invasion as we will have control over what is coming in. It is not a matter of hindering the free flow of information, but of seeing that what would not be allowed through a border point cannot get through electronically either. We can also agree to export our own cultural wealth overseas and not let barriers be put in place over there.

In conclusion, the bill as it stands should not be approved by this House nor by the other place, as it does not meet the requirements Canadians and Quebecers are entitled to.

[English]

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

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Call in the members.

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

(Division No. 156)

YEAS

Members

Allmand	Anderson
Assadourian	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellemare	Berger
Bertrand	Bethel
Bhaduria	Blondin-Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Campbell	Catterall
Chan	Cowling
Crawford	Culbert
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gerrard
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Hickey	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Irwin	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)	Lee
Lincoln	Loney
MacAulay	MacDonald
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McGuire

The Royal Assent

McKinnon
McTeague
Mifflin
Mitchell
Murray
O'Brien
Ouellet
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Richardson
Rompkey
Shepherd
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Wappel
Whelan
Young —123

McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Murphy
Nunziata
O'Reilly
Pagtakhan
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Proud
Regan
Rideout
Serré
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thalheimer
Ur
Vanclief
Walker
Wells
Wood

(1625)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare the motion carried.

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

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think you will find that there is unanimous consent for the following motion and I believe the hon. member for Roberval will second this motion. I move:

That the House shall not sit on December 16, 1994 provided that it shall be deemed to have sat and adjourned on that day for the purposes of Standing Order 28.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The House has heard the terms of the motion by the parliamentary secretary. Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Louis—Hebert—Human Rights; the hon. member for Chicoutimi—Gliding school; the hon. member for Yukon—Social program review; the hon. member for Laval East—Draft bill on Quebec sovereignty.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing the House that the Senate has passed the following bills: Bill C-51, an act to amend the Canada Grain Act and respecting certain regulations made pursuant to that act; Bill C-56, an act to amend the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act; Bill C-57, an act to implement the agreement establishing the World Trade Organization.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received as follows:

Government House
Ottawa

December 15, 1994

Mr. Speaker:

I have the honour to inform you that the Right Honourable Ramon John Hnatyshyn, Governor General of Canada, will proceed to the Senate chamber today, the 15th day of December, 1994 at 4.30 p.m., for the purpose of giving royal assent to certain bills.

Yours sincerely,

Judith A. LaRocque
Secretary to the Governor General

NAYS**Members**

Ablonczy
Bachand
Benoit
Blaikie
Bridgman
Bélisle
Chatters
Debien
Deshaies
Dumas
Fillion
Frazer
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Grey (Beaver River)
Guay
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hill (MacLeod)
Jacob
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Shefford)
Manning
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Ménard
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Ringma
Schmidt
Silye
Stinson
Thompson
Williams—71

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Caron
Cummins
de Savoye
Duceppe
Duncan
Forseth
Gagnon (Québec)
Gilmour
Gouk
Grubel
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Hart
Hoeppner
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
Mayfield
McLaughlin
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunez
Penson
Pomerleau
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
St-Laurent
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bevilacqua
Bélair
Crête
Dubé
Lalonde

Bouchard
Clancy
Davialt
Dupuy
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)

Adjournment Debate

(1635)

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Excellency, the Governor General of Canada desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, the Speaker with the House went up to the Senate chamber.

(1650)

And being returned:

The Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that when the House went up to the Senate chamber the Governor General was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills:

Bill C-36, an act respecting the Split Lake Cree First Nation and the settlement of matters arising from an agreement relating to the flooding of land—Chapter No. 42.

Bill C-38, an act to provide for the security of marine transportation—Chapter No. 40.

Bill C-42, an act to amend the Criminal Code and other acts (miscellaneous matters)—Chapter No. 44.

Bill C-48, an act to establish the Department of Natural Resources and to amend related acts—Chapter 41.

Bill C-51, an act to amend the Canada Grain Act and respecting certain regulations made pursuant to that act—Chapter 45.

Bill C-55, an act to establish a board having jurisdiction concerning disputes respecting surface rights in respect of land in the Yukon Territory and to amend other acts in relation thereto—Chapter 43.

Bill C-56, an act to amend the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act—Chapter 46.

Bill C-57, an act to implement the agreement establishing the World Trade Organization—Chapter 47.

Bill C-63, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1995—Chapter 48.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on Friday, December 9, I put a question to the Deputy Prime Minister about the Prime Minister's timid stand on human rights and the Canadian government's inability to guarantee the security of Canadian business people travelling abroad.

I made particular reference to the case of Mr. Tran Trieu Quan, a citizen from the Quebec City area who has been held prisoner in Hanoi for over eight months by the Vietnamese authorities. Charges have yet to be laid against him, which leads us to conclude that Mr. Tran is being unjustly held and that the Canadian government should demand his unconditional release without delay.

In answer to the first part of the question, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade said that "the Canadian government has raised the issue on several occasions". We in the Official Opposition cannot forget that during his Asian Tour with Team Canada, the Prime Minister never talked publicly about the important issue of human rights. To justify his cowardice, the Prime Minister said that he was afraid that Canada would be made fun of.

As regards the outrageous situation experienced by this Canadian who has been held prisoner in Hanoi for more than eight months now, the parliamentary secretary is merely taking note of the question.

(1655)

Why is the Canadian government unable to impose the only possible solution, that is to say the release of Mr. Tran, who is being held illegally in a country where Canada just opened a chancellery in Hanoi and a trade office in Ho Chi Minh City, in addition to having been involved in the settlement of the arrears owed to the International Monetary Fund? Let us be frank: the Government of Canada is directly financing a government that is holding a Canadian prisoner. Some justice, Mr. Speaker!

The second part of my question dealt with the Canadian government's inability to ensure the security of Canadian business people abroad. In this regard, this whole affair has already taken its toll on the Quebec business community. For instance, the Sainte-Foy Chamber of Commerce recommended that its members stop trading with Vietnam. Last Friday, this organization also announced that it would recommend that chambers of commerce across Canada and Quebec adopt the same policy as long as Mr. Tran is held prisoner by the Vietnamese authorities.

How then are we to understand the Deputy Prime Minister's answer, and I quote: "I have personally reviewed every comment made by the Premier of Quebec when he was the host of the governor of a Chinese province and, each time, he adopted the same policy as the Government of Canada"? First, I would remind the Deputy Prime Minister that Vietnam is a sovereign state and not a Chinese province. Second, I would remind her that if I want to question the Government of Quebec, I would not do it through the House of Commons.

Lastly, I am pleased to see that the Deputy Prime Minister admits that Quebec has the ability and the know-how to establish an international policy independent of the federal gov-

Adjournment Debate

ernment's. If that were not the case, I would really like to know why she would waste her time reading and studying the public statements made by the Premier of Quebec on various subjects relating to foreign affairs.

However, this partisan stand of the Deputy Prime Minister clearly shows the Canadian government's insensitivity to the fate of Mr. Tran, a Quebecer held prisoner in Vietnam.

[English]

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want the hon. member to know that this government is not at all insensitive to the situation of Mr. Quan. He might be happy to know that the Prime Minister raised the matter of Mr. Quan's continuing detention during his meeting in Hanoi with the Vietnamese Prime Minister Vo Van Kiet.

The Prime Minister received a full explanation of the details of the case and was assured that the matter would be handled fairly and in accordance with Vietnamese law.

Mr. Quan has both Canadian and Vietnamese citizenships. Vietnamese authorities, however, do not recognize dual nationality and deny access to Mr. Quan by Canadian officials.

However, as a result of repeated high level interventions from the Canadian government we have gained counsellor access to Mr. Quan. Canadian officials have visited Mr. Quan and confirmed he is not being mistreated.

This is a very complex case in which a Vietnamese corporation lost a considerable sum of money. We understand that the Vietnamese are investigating the possibility of fraud.

As part of its regular counsellor assistance Canadian officials are facilitating discussions between Mr. Quan and Vietnamese authorities with regard to the possibility of Mr. Quan's release. These discussions are private and confidential and it would be inappropriate for me to comment on them here.

The Canadian government will continue to provide all appropriate counsellor assistance to Mr. Quan and will monitor the situation with vigilance. It would not be appropriate for the Canadian government to demand that the Vietnamese set aside their own legal procedures and immediately release Mr. Quan, nor would it be appropriate for the government to support a business boycott of Vietnam because one of its citizens is being held in connection with a criminal investigation.

We have the right to insist upon counsellor access and due process. We are and will continue to do both.

[Translation]

DRAFT BILL ON QUEBEC SOVEREIGNTY

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, On December 9, I rose in this House to ask the Prime Minister about the referendum process in Quebec. The Bloc Québécois wanted to know, and still wants to know, if the Prime Minister stands by what he wrote in his autobiography where he said: "If we lose the referendum, we will respect Quebecers' wishes and accept separation".

The Prime Minister answered my question by saying, first of all, that he wanted a clear question, adding that he would not answer any hypothetical question. The Prime Minister should realize that he is inconsistent in his statements. By not clarifying his stand on wishes democratically expressed by Quebecers, the Prime Minister is refusing to give an opinion on the right of the Quebec people to decide their future.

(1700)

Before being sovereignists or federalists, we must all be democrats. I dare hope that nobody wants to make Quebec an independent country or to maintain it within the Canadian federation against Quebecers' will.

Moreover, the Prime Minister would do well by following the lead of his colleagues, the hon. member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine and the hon. member for Mount Royal, both of whom recently recognized that it is up to Quebecers to decide their future. The Prime Minister has shown partisan behaviour instead of political responsibility during Question Period last Friday. It is urgent that he display an attitude appropriate to his important responsibilities as a head of state.

Besides, during the same debate last week, the Prime Minister wrongly accused sovereignists of hiding their option by using a question referring to a draft bill containing 1,600 words. He said that many federalists were refusing to participate in those consultations because of this little trick. Those were terrible and very inconsiderate remarks.

Should we remind him of the consultations which surrounded the Charlottetown Agreement? Should we remind him that the Charlottetown Agreement contained not 1,600 words but well over 10,000 words? Yes, 10,000 words. The Prime Minister and his party were not at all shocked. On the contrary, they promoted the content of that agreement all across Canada.

You must admit that the qualms the Prime Minister has today are quite recent and his rationale seems one-sided. The federal government and its Quebec branch have to talk about the real options. Let them remind us that they have nothing else to offer but the status quo.

Adjournment Debate

The truth of the matter is—and the Prime Minister should admit it—that federalists do not want to take part in consultations on the referendum because they have nothing to suggest but the old status quo. It may be Christmas and a time to eat traditional dishes, but that does not mean the federal government should serve us the same rehash.

In fact, the federal Liberals do not want to travel across Quebec and talk with citizens of every region. When you cannot argue for your political ideas with logical arguments, you use every kind of trick to divert the debate onto procedural details.

You cannot negotiate or manipulate the soul of a nation, nor can you put a price on it. No, the soul of a nation can only be seen if the people can democratically express their will. That is what the Government of Quebec is proposing and what the Prime Minister of Canada is rejecting. The Prime Minister must accept this inescapable fact and take part, with his colleagues, in particular the member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, in the pre-referendum consultations the Government of Quebec will be holding.

[English]

Mr. John English (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, before debating the result of the vote, let us address the process. It should be democratic and it should be clear.

We are asking Mr. Parizeau to duly initiate the referendum process, to present his question to the National Assembly and to move on quickly to the *Loi sur la consultation populaire*.

As indicated by Mr. Johnson, we are asking the PQ to end this masquerade, this so-called consultation and to get a clear mandate from the population. In other words, hold a referendum as soon as possible and put an end to the uncertainty. Let the public decide.

The Bloc and the Government of Quebec claim that they are great believers in the democratic process. They talk solemnly about the need to respect this process, but their very first act is to attempt to pre-empt the referendum by introducing a draft declaration of sovereignty which will be voted on by the National Assembly before the people of Quebec have spoken.

There can be nothing less democratic than forcing the National Assembly to vote on a declaration of sovereignty before the people of Quebec have had an opportunity to express themselves at the ballot box.

The Bloc is asking, in the event that Quebecers vote yes to separation, to recognize the people of Quebec, to recognize the right to leave the Canadian federation. Will the Bloc agree that the decision to introduce the draft declaration of sovereignty and to have the National Assembly pass it before the people of

Quebec have spoken through referendum is fundamentally undemocratic and against everything they claim to stand for?

(1705)

Will the Bloc recognize that the people of Quebec have the right to stay in Canada when they vote no in the referendum?

Quebecers know that they live in one of the greatest countries in the world, a country that they built. This country is evolving and Quebecers have a part to play in this evolution. The burden of proof rests with the separatists.

We are confident, Mr. Speaker, that a strong case will be made for Canada.

* * *

SOCIAL PROGRAM REVIEW

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on October 17 of this year I asked the Minister of Finance to come clean with Canadians about what the government's intentions were in terms of reducing funding for social programs in this country.

Since that time there has been much speculation. One report indicates a potential cut of \$7 billion contemplated by the government in our social programs envelope. Others, for example the Standing Committee on Finance which has just released a report, project that over the next two years there will be something like a \$3.4 billion cut in social programs.

This discussion that is going on certainly does not take into account the reality of what social programs have contributed to this country. Certainly as a New Democrat I am not against changes to social programs, but clearly Canadians are beginning to realize that the social security review has been merely an attempt to cut expenditures rather than to really and truly change our programs.

If the intent was to change programs, to make them better, to make them more efficient, I think we would have seen a very different process. I think the government has to be clear with Canadians what the intent is around the reduction of revenues in the social program area.

I would remind the government that in 1991 Statistics Canada was very clear that only 6 per cent of our debt could be attributed to social programs. I would suggest to the government that we need equal debate, indeed more debate, on that 94 per cent of the cost of our debt and deficit.

One of the major costs of that is how we finance our programs, not simply what we do within the purview of those programs. Since October 17 when I first posed the question to the minister I continued to raise questions about the financing of the debt. For example, only yesterday I posed the question to the Minister of Finance suggesting that he should have a public inquiry into the role of the Bank of Canada in setting interest rates, because of course the amount of our foreign debt is certainly affecting the

interest rate policy, and to look seriously at how monetary policy in this country is formed and the role of the Bank of Canada in that.

The minister did not respond to that particular request. I would suggest again that the minister instead of just simply looking at cuts to expenditures should also look at why they are necessary. Part of the reason for that is the monetary policy that was pursued by the previous Mulroney government and has been continued if not with even more zeal by the current Liberal government.

There are several things that the minister should be looking at in this area. The minister might recall that before 1967 the Bank Act legislated a ceiling on interest rates that allowed for some control. Prior to 1991 the act ensured that the Bank of Canada had some control over interest on the national debt.

I would like to ask the question why it is that the government will not be clear about the reduction in expenditures it wants to make to the social programs envelope? In addition, why will the government not look at the way and the role of the Bank of Canada, which has become I might add not the bank for Canadians but the bank for chartered banks, and how the government by looking at that could return the controls of its monetary policy to the people of Canada and not simply to the chartered banks.

I would be very interested, Mr. Speaker, in again posing those two questions.

Mr. John English (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada has embarked upon a significant reform of Canada's social security system in co-operation with provincial and territorial governments and with all Canadians. The social security review is allowing Canadians to consider options for structural reform of Canada's social programs. At the same time this review must respect fiscal realities and the government's deficit reduction targets.

The 1994 federal budget established fiscal parameters for social security reform. It announced measures that would reduce spending on unemployment insurance by \$2.4 billion. It also indicated that further UI savings leading to lower UI premiums would result from social security reform.

(1710)

The 1994 budget also announced that growth in social security transfers to the provinces would be curtailed by ensuring that Canada assistance plan transfers and the post-secondary education component of established programs financing are no higher in 1996-97 than in 1993-94. Savings of at least \$1.5 billion will be realized from preventing the growth that would otherwise have occurred.

Adjournment Debate

The social security discussion paper confirmed these parameters and makes sure that the entitlements under EPF-PSE and under CAP will be no higher in 1996-97 than they were for each program in 1993-94.

Beyond 1996-97, EPF-PSE funding will be at best kept stable at the 1996-97 level and no increase in funding for CAP or its successors should be anticipated beyond 1996-97.

If any additional savings are required to help meet the government's fiscal targets they will be announced in the 1995 budget.

In the meantime the government is listening attentively to the views of Canadians and of the parliamentary committees that are now engaged in discussions about social programs and fiscal issues.

[*Translation*]

GLIDING SCHOOL

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the eastern region gliding school at the Chicoutimi—Saint-Honoré airport in the Saguenay has been in operation since 1978.

Sixteen years of operation during which the school was assessed yearly by the authorities of the Royal Canadian Air Cadets and given full marks. Also sixteen years of operation at a location that is considered ideal. The Chicoutimi—Saint-Honoré airport is located in a truly outstanding site, in a rural area offering numerous advantages in terms of room to maneuver and safety.

In September, authorities in charge of the cadets asked for a feasibility study with a view to moving the gliding school from Chicoutimi—Saint-Honoré, in the Saguenay, to Saint-Jean.

Last Wednesday, socio-economic stakeholders in the region presented Major Dumontet and Lieutenant-Colonel Chartrand with an analysis of the Chicoutimi—Saint-Honoré site. Besides stating advantages of the Chicoutimi—Saint-Honoré site that were never disputed, the study emphasized major security problems at Saint-Jean. We have proof and aviation experts agree that our concerns are justified.

Nothing came out of the meeting with the people in charge of the cadets. Quite the contrary, the answers they gave us added to our concern. Therefore, because the decision appeared imminent, I asked the Minister of National Defence to impose a moratorium long enough to leave the Cadet headquarters sufficient time to address the concerns of the Chicoutimi—Saint-Honoré committee and, in particular, to make the best decision.

Since the survival of a school which has been operating in our area for 16 years and which has generated substantial economic spin-off is at stake, we repeat our request for the feasibility study to justify the move to Saint-Jean.

Adjournment Debate

We also ask for a second evaluation by Transport Canada of both airport sites, mainly from a security point of view.

The evasive answer the minister gave us led us to believe that everything was done behind closed doors and that he was not even advised. My question enabled him to learn that this whole reorganization was being planned in dark back rooms, away from the scrutiny of those concerned, and, therefore, without any consultation.

The people of Saguenay—Lac Saint-Jean do not want to have to put up with the same bungling as the people of Saint-Jean, when the military college was closed. There should be greater transparency when consulting with the committee, for the preservation of eastern region gliding school. Why rob Peter to pay Paul? This is the question.

[*English*]

Mr. John English (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Eastern Region Gliding School was situated in St-Honoré in the early 1970s because suitable accommodations for the cadets were available and the airport was conducive to glider training operations.

However several factors have resulted in the recommendation of the eastern region cadet staff to relocate the summer cadet gliding operations from the civilian airfield in St-Honoré to the municipal airport in St-Jean. The reasons are several.

First, one has to consider the ongoing efforts to reduce costs and improve the efficiency of cadet training.

Second, there is a substantial commercial cost required to house and feed the cadets in Chicoutimi.

Third, there are operational inefficiencies involved in moving aircraft and personnel resources every summer from the home base at the St-Jean airport, where are located the hangar and the offices, to the training location in St-Honoré, which is located at a distance of approximately 350 miles.

Finally one must note the decrease in the usage of the St-Jean megaplex coupled with improvement to the St-Jean airport.

Prior to undertaking the operational and financial analysis, full support for the proposal was received from the city of St-Jean, subject to noise reduction concerns. In accordance with Canadian law an environmental impact analysis was conducted.

A comparison of operations and flight safety measures between the airfields at St-Honoré and St-Jean clearly indicated the following benefits: an annual saving of approximately \$300,000 generated primarily by reduced costs of housing and feeding of staff and the air cadets at the CFB St-Jean megaplex.

Second is the availability of the main operating base hangar at the St-Jean airport to which the gliders and tow aircraft can be rapidly moved, thereby eliminating the possibility of environmental damage from the wind or hail compared to the situation at the St-Honoré base where the gliders and tow aircraft remain in the open over the entire summer training period.

Furthermore there is the non-restrictive glider takeoff and climb procedures at St-Jean compared to the restrictive ones imposed by the Chicoutimi airport authorities as a result of the noise concerns of St-Honoré residents.

In conclusion, flight safety is our number one consideration. This proposed move would not have been recommended if we had any concerns over flight safety.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Let me express season's greetings to Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

[*Translation*]

To all Canadians, from coast to coast, season's greetings.

[*English*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 38 the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, pursuant to order made earlier today, the House stands adjourned until Monday, February 6, 1995 at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Orders 28 and 24.

(The House adjourned at 5.18 p.m.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Thursday, December 15, 1994

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Motions for Papers

The Speaker	9103
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 185; Nays, 42.	9103

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Department of Canadian Heritage Act

Bill C-53. Consideration resumed of report stage	9104
Motion No. 8 negatived	9104
Motion negatived on division: Yeas, 42; Nays, 185	9105
Motion No. 2 negatived on division: Yeas, 38; Nays, 189.	9106
Motion No. 3 negatived on division: Yeas, 80; Nays, 147.	9107
Motion negatived on division: Yeas, 48; Nays, 179	9108
Motion negatived on division: Yeas, 86; Nays, 141	9111
Motion for concurrence	9112
Ms. Marleau	9112

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Security Intelligence Review Committee

Mr. Gray	9113
----------------	------

The Environment

Ms. Copps	9113
-----------------	------

Human Resources

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	9113
--	------

Canarctic Shipping

Mr. Fontana	9113
-------------------	------

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Milliken 9113

Interparliamentary Delegations

Mr. Proud 9113

Committees of the House

Natural Resources

Mr. Canuel 9113

Mr. Deshaies 9113

Western Grain Transportation Act

Bill C-66. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted 9114

Mr. Young 9114

Veterans Review and Appeal Board Act

Bill C-67. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted 9114

Mr. MacAulay 9114

Canada Pension Plan Act

Bill C-299. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted 9114

Mr. Peric 9114

Mr. Gagliano 9114

Petitions

Human Rights

Mr. Graham 9114

Gun Control

Mr. Adams 9114

Child Abusers

Mr. Adams 9114

Leonard Peltier

Mr. Adams 9115

Parliamentary Prayer	
Mr. Rideout	9115
Assisted Suicide	
Mr. Rideout	9115
Gun Control	
Mr. Gouk	9115
Mining Industry	
Ms. McLaughlin	9115
Grandparents' Rights	
Miss Grey	9115
Human Rights	
Mr. Duncan	9115
Assisted Suicide	
Mr. Duncan	9115
Human Rights	
Ms. Fry	9115
Mining Industry	
Mr. Serré	9116
Human Rights	
Mr. McWhinney	9116
Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	9116
Crimes of Violence	
Ms. Phinney	9116
Rights of the Unborn	
Mr. Hopkins	9116
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Milliken	9116

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Department of Canadian Heritage Act

Bill C-53. Motion for third reading	9118
Mr. Anderson	9118
Mrs. Finestone	9118
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	9122
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	9127
Ms. Guarnieri	9130
Ms. Brown (Oakville—Milton)	9132
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec)	9133
Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	9135
Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	9136
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	9138
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec)	9138

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food

Mr. Steckle	9139
-------------------	------

Francophone Communities

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	9139
--	------

World Cup Skiing

Mr. Thompson	9140
--------------------	------

Canadian Children

Mrs. Chamberlain	9140
------------------------	------

Peacekeepers

Mr. Bryden	9140
------------------	------

Raoul Wallenberg

Mr. Berger	9140
------------------	------

International Trade

Mr. Bergeron 9140

Bill C-226

Mr. Harris 9141

Railways

Mr. Blaikie 9141

Friendship Centres

Mrs. Cowling 9141

First Nations Policing Services

Mr. Dhaliwal 9141

MicroCell 1-2-1

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) 9142

Social Program Reform

Mr. Pomerleau 9142

Petro-Canada

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) 9142

Manitoba Association of Bilingual Municipalities

Mr. Duhamel 9142

Canadian Flag

Mr. Milliken 9142

Social Program Reform

Mrs. Hickey 9143

Special Interest Groups

Mr. Silye 9143

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Taxation

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval)	9143
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	9143
Mr. Gauthier (Roberval)	9143
Mr. Anderson	9144
Mr. Gauthier (Roberval)	9144
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	9144
Mr. Loubier	9144
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	9144
Mr. Loubier	9144
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	9145

Security Intelligence Review Committee

Mr. Manning	9145
Mr. Gray	9145
Mr. Manning	9145
Mr. Gray	9145
Mr. Manning	9145

Tax Credits

Mr. Brien	9146
Mr. Gray	9146
Mr. Anderson	9146
Mr. Brien	9146
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	9146

Security Intelligence Review Committee

Ms. Meredith	9146
Mr. Gray	9146
Ms. Meredith	9147
Mr. Gray	9147

Blood Supply System

Mrs. Picard	9147
-------------------	------

Ms. Marleau	9147
Mrs. Picard	9147
Ms. Marleau	9147

Health Care

Mr. Hill (Macleod)	9147
Ms. Marleau	9147
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	9148
Ms. Marleau	9148

International Trade

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac)	9148
Mr. Goodale	9148
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac)	9148
Mr. Goodale	9148

Infrastructure Program

Mrs. Bakopanos	9148
Mr. Eggleton	9149

Petro–Canada

Mr. Gilmour	9149
Ms. Copps	9149
Mr. Gilmour	9149
Ms. McLellan	9149

Post–secondary Education

Mr. Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	9149
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	9149
Mr. Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	9150
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	9150

Agriculture

Mr. Hoeppepner	9150
Mr. Goodale	9150
Mr. Hoeppepner	9150

Mr. Goodale	9150
-------------------	------

Softwood Lumber Industry

Mr. Dromisky	9151
Mr. MacLaren	9151

Tributes

The Speaker	9151
Mr. Milliken	9151
Mr. Duceppe	9151
Mr. Stinson	9151
Mr. Boudria	9152
Ms. McLaughlin	9152
The Speaker	9152

Business of the House

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval)	9152
Mr. Gray	9153

Privilege

Order Paper Questions

Mr. Cummins	9153
Mr. Tobin	9154
Mr. Milliken	9154
The Speaker	9155

Press Gallery

Mr. Lee	9155
The Speaker	9155

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Department of Canadian Heritage Act

Bill C-53. Consideration resumed of motion for third reading	9155
Mr. Hanrahan	9155

Mr. de Savoye	9157
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 123; Nays, 71	9158
(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.)	9159
Mr. Milliken	9159
Motion	9159
(Motion agreed to.)	9159

Message from the Senate

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger)	9159
---------------------------------------	------

THE ROYAL ASSENT

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger)	9159
---------------------------------------	------

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Human Rights

Mr. Paré	9160
Mr. Flis	9161

Draft Bill on Quebec Sovereignty

Mrs. Debien	9161
Mr. English	9162

Social Program Review

Ms. McLaughlin	9162
Mr. English	9163

Gliding School

Mr. Fillion	9163
Mr. English	9164