



# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 224

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Thursday, June 22, 1995**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, June 22, 1995

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY PERMANENT ENGINEERING BOARD

**Mr. George S. Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I am pleased to table, in both official languages, the annual report of the Columbia River Treaty Permanent Engineering Board to the governments of the United States and Canada for the period October 1, 1993 to September 30, 1994, and the 1994 state of Canada's forests annual report.

**Mr. Milliken:** Madam Speaker, there has been a delay in the receipt of the documents this morning. Perhaps we could revert to tabling of documents after the presentation of petitions. I expect the response to petitions to arrive momentarily.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Duncan:** Madam Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to table, in both official languages, the joint report of the ad hoc parliamentary committee on light stations.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Madam Speaker, I have just returned from a conversation with the government whip about another matter and I did not hear what happened with respect to petitions.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** We have not reached that point.

[Translation]

## SAFETY IN TRANSPORTATION

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, this morning I am pleased to table, in both official languages, the government's response to the report by the Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board Act Review Commission.

\* \* \*

## COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

**Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the 15th report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. In this 15th report, dealing with the Atlantic Region Freight Assistance Program, the committee makes a series of recommendations to the National Transportation Agency, the Department of Transport, and the Treasury Board.

(1005)

Appended to this report is the dissenting opinion by the official opposition containing the two following recommendations. I quote: "That the Department of Transport assess the impact on employment of abolition of the Atlantic Region Freight Assistance (ARFA) subsidy. The government should then emphasize job creation programs in the affected regions in a way that reflects the Department's findings".

There is also a second recommendation: "That the government review the amounts allocated under the 1995 Budget as compensation for abolition of freight subsidies, so that the assistance provided represents the same compensation:subsidy ratio for the Atlantic Region Freight Assistance Program".

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

### CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint-Denis, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration, dealing with refugees, immigration and gender. In recent months, the committee has considered the extent to which gender can prevent women from obtaining refugee status in Canada.

*Routine Proceedings**[English]*

Our report encourages ongoing sensitization of those involved in the refugee selection process and considers how to reduce the systemic barriers which deny women an equal opportunity to obtain protection in this country.

*[Translation]*

In closing, I would like to thank all the members of the committee, as well as the staff of the House, for their contribution to this report.

**Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ):** Madam Speaker, the Bloc Quebecois is tabling a minority report dealing with refugee status claims made for gender related reasons, as was proposed by the Bloc Quebecois members of the committee.

*[English]*

Even now we agree with the main orientation of this majority report. We cannot agree on its contents because it is too vague in the wording and too weak.

*[Translation]*

In particular, we cannot agree with the immigration tax. We would also like gender to be included in the legislation as a sixth prohibited ground for discrimination against women.

*[English]*

## AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

**Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food examining the impact of the elimination of the Western Grain Transportation Act, the Atlantic Region Freight Assistance Act, the Maritime Freight Rates Act and the Feed Freight Assistance Act.

The report is entitled "Dismantling the Crow: Curbing the Impacts".

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ):** Madam Speaker, the Bloc Quebecois members of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food have appended a dissenting report to the report that my colleague from Malpèque has just tabled. We wanted to table a dissenting report in order to highlight the inequity that now exists between western and eastern farm producers in Canada.

One thing we pointed out was discrepancies in the abandonment of rail lines. For example, in the west, the public interest is the criterion for closing a line, while in the east, economic cost effectiveness is the criterion. For several reasons of that sort, we had to append a dissenting report.

*[English]*

## CUSTOMS ACT

**Hon. Herb Gray (for the Minister of Finance, Lib.):** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-102, an act to amend the Customs Act and the customs tariff and make related and consequential amendments to other acts.

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

\* \* \*

(1010)

## EXCISE TAX ACT

**Hon. Herb Gray (for the Minister of Finance, Lib.):** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-103, an act to amend the Excise Tax Act and Income Tax Act.

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

\* \* \*

## CRIMINAL CODE

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-104, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act (forensic DNA analysis).

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** When shall the bill be read a second time?

**Some hon. members:** Later this day.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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

\* \* \*

## CANADA BUSINESS CORPORATIONS ACT

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-345, an act to amend the Canada Business Corporations Act (qualification of directors).

He said: Madam Speaker, the purpose of this private member's bill is to amend the Canada Business Corporations Act to limit to 10 the number of concurrent directorships that one person can hold at any time.

The responsibilities of a director are broad and very serious and as such there must be a point at which one cannot fully discharge those responsibilities without jeopardizing the interest of investors, the company or its employees.

Therefore I look forward to debating the bill with my colleagues in the House.

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

\* \* \*

#### BELL CANADA ACT

**Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-346, an act to amend the Bell Canada Act (construction charges).

He said: Madam Speaker, this bill specifically addresses inequities faced by many rural Canadians and stipulates that telephone service will be provided for customers up to 1,000 metres from existing lines and to recover their construction costs to provide that service only if the service is provided beyond 1,000 metres, and that an upward limit be established for that fee.

It also allows that subscribers be entitled to recoup their costs through rebates of additional customers signing up to the service for a period of up to 10 years.

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

\* \* \*

#### COMPETITION ACT

**Mr. Dan McTeague (Ontario, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-347, an act to amend the Competition Act.

He said: Madam Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to afford consumers protection against sudden, unexpected and unexplained increases in the retail price of gasoline by providing a set notice period in advance of any significant increase at the pumps.

The bill would not regulate gas prices or infringe on the ability of oil companies and retail gasoline distributors to conduct business. It would, however, provide consumers with the means to be made aware through the notification provision by the oil companies to the Minister of Industry within 30 days of the an impending increase in the price of gasoline over the 1 per cent current price, when the increase will take effect and the reason or reasons for the increase.

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

\* \* \*

(1015)

#### PETITIONS

##### VICTIMS OF CRIME

**Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West, Lib.)**: Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour and the privilege to present to the House a petition certified correct by the clerk of petitions.

#### Routine Proceedings

My constituents humbly pray and call upon Parliament to do two things: to immediately direct available moneys toward the funding of agencies and services to provide assistance to the increased number of people coming forward whose lives have been affected by sexual abuse or assault; and second, to immediately undertake a thorough review of the court and judicial processing of crimes involving sexual violence.

[Translation]

##### ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval-Centre, BQ)**: Madam Speaker, it is with confidence that I table today a petition signed by some 1,600 voters, mostly of Armenian origin.

The petitioners request that now, eighty years after the genocide of the Armenian people, the Government of Canada, like the legislative assemblies of Quebec and Ontario, officially condemn the atrocities committed against their people early in this century. On their behalf, I therefore ask Parliament to show leadership in defending democratic principles and human rights.

[English]

##### CRIMINAL CODE

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.)**: Madam Speaker, I have three petitions to present today on behalf of the people of Medicine Hat.

The first calls on Parliament to support laws that severely punish all violent criminals who use weapons in the commission of a crime and to support new Criminal Code firearms control provisions that recognize and protect the rights of law-abiding citizens to own and use recreational firearms.

##### DEFINITION OF FAMILY

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.)**: Madam Speaker, the second petition calls on Parliament to oppose legislation that would directly or indirectly redefine family, including the provision of marriage and family benefits to those who are not family as designated in the petition.

##### REFORM PARTY

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.)**: Madam Speaker, the third petition calls upon Parliament to preserve Canadian unity, parliamentary tradition, and to protect the rights of all people of Canada by prevailing upon the Speaker of the House of Commons to recognize the Reform Party of Canada as the official opposition during the remainder of the 35th Parliament.

In this they have my wholehearted concurrence.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu)**: I would ask members to be brief. We have only 15 minutes allocated to petitions. Forming personal opinions is part of debate.

*Routine Proceedings*

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Middlesex, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I wish to table a petition signed by the constituents of Lambton—Middlesex, duly certified by the clerk of petitions pursuant to Standing Order 36.

The petitioners call upon Parliament not to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way that would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality.

## CANADA POST

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I have the pleasure of presenting three petitions.

The first one calls upon Parliament to request the federal minister responsible for Canada Post to consider bringing in legislation requiring all unsolicited mail and flyers to use recyclable materials and amend the Canada postal act so that Canada Post will have to comply with no flyer signs at personal residences.

## DIVORCE ACT

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP):** Madam Speaker, my second petition calls on Parliament to amend the Divorce Act to include a provision similar to article 611 of the Quebec civil code, which states that in no case may a father or mother, without serious cause, place obstacles between the child and grandparent, and failing agreement between the parties the modalities of the relations are settled by the court.

## RAILWAYS

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP):** Madam Speaker, the third petition is very large, collected by the UTU, and calls on Parliament to be fully aware that they are strongly opposed to any initiatives to sell or merge CN or CP Rail or to dismantle CN Rail by way of the disguise of the commercialization of CN Rail.

[*Translation*]

## CANADA EMPLOYMENT CENTRES

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to table a petition signed by over 1,000 persons in the constituency of Gaspé. The member for Gaspé is absent because there has been a death in his family.

(1020)

This petition is a foretaste of a general outcry because it is strongly critical of the government's current reform of Canada Employment Centres, and urgently requests an overall evaluation of the repercussions of that restructuring on the regions, as well as implementation of that restructuring to reflect specific regional characteristics.

[*English*]

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Derek Wells (South Shore, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I rise today to table five petitions signed by people from the counties of Lunenburg, Queens, and Shelburne in my riding of South Shore in Nova Scotia.

Two petitions containing a total of 131 signatures oppose the inclusion of the term sexual orientation in the Canadian Human Rights Act and the extension of the privileges heterosexual couples enjoy to same sex couples.

## ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. Derek Wells (South Shore, Lib.):** I have two petitions containing a total of 92 signatures opposing assisted suicide.

## RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

**Mr. Derek Wells (South Shore, Lib.):** The final petition, Mr. Speaker, contains 35 signatures and supports the protection of human life at the pre-born stage.

## DIVORCE ACT

**Mr. Andy Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have two petitions.

The first calls upon the House to amend the Divorce Act to include provisions similar to article 611 of the Quebec civil code and to amend the Divorce Act to give grandparents who are granted access to a child the right to make inquiries and to be given information as to the health, education, and welfare of the child. This petition is signed by roughly 100 constituents.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Andy Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury, Lib.):** The second petition calls upon Parliament not to amend the human rights code or the Canadian Human Rights Act or the charter of rights and freedoms in any way that would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships, including amending the human rights code to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation. This petition is signed by approximately 100 constituents.

[*Translation*]

## VOICE MAIL

**Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ):** Madam Speaker, allow me, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to table petitions from the constituency of Argenteuil—Papineau, the constituency of the Prime Minister, and the constituency of many citizens of the province. These petitions contain 835 signatures and come from two groups: the Association féminine d'éducation et d'action sociale (AFEAS), and the Association des retraités de l'enseignement du Québec (AREQ). These petitioners are opposed to the introduction of voice mail for senior citizens.

[English]

CUSTOMS

**Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have three petitions.

The first one is signed by a number of residents from the community of Don Mills, Ontario, which is in Toronto. It calls upon Parliament to prohibit the importation, distribution, sale, and manufacture of killer cards and to advise producers of killer cards that their product, if destined for Canada, will be seized and destroyed.

CRTC

**Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.):** The second petition, Madam Speaker, is signed by people in the communities of Trenton, Belleville, and Frankford, Ontario. They call upon Parliament to ensure that the CRTC recognizes that Canadians do not need to be shocked to be entertained and that foul language, excessive violence, and explicit sex are not necessary on television to provide quality entertainment.

CRIMINAL CODE

**Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.):** Finally, Mr. Speaker, from residents of the community of Simcoe, Ontario, I have a petition calling upon Parliament to pass legislation that would remove section 745 from the Canadian Criminal Code.

HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, today I am pleased to present a petition on behalf of residents of the Vancouver area. This petition reflects the deep concern of a great number of Canadians.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to oppose any amendments to the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms that provide for the inclusion of the phrase of sexual orientation.

[Translation]

NATIONAL UNITY

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have here a petition of which I am very proud. The petitioners are young people from three schools in my constituency: École Lavallée, Windsor Park Collegiate, and Nelson McIntyre Collegiate.

These young people recognize that Quebec is a founding partner of Canada, that Quebec is unique in several regards including language, culture, population and size, and that Quebec enriches the lives of all Canadians.

They also recognize that, despite the divergent views we have heard for years, we have always been able to accommodate each

*Routine Proceedings*

other. They recognize that a separation would diminish the quality of life for all Canadians, including young people, and could jeopardize their future. They are therefore asking parliamentarians to work very hard for a united Canada. They do not want adults to make decisions that would be harmful to them.

(1025)

[English]

VIOLENCE IN SOCIETY

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my second petition is with respect to violence.

The petitioners recognize that there has been some gain in this area, but that unnecessary violence and abuse of all forms, be it verbal, physical, or other, in society in general has become a growing concern to all Canadians. They believe that abuse and violence is not necessary to educate, inform, or entertain. These petitioners ask government, by way of the CRTC or other mechanisms, to regulate it on television and in other situations. These petitioners applaud the gains but they want more.

[Translation]

RECOMBINANT BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

**Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec—Est, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to table in this House a petition from a group of over 500 readers of the magazine *Vie et Lumière* indicating their opposition to the introduction of recombinant bovine somatotropin, a hormone.

In addition, I am personally opposed to the introduction of this hormone, which, in my opinion, should never—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I am sorry, but personal comments are part of debate and are not allowed following the tabling of a petition.

[English]

CANADIAN FORCES BASE CALGARY

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I have a petition to present on behalf of the citizens of the city of Calgary.

These citizens are concerned about the proposed closure by the government of CFB Calgary. They point out that for a number of economic and equitable reasons this is not a good decision and call upon Parliament to refrain from closing CFB Calgary.

[Translation]

NORTHERN QUEBEC

**Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to table in the House two petitions containing the signatures of several thousand voters in the constituency of Charlevoix.

*Routine Proceedings*

In the first petition, the petitioners are asking the government to change municipalities in the regional county municipalities of Charlevoix—est and Charlevoix—ouest from area 16 in north central Quebec to area 25 in northern Quebec, for the purposes of unemployment insurance eligibility.

Since most jobs available in area 16 are seasonal, the petitioners are asking to be made part of area 25, which is better adapted to the kinds of jobs they are seeking.

## LA MALBAIE EMPLOYMENT CENTRE

**Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ):** Madam Speaker, in the second petition, the petitioners ask the government not to downsize the staff at the employment centre in La Malbaie, which would have the effect of jeopardizing the services provided.

Like most regional offices, the office in La Malbaie is crucial to the population of what some people wrongly describe as—  
[English]

## ALCOHOL

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

The first petition concerns the use of an illegal defence that has become known as the drunk defence. The petitioners believe that in committing the act of choosing to consume alcohol the individual must also accept all the responsibility for their actions while under the influence.

## CRIMINAL CODE

**Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, the second petition involves section 718.2 of Bill C-41.

The petitioners are concerned that naming some groups in legislation will exclude other groups from protection and that sentencing based on the concept of hatred is very subjective and will undermine our justice system.

## CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

**Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, the final group of petitioners are requesting that the Government of Canada not amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to include the phrase sexual orientation.

The petitioners are troubled about defining the phrase sexual orientation. They have a legitimate concern—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I am sorry, I have to ask members to be brief.

[Translation]

## EUTHANASIA AND ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour and the privilege to table petitions signed by 97 persons opposed to euthanasia and assisted suicide.

[English]

## ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, my first petition asks that this Parliament ensure that the present provision of the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide be vigorously enforced and that Parliament make no changes in the current law.

## RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

**Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, the second petition asks that Parliament act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to give this protection.

## SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, the third petition asks that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act, or the charter of rights and freedoms in any way that would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships.

## WITNESS RELOCATION AND PROTECTION PROGRAM

**Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, the last petition asks that Parliament enact Bill C-206 at the earliest opportunity so as to provide statutory foundation for a national witness relocation and protection program.

## CURRAGH RESOURCES

**Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I have several petitions here.

The first petition is from residents of Faro, Yukon, who did not receive vacation pay, severance pay, or pay in lieu of notice when the firm Curragh Resources was declared bankrupt.

(1030)

Therefore, the petitioners request that the Minister of Human Resources Development investigate the situation and take the necessary steps to ensure that this worker and other workers who are laid off do not have severance packages, including earnings in the final calculation of UI benefits.

## FORESTRY

**Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP):** Madam Speaker, the second petition is from a number of residents of the Yukon who are concerned that the harvest levels of Yukon forests are not economically or environmentally sustainable. They petition Parliament to mandate an immediate return to traditional timber harvest levels in the Yukon.

## BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

**Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP):** Madam Speaker, the third petition regards BST. The petitioners from different communities in the Yukon suggest that Parliament desist from passing legislation legalizing the use of BST or rbGH in Canada.

## CRIMINAL CODE

**Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP):** Madam Speaker, the final petition which I wish to present urges the government to table amendments to the Criminal Code to prevent the use of extreme intoxication as a defence in cases of assault.

## INCOME TAX ACT

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I would like to present a petition from the Calgary, Alberta area.

The petitioners pray and call on Parliament to pursue initiatives to eliminate tax discrimination against families who decide to provide care in the home for pre-school children, the disabled, the chronically ill and the aged.

## FORMER YUGOSLAVIA

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by numerous residents of Kingston and the Islands who call on Parliament to refrain from taking any action involving recognition of the former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia until such time as its government renounces the use of the name Macedonia, removes objectionable language from its constitution, abandons the use of symbols implying territorial expansionism, ceases hostile propaganda against priests and adheres fully to the norms and principles of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe.

\* \* \*

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, Questions Nos. 175 and 190 will be answered today.  
[Text]

Question No. 175—**Mr. Grubel:**

Concerning the announcement in the last budget of a decrease in the number of civil servants by 45,000, what number of these positions are expected to be eliminated by (a) not refilling positions which are now vacant, (b) the commercialization of government activities like airports, (c) early retirement and (d) voluntary quits (attrition)?

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister Responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.):** The February budget announced a reduction in the size of the public service and the federal sector as a whole, including the military, separate agencies and crown corporations, as a result of program review. An estimated 45,000 positions will be affected over three years.

The figure 45,000 is not on its own a target but is the result of the government's program review decisions, whereby a number of programs and activities are being reduced, eliminated or

## Routine Proceedings

re-engineered. It is an estimate based on the overall savings targets established in the budget and the structure of program costs.

During the government's program review some estimates were derived of how the downsizing is expected to unfold, broadly speaking.

For example, about 6,000 jobs will be transferred to the private sector. There will also be some natural attribution through voluntary departures and transfers.

Two separation programs have been put in place to assist organizations to cope with their personnel downsizing: early retirement incentive, ERI, and early departure incentive, EDI. Projected take-up for each program is included in the tentative allocation of projected reductions in personnel set out in the following table.

EDI take-up	13,000
ERI take-up	4,000
Block transfers	6,000
Natural attrition	10,000
Agencies & crown corporations	5,000
Military	7,000
Total	45,000

Question No. 190—**Mr. White (North Vancouver):**

With respect to the unemployment insurance program for the calendar years of 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993 and 1994, (a) how many cases of fraud were reported each year, (b) how many convictions for fraud were secured each year, and (c) how many frauds were there as a total of overall claims?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Human Resources Development Canada, HRDC, has the option of penalizing unemployment insurance, UI, fraud by imposing an administrative penalty under section 33 of the UI act or by prosecuting under UI act or the Criminal Code of Canada. The vast majority of UI fraud cases are administratively penalized. Prosecutions are initiated only in the more serious or flagrant cases of fraud and in those cases that would have a special deterrent effect.

With respect to UI fraud the control branch of HRDC has provided the following statistics in response to the questions posed.

Cases of fraud each year:

1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
143,070	126,117	154,149	152,563	113,090

Totals include fraud penalized by administrative penalty and by prosecution.

Convictions for fraud in courts of law each year:



*Government Orders*

2,035	1,254	640	865	525
Fraud as percentage of overall claims:				
1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
3.9%	3.2%	4.0%	4.2%	3.9%

\* \* \*

[English]

**QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN**

**Mr. Milliken:** Madam Speaker, I would also ask that Questions Nos. 109, 167 and 201 be made Orders for Return.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Is it the pleasure of the House that Questions Nos. 109, 167 and 201 be deemed to have been made Orders for Return?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Text]

**Question No. 109—Mr. Mayfield:**

From January 1, 1993 to September 1, 1994, how many people from British Columbia have been appointed to federal government boards, agencies, commissions or Crown corporations and what is the name and city/town of residence of each appointee, the name of the board, agency, commission or Crown corporation to which they were appointed as well as the duration of the appointment?

Return tabled.

**Question No. 167—Mr. Epp:**

With respect to public opinion contracts awarded by the government in the periods between (1) April 1 and December 1, 1994, and (2) December 1, 1994 and the present, (a) what was their total cost, (b) what is the name of each department requesting the poll, (c) the name of the polling company, (d) the value of each contract, and (e) were any of the contracts awarded by public tender offering and if not, why not?

Return tabled.

**Question No. 201—Ms. Beaumier:**

With respect to the new procedure for determining eligibility requirements for the receipt of the disability tax credit now being employed by Revenue Canada officials, (a) why are individuals who received the disability tax credit from 1991 to 1993, and who no longer qualify, required to repay the government of Canada the amount received in those years in full and (b) why weren't individuals told that they may have to repay the disability tax credit when it was initially granted to them?

Return tabled.

[English]

**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.

**Mr. Milliken:** Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might revert to the Tabling of Documents, as agreed earlier in the Routine Proceedings.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Translation]

## GOVERNMENT RESPONSES 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 responses to 13 petitions.

\* \* \*

[English]

**WAYS AND MEANS MOTIONS**

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, in the interest of clearing up matters on the Order Paper, I think you would find unanimous consent to allow for the withdrawal from the Order Paper of Ways and Means Motions Nos. 9, 10, 19, 22, 24 and 26. These have all been superseded by events and they are no longer required on the Order Paper. I have consulted with members opposite and I think you would find consent to allow those to be withdrawn from the Order Paper.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motions Nos. 9, 10, 19, 22, 24 and 26 withdrawn.)

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[Translation]

**MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT RETIRING ALLOWANCES ACT**

**Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (for the President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.):** moved that Bill C-85, an act to amend the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act, be read the third time and passed.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to address the House at third reading of Bill C-85, an act to amend the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act.

(1035)

The issue of MPs' pensions is, of course, of interest to all members of this House and to Canadians in general.

This is an issue that demands leadership. However, in showing leadership, the government and members must carefully consider all aspects of MPs' and senators' remuneration.

The issue itself is complex and contentious, a fact that makes it hard to address in a partial or even a general manner. That said, during its election campaign our government made certain promises it intended to keep once it came to power. The red book emphasized two aspects in particular of the MPs' pension scheme that were to be the subject of reform.

I shall take the liberty of quoting directly an excerpt from page 92 of the red book: "The pension regime of members of Parliament has been the focus of considerable controversy. —We believe that reform is necessary".

Our government has now taken action. The changes we planned to the MPs' pension scheme will be made when Bill C-85 is passed. The red book stated, and I quote: "A Liberal government will reform the pension plan of members of Parliament to end "double-dipping". MPs should not be able to leave office and receive a pension from the federal government if they accept a new full-paying job from the federal government. In addition, we will review the question of the minimum age at which pensions will begin to be paid". The Liberal government had made a commitment to keeping those promises.

*[English]*

However, the government has gone further. It will put into place a number of additional changes that will enhance the needed reform of MP pensions, changes that will provide for former members who have become disabled, equitable support for common law spouses, the option for members of this Parliament to determine their continued participation in this plan, which is a direct result of the request put to the Prime Minister on January 21, 1994 by the Reform House leader on behalf of his party.

Furthermore, a direct savings of millions of dollars due to a 20 per cent reduction in benefits to all MPs will be realized.

*[Translation]*

Let me be clear. This government consulted; this government listened; this government acted. Here are the facts: double-dipping eliminated; minimum age set at 55 years; optional participation offered to MPs in this Parliament; and \$3.3 million saved

for the government—in other words, 33 per cent lower costs to Canadian taxpayers.

On February 22, 1995, immediately before the Minister of Finance tabled the Budget that would strike a mighty blow to the deficit, the President of the Treasury Board announced that our government intended to reform the MP's pension scheme. He also tabled Bill C-85 on April 28, 1995, and spoke when that bill was tabled for second reading on May 4, 1995. The President of the Treasury Board also testified before the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs on May 30, 1995. As well, I was given the opportunity of speaking to you when this bill was tabled for third reading.

This debate, which has continued for eight months, has also included a full day of consideration by the House of a motion made on this matter on Opposition Day and, of course, the appearance of expert witnesses before the Standing Committee. Over 20 hours of debate—and I must say it was often tough debate—have been devoted to this bill thus far.

(1040)

The official opposition has presented some interesting and quite often constructive ideas on this issue, which is a thorny and difficult one.

*[English]*

The third party is engaged in often rancorous debate and highlighted a number of issues that are of importance, particularly the issue of salaries. Because we are in an area of fiscal restraint it is vital to note that Bill C-85 only deals with pensions. We will not and cannot act to raise the salaries and other benefits of members of Parliament at this time.

We will respect the legislated salary freeze on employees and continue to demonstrate leadership in putting Canada's fiscal house in order.

Members of the standing committee heard testimony from expert witnesses, including a taxpayers' group, that had the same theme. The issue surrounding the greater issue of compensation must be addressed, pensions must be reduced and salaries increased.

This was also the viewpoint expressed by the pension experts from the private pension consulting firm, Sobeco, Ernst & Young. It was the same as that of Professor C.E.S. Franks of Queen's University, a member of the Lapointe commission. It was the testimony of a former member of Parliament and actuary, Paul McCrossan. It was supported by Robert Fleming, a former administrator of the Ontario legislature. It was even put forward by the very group that puts hundreds of little plastic animals on the lawn of the House.

This total compensation approach is supported by the government in principle. However, as I mentioned at the outset, in practice we must carefully consider all elements of compensation. Salaries cannot and will not be increased.

*Government Orders*

At the risk of repeating myself, I will again state that the government has demonstrated leadership by reducing pensions for MPs, by going beyond what it had promised. This will have the net effect of reducing total compensation. Unfortunately this is the reality Parliament must face in today's economic climate.

[Translation]

I would now like to focus on the major elements of Bill C-85, and perhaps to correct some of the errors of interpretation that have crept in. I certainly would not want the honourable members on the other side of the chamber to voice their views about the bill without having accurate information.

Bill C-85 restricts double dipping. It will apply to any future appointment, to any renewal of an appointment, and to any contract signed after the date on which the bill obtains royal assent.

Former senators will be subject to this restriction in the same way as former members of this House. The clause on double dipping in Bill C-85 provides that any former member who is receiving a pension will be required to notify the appropriate minister when he starts to hold federal employment or enters into a federal service contract.

The notification will have to be made within 60 days after the date of the appointment or the signing of the contract, and the member will have to report how much he is earning or expecting to earn. Every year he will have to report all sums of money received from the federal government as long as he holds the employment or continues to execute the contract.

[English]

Any member whose earnings exceed or are expected to exceed \$5,000 annually would have their pensions abated dollar for dollar by the amount of their remuneration. For example, if a member receives \$30,000 in pension and earns \$45,000 in a federal position, his or her pension will be totally suspended. If the member earns \$25,000 he or she would receive \$5,000 of their pension. That is because they earned a \$30,000 salary.

I am taking the time to illustrate these examples because it is important to note that only federal parliamentary pensions and federal salaries comprise the double dipping provision.

(1045)

The second component of Bill C-85 I would like to address is the red book commitment of the minimum age. Age 55 will be the minimum age at which former MPs and senators can collect a pension. This government agrees with the age 55 recommendation put forward by the Lapointe commission in the report entitled: "Democratic Ideals and Financial Realities".

[Translation]

Madam Speaker, the third point I would like to raise is that of optional participation.

[English]

As I mentioned earlier, within days of entering Parliament, the Reform Party House leader stood before this House and asked the Prime Minister if the government intended to continue to force MPs to participate in the MP pension plan. The Prime Minister's response was to the point: If members do not want to contribute to the pension plan, then administrative arrangements would be made to ensure they would not be part of the plan. Bill C-85 explicitly responds to the Prime Minister's promise to the Reform Party. Members will be provided with the option to choose whether or not they wish to continue to participate in this pension plan.

[Translation]

Madam Speaker, there are people shouting over there because they do not like to hear the truth. They prefer exaggeration so that they can make a little political hay. That is what they do when they have problems with the electorate.

[English]

I am confident members of the Reform Party will recognize this change adequately reflects what their party has sought. However, I would urge all members including those of the government and the official opposition to carefully consider their personal and family retirement needs prior to making this decision. Political motivation and party discipline should not play a part in this important choice.

This government has a clear view that retirement savings should be supported as they are through the income tax system in providing benefits through RRSPs or registered pension plans by employers providing for the legitimate retirement needs of their employees. The Government of Canada provides pensions for its public servants, the military, the RCMP and we should certainly provide pensions for our parliamentarians.

I would like to put forward some figures which were first presented to the standing committee. I understand they were useful to the committee members for the analysis of this proposed legislation. According to the Statistics Canada 1992 publication "Pension Plans in Canada" only 9 per cent of people who are in employment related pension plans are in plans that match contributions or are similar to RRSP type plans. The remaining 91 per cent are in defined benefit plans which provide a set formula to determine benefits. This type of plan provides better certainty and security for employees and planning for retirement because their ultimate benefits can be anticipated without being subject to the prevailing interest rates at the time the annuity becomes payable.

*Government Orders*

My colleagues in the opposition are taking great risks. If they continue to make noise, my voice can be much louder than theirs.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, the Statistics Canada publication I just mentioned reveals that in general, in the context of these defined benefit plans, private sector employers contribute about 60 per cent of the costs while in the public sector the employer's proportion is 60 per cent.

Naturally enough, in the case of special plans, the share of the costs assumed by the employer is considerably higher. For instance, in the case of the Canadian Forces the employer's contribution is \$2.70 for every dollar contributed by an employee.

I have taken the time to state these facts because I think it is important that we have enough knowledge about private or employer-sponsored pension plans in Canada generally, if we want to evaluate this particular pension plan logically and rationally.

The final element I want to discuss is the question of pension accrual or pension benefit rate. Bill C-85 reduces the benefit rate for members' pensions from 5 per cent to 4 per cent of their annual salary per year of service. This is equivalent to a 20 per cent reduction.

(1050)

Combined with the introduction of a minimum age, this reduction will make it possible to reduce by 33 per cent the amount the taxpayer contributes to the members' pension plan. This is a significant saving, in line with our government's deficit reduction strategy.

Clearly the government has gone even further than it promised it would in reforming members' retiring allowances. We have markedly reduced the costs that the Canadian taxpayer has to pay.

[*English*]

In addition to outlining the important elements of Bill C-85 I would like to address one concern that I have in effectively communicating the impact of pensions. Private interest groups and members of this House have put forward what I would call, and I want to underline it, misleading information of potential payments to MPs. It is not just government MPs that have been mentioned. The exorbitant amounts reportedly to be paid to young cabinet ministers and long serving MPs are based on misleading and incorrect assumptions.

For example, the 5 per cent inflation assumption is certainly out of whack with what the Department of Finance calculates, which is a standard of 1.5 per cent. Even Reform will understand that there is a difference between 1.5 per cent and 5 per cent.

Additionally to state that a pension figure is based on an MP retiring today and collecting a pension immediately until age 75 fails to recognize the effects of Bill C-85. They fail to recognize it because it is convenient to them. Particular attention should be paid to clause 11 of the bill which will introduce the minimum age of 55. The assumptions also ignore the ministers and MPs are not retiring today. In fact they are making active contributions to the Canadian political landscape and will continue to do so for many years.

It might be useful by way of example to demonstrate the nefarious effects of such outrageous and incorrect assumptions. The price of a \$2 loaf of bread considered in future dollars would cost according to these assumptions which include compounding and high inflation \$3.20 in 10 years and after 20 years about \$5.30. That is the kind of gimmickry we are engaged in. Simply put, these comparisons do not accurately reflect what a former member may receive in pension. They are extremely inaccurate and misleading.

In conclusion, Bill C-85 is an accurate response to the concerns expressed by Canadian taxpayers. They have asked for reduced contribution on the part of government. Bill C-85 delivers a 33 per cent cut in that contribution. Electors have asked that we fulfil our stated commitments in the red book. Bill C-85 does that and goes further.

[*Translation*]

Our public servants, the members of the Canadian forces and other employees affected by the wage freeze are expecting us to respect the same rules as they do.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Before we continue on the debate, I know the subject is emotional for a lot of you. Our constituents, right across this country, are listening. I think they would like to hear what people have to say. Could I ask that we give them that much respect.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to address the House at third reading of Bill C-85 on reform of members' retiring allowances. I rise as the official opposition critic on parliamentary reform.

I would like to say right off that the objective that we in the Bloc Quebecois and the official opposition wished to achieve in the reform was twofold. First, because we shared the concern of all taxpayers in Quebec and Canada, we knew very well that a pension plan that allowed members to collect both pensions and federal civil service salaries could not continue. We also knew that the absence of a specific age limit for qualifying for a pension was unacceptable, because taxpayers were seeing people after just six years of parliamentary service getting an immediate pension at the age of 30 or 35 or 40. It was unacceptable. It was unfair.

*Government Orders*

(1055)

So those aspects were our two targets, shared by the taxpayer, and I think that Bill C-85 is confirmation that both have been met.

However, I would like to recall that we tabled an amendment to this bill that was designed to prevent former members who were currently double dipping from continuing to do so. The government preferred not to incorporate our amendment. Instead, the restriction on double dipping will come into effect only when the bill becomes law, thus leaving plenty of government employees drawing both their pension and their salary. I am thinking, among others, of the ambassador to Paris, Benoît Bouchard, who gets both a pension and a salary.

I think it would have been very useful if the government had agreed to make the system fair for everyone immediately.

I would also like to add, in the course of these remarks, that in the end the total value of members' pensions strikes me as a small matter in comparison with a more useful way of recovering money and reducing government expenditure: the abolition of the Senate, the other House. If the \$45 million and more that goes on salaries and services for the Senate could have been tackled, we could have saved an enormous amount of money.

One of the distinctive things about the western world is its democratic systems of government. Universal suffrage is indisputably the element in a revolution that at the start of this century allowed a number of western societies to achieve, rapidly, unprecedented economic development and to experience the emergence of the mass consumer society we know today.

However, western democratic society has not eliminated all inequalities, nor does it really hold the promise of a better world where all men and women would be equal, a society where poverty and misery would no longer occur. Social classes continue to exist, with their different levels of wealth, their injustices. We live in the very heart of economic liberalism. If democracy is a synonym for political freedom, it is also the home of economic freedom.

There are members of Parliament in our society, certainly, but there are also professionals, welfare recipients, people without jobs, CEOs of big and small companies, civil servants, tramps. We do not all have the same lot in life. We live in a society with social classes. And it is an illusion to think that everyone is treated equitably.

The debate on members' pensions, in my opinion, serves as a way of avoiding a much more fundamental debate that needs to be held on poverty and power. We have to expose the illusory democracy that screens us from the human misery in our societies. We have to attack the system's real profiteers. There are profiteers in the Canadian parliamentary system, and to focus exclusively on members' pensions, without calling among

other things for abolition of the Senate, is serious political irrelevance and evidence of boundless bad faith.

The cost of the parliamentary pension plan is insignificant compared to what has to be paid out of the public purse to maintain Senate appointments and the institution itself.

One of the Reform Party's main election promises was to make cuts in what the party calls the "three Ps": members' pay, pensions and privileges. The Reform Party calculates that a significant reduction in members' pensions would result in savings on the order of \$1.5 million over five years.

According to Jean Dion, columnist for *Le Devoir*, "the savings that could be made by slashing members' benefits are hard to calculate".

(1100)

Following the last election, the pensions to be paid to defeated members were estimated at \$109 million over 20 years, or a quarter of 1 per cent of the deficit for 1992-93 alone. Now, the total budget for senators is \$42.6 million a year. Over 20 years, if you consider the costs of upkeep for the premises the Senate occupies, the cost to the taxpayer is, by comparison, more than \$1 billion.

That is what I would call shameless exploitation of a country's citizens, who pay out of their taxes the salaries and pensions of people they never elected. A senator is a member of a political species that lives off the poor in our society. The Senate is nothing but a pretext for whatever government is currently in power to reward its cronies, be they Tory or Grit.

The Senate is an institution with no democratic legitimacy. Its members are appointed by the Governor General, who by convention acts on the initiative and advice of the Prime Minister, who submits a list of names to him. Because senators are not elected, the official opposition, the Bloc Québécois, considers the Upper House a political anachronism and convincing proof of the obsolescence of the Canadian federal system.

We in the Bloc Québécois have grasped that one of the great weaknesses of the Canadian parliamentary system is not the members' pension plan but rather the very existence of a Senate. The existence of the Canadian Senate is a vestige of the traditional elitist form of representation that is supposed in some way to balance the democratic legitimacy of the elected members of the House of Commons.

From 1925 to 1963, the average age of a senator was 69. In 1975 it was 64. A Senate seat, as the whole world knows, is a prize for someone at the end of his career. He will not need to fight to keep his seat, because the salary is guaranteed until he reaches 75. That is what I call a golden retirement. That is what I call the real problem. That is the real scandal of the Canadian parliamentary system and the democratic system in which it has developed.

*Government Orders*

I think that the government in power, the Liberals, and the Reform Party too, should have gone after the really pointless expenditures. Lacking the courage to attack the Senate, which represents a pointless expenditure, they referred instead to cut members' pensions. We recognize that they accomplished what they set out to do, and that it is an improvement, but as I have shown, the money they hope to recover is just a little more than a million dollars over twenty years.

If we got rid of the Senate, we could save over \$42 million a year. The goal of reviewing sessional allowances or members' pensions can never, in any way, be a means of putting the country's finances on a sounder footing, or fighting the deficit, or achieving the great collective ideals of equality and wealth in our sacrosanct democracy. This debate is just something to placate the people, and bills making changes to members' retiring allowances—remember Bill C-270, brought in by the NDP, Bill C-236, brought in by the Liberals, Bill C-208, brought in by the Conservatives—are just ways for this House to assuage its conscience.

On July 20, 1994, the Commission to Review Allowances of Members of Parliament tabled its report. It made the following points: the number of former members receiving a pension is not what is commonly believed. To go by the press, every parliamentarian who ceases to sit gets a retiring allowance. But in fact only half of the members who retired over the past decade received an allowance. Since 1984, only 42 per cent of retirees have received an allowance.

The report goes on to state that the public sometimes has the impression that parliamentarians who retire do so with an excessively large pension.

(1105)

In fact, most pensions paid to parliamentarians in the past decade were between \$10,000 and \$40,000. Actually, 57.2 per cent of them are below \$30,000 and 90.4 per cent are below \$50,000.

“One might also think, the report goes on to say, that a disproportionate percentage of retirement benefits are paid to persons below the age of 55. But this is absolutely not the case since only 13 per cent of retired MPs receiving benefits are below 55”.

According to the report, the Canadian parliamentary pension plan is quite comparable to those in other western democracies. Admittedly, this plan is one of the least demanding with regard to the minimum age at which benefits can be collected, but one of the strictest with regard to the contribution rate of the

beneficiary; and it falls within the average with regard to the maximum authorized benefit.

As can be gathered from the report of the Commission to Review Allowances of Members, there is no reason to hold a real debate on the matter and it is no secret that the parliamentary discussions about MP pensions are merely a way of avoiding the real debate on the fundamental questions which are increasingly undermining the credibility of western democracies.

The Reform Party lays it on a bit thick. The great number of amendments which they tabled at the beginning of June look more like an insurance policy negotiated downward than an effort to prepare a serious piece of legislation.

I repeat, Bill C-85 on the reform of MP pensions in its present version responds entirely to the two main concerns of taxpayers in Quebec and in Canada with regard to equity.

First, the age at which a former MP can collect his pension is now set at 55. Secondly, a former MP can no longer receive both a pension and a salary paid by a government agency. The bill is unequivocal in that regard.

With this bill we have therefore attained the basic objectives which we have in common with taxpayers, but we would have liked the government to accept our amendment and apply it immediately to those in government and in the public service who currently benefit from double dipping.

I remind this House that we would also have preferred to deal effectively with the expenses of useless institutions like the Senate, which costs us tens of millions of dollars per year. All this for an institution which serves no useful purpose. It is simply a place—and the real place—for a golden retirement. A place to which men and women who have rendered or could render services to the government are appointed with a salary which is guaranteed until age 75. That is what I call an unacceptable golden retirement and that is where we have to get the money that is needed.

In closing, I remind this House that in this matter the official opposition is concerned about equity. We fundamentally believe that our amendments contained all that is needed to achieve this equity, namely two basic elements: the setting of the minimum age at 55 years and the elimination of double dipping.

**Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary—Ouest, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to Bill C-85, an act to amend the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act. I would first like to say a word about the position of the Bloc Québécois. The Bloc Québécois has explained well the problems with the Senate and with ambassadors' pensions, for example.

*Government Orders*

(1110)

But the fact remains that the Bloc supported the government in this matter in order to keep their pensions from the Parliament of Canada just before the referendum on independence. I remind this House that the members of the Bloc have the option of not participating in this plan. They must explain their participation to their constituents.

*[English]*

I have given a lot of thought to what I might say today. There has been a lot of emotion in the debate and I must admit that I share in a lot of the emotion. Because I like to avoid a lot of emotionalism, I probably will avoid some of it in my speech today. This is not because I think I should but because, perhaps in my state of mind at the moment, I would be better to stick to some of the facts and to try to make some arguments that hopefully a few on the other side will listen to at the last minute.

I will not get into the statistics about the generosity of the plan. Those are well known now by the public. We have a very rare occasion here. In supporting a government bill we have a coincidence of a lack of intelligence and a lack of integrity at a single time which I would not say is unprecedented but should give members cause for reflection.

Let me review some of the headlines in the newspapers of the last couple of weeks on this topic. According to the *Montreal Gazette*: "Voters won't forgive MPs for keeping lavish pensions". From the *Ottawa Citizen*: "Pension issue certain to haunt Liberals". My personal favourite in my favourite newspaper, the *Calgary Herald*: "MPs pensions still too rich".

All of us in the House have been around long enough. Even those who have not been around very long have been around long enough to know that not everything we read in the newspaper is true. However I believe in this case there is a certain correlation between the reality and the reporting.

Let us take a little time to go back to the testimony we heard before the procedure and House affairs committee studying the bill and to some of the comments of my friends across the way. It is important to do this so that after the next election, when we look back at the day this bill was passed, we will see just how prophetic many of the commentators and experts were when discussing the bill.

I had done some teaching before I came to the House and this is an opportunity to do a little teaching here about what will happen if self-interest overcomes principle.

One witness before the committee, Mr. Robert Fleming, had written extensively about the compensation of elected officials as well as the broader issues that universally face legislatures across the world. I will read Mr. Fleming's closing remarks to the committee. Perhaps the House will pay closer attention to these than committee members did. I do not repeat Mr. Fleming's remarks because I agree with all he said. In fact he is more sympathetic to the bill than I am. Nevertheless Mr. Fleming said:

All I'm saying is that I don't think you're listening to some of these issues—Regardless of what the President of the Treasury Board or anyone else says, they are flying in the face of public opinion if they don't put this into the hands of the broader community to debate and examine.

I'm not talking about the traditional form of commission conducted, as we are, in this forum, but I'm talking about a way for sensible people, who are fair and include knowledgeable parliamentarians and actuaries getting together to look at the whole picture and saying this is what should be done. Again, I believe if you permitted this at this point pretty darn soon, before it gets out of hand, that without credible results you probably would come out smelling like roses and with much better results.

If this doesn't happen, I feel, and I've talked to very reasonable and sensible Canadians about this, who I think have their heads screwed on and not the sort of people who are going to jump to conclusions. But they definitely feel that you are quoting your own counsel, pushing your own show ahead. And it's going to be to the detriment of the Liberal Party of Canada, the Government of Canada, and it's definitely going to be to the detriment of the people of Canada. I think this has to be taken into account.

Again, as somewhat of a political scientist, the Liberal Party of Canada has had a marvellous go at it since October 1993. But I think the thing risks becoming unravelled if this kind of situation is not dealt with in a totally and utterly open manner. This applies to everything concerning the administration of the House of Commons.

(1115)

Broadly speaking there was consensus among all of the witnesses the committee heard that Bill C-85 is a bad idea for all sorts of reasons and certainly politically a very bad idea.

This witness also pointed out: "The fact that 81 qualifying members are Liberals and only 14 belong to other parties suggests that the government should tread warily and wisely in advancing legislation. This is an area which has become a political minefield". The government has made very little attempt to get cross party consensus on this.

Former Conservative MP and actuary Paul McCrossan had something to say on this also. According to him Bill C-85 is bad for members, bad for Parliament as an institution and bad for Canada. Mr. McCrossan went on to explain how Bill C-85 will hamstring Parliament, how it will destroy any legitimacy the government has or might have had in redesigning Canada's national retirement income and medical care system, just when these changes are most needed in the face of Canada's flourishing debt and aging population. We know about the government's plans in those areas.

*Government Orders*

Mr. McCrossan talked about the need for Parliament to act with integrity and to redesign our national social plans rather than let a future crisis arise and dictate their reform. He talked about the effect that passing the bill would have on generating immense public outrage for protecting privileged positions just when reductions in national benefits are being proposed for other Canadians.

This witness talked about the public's feeling toward politicians. We have all heard this: "They are all crooks". He told the committee the underlying cause of this attitude, and I agree with him, was politicians have consistently established one set of rules for themselves and one for the general public.

Referring to the potential passing of this bill without amendments he said: "Once again, in that case you deserve the public's contempt". I agree with that.

Mr. McCrossan recently published an article in *Benefits Canada*. In it he describes the Conservatives' attempt to reduce the generosity of the plan. The Conservatives promised this in 1984 and never delivered on it. I will read the excerpt once again:

Wilson asked me to help him present his proposals for changing MPs' pensions to the last PC caucus meeting before the 1988 election. He wanted a mandate to proceed before the election was called so that the new Parliament could start with a new plan. A riot broke out. For about 20 minutes Wilson tried to explain either the problem or its solution. He was not allowed to speak. Member after member shouted him down. Whenever calm was restored and Wilson tried to speak, bedlam erupted. Finally he gave up.

Can we not see it happening all over again, this time in the Liberal caucus? We all know about the press reports.

I understand the minister also tried to bring about some significant reforms which were ultimately thrown out of caucus and of cabinet. Who will pay the price for this? The price will ultimately be paid by first term backbench MPs sitting across the way who really do not support this plan, probably really do not understand it, but who will go along with the whole Liberal government group think thing. I hope they will at least consider opting out. I will address that again later.

The voters may forgive them if they opt out, but that is the only way they will be around long enough to qualify for this plan. What it is interesting is they will end up supporting this plan, it will be their votes which pass it, it will protect and enlarge the pensions of the most senior members of the government and they will end up out of their seats with no pension whatsoever.

During the report stage debate on the bill the chief government whip asserted there was nothing wrong with this plan, that outflows matched inflows and had for years. This is an example of some of the misquoting of statistics that has gone on around here.

What the chief government whip did not mention was the size of those inflows, or the source, is exclusively tax dollars and the vast majority does not come from the members' of Parliament pay cheques.

(1120)

Second, the vast majority of the outflows has yet to come and the inflows are to cover the future liability streams created by this pension plan.

Let me quote again from Mr. McCrossan's article as he refers to Don Mazankowski's half hearted attempts at reform: "Even well informed MPs like Don Boudria, the chief government whip, continued to assert in debate that the government's chief actuary had said the MPs pension plan was actuarially sound". That has been repeated in this debate. "In his latest report published prior to the 1991 House of Commons debate the chief actuary pointed out the plan had only \$27.9 million in assets to cover about \$182.7 million in liabilities. Also, the normal cost of the plan was rising". To cover the actuarial liability we now have these huge inflows each year.

During the one day of witness testimony—the committee never did study the bill—at the procedure and House affairs committee, the government whip made some other enlightening comments. He talked about his situation and how well off he would be if instead of having the MP pension plan he had participated in an RRSP plan with contributions matched dollar for dollar by his employer, ostensibly the House of Commons.

He said that under the MP pension plan he would enjoy a benefit if he retired today of somewhat less than \$30,000 year. According to our calculations it would be closer to \$36,000 a year, but \$30,000 under the new proposal. Remember this does not apply retroactively and so he would be getting \$36,000 a year.

My office did the calculation. The government whip said he had calculations but never tabled them. I have done the calculations according to the assumptions outlined by the government whip. I see some truthful aspects but his answers still required scrutiny.

He said he would be eligible for a pension of about \$27,000 a year already under a matching RRSP arrangement. He forgot to mention that under an RRSP plan like other Canadians are eligible for, contributions of the size he is talking about fully matched by an employer would be illegal. Our 11 per cent plus an 11 per cent match make 22 per cent, which is well above the legal limit. No other Canadian would be allowed to shelter that much of their income from tax and have it grow without paying taxes on the income it generates. An investment of this type would not have the expensive advantage of full indexation offered under Bill C-85.

As the member for Mississauga West pointed out several times during the committee's hearing, the government may decrease the contribution for limits on RRSPs in any case. Where would that leave MPs? It did not seem to bother her that



*Government Orders*

this would affect millions of other Canadians negatively. This is an important point.

Applying the Income Tax Act in the same way it applies to other Canadians lowers the government whip's expected pension benefit from \$27,000 to only about \$22,000, which is not a bad pension considering he has only been on the job here since 1984.

Compared with a fully indexed pension of \$35,000 to \$36,000 which he would collect if he resigned tomorrow, this may not look quite so inviting. Fully indexed as provided for under this plan at the current inflation rate, this \$35,000 would grow and would be worth approximately \$82,000 in tomorrow's dollars by the time he was 75.

An annuity purchased with an RRSP would still be worth only \$22,000. In other words, in 30 years or so he would find his pension is worth only \$5,000 or \$6,000 in today's dollars. This is a very different case and we start to see why this plan is so costly to taxpayers.

Let us be serious. Will the member and the government really try to tell ordinary Canadians they could have a \$60,000 salary for 10 years and retire for the rest of their lives with a pension that would support their every need and more? Seriously, Canadians do not live in that kind of world. We should not invent those kinds of numbers.

According to one witness, Mr. Brian Corbishley, to provide the benefits promised under this bill would take an investment of about \$34,000 for each year of service; this is for the ordinary, backbench member of Parliament, not someone with an additional salary they can contribute like the government whip. Basically Mr. Corbishley is saying it would take a matching contribution of 26 per cent of a member's salary to fulfil the government whip's assertions.

(1125)

Several government members have indicated they believe the 9 per cent contribution level in the bill is too high. Obviously it is not nearly high enough to provide the benefits the bill provides.

The government did, I believe inadvertently, make an important point. A plan with matching contributions, properly invested over a long period of time, even one that was legal under the Income Tax Act, would help to provide a reasonable retirement income and would save the taxpayers a bundle.

The cost for a one to one plan like we proposed, about 9 per cent MP salary matching, would cost about \$1 million. That is about \$6 million less than the government's contribution costs,

to which it must add \$23 million in interest charges it has to fork out for the present plan. That is a saving of about \$29 million a year and clearly there is no comparison whatsoever in the cost.

I hope my speech has cleared up what is maybe some honest misconception regarding the plan with members opposite. We know the debate has at times been very emotional. There have been all kinds of accusations levelled. My hope is in talking about these personal cases that I not bring it back to that level but use them as examples to put forward some of the honest problems the public finds with the bill.

Unfortunately it does not appear we will solve this problem in the House. My position and that of my party is we must bring in a plan which is no more generous than the average private sector plan and that we need an independent body to do it and there must be full disclosure of all the benefits.

There seems to be some confusion on what a normal pension plan is. The President of the Treasury Board gave some statistics when he appeared before the committee, which the parliamentary secretary repeated today. I will go over them because they talked about misleading statistics. The President of the Treasury Board has presented statistics about what a normal pension plan is. Let us go over a normal pension plan.

Normal for most Canadians is no employer pension plan at all. According to Statistics Canada, as of January 1, 1992 only about 47.5 per cent of employed paid workers were fortunate enough to belong to an employer pension plan. About half of those were workers who belonged to pension plans in the public sector.

The minister told that committee 44 per cent of all pension plan members have some form of automatic indexing. What he neglected to mention was in the private sector less than 12 per cent have any automatic protection from inflation, and full protection of the kind offered to MPs in Bill C-85 is virtually unheard of even in the public sector.

The minister indicated as well that about 95 per cent of all pension plan members are in defined benefit plans which provide a set formula to determine benefit payments. According to Statistics Canada, only 43.7 per cent of all plans are of this type. Some of the larger plans have this but over 50 per cent do not. Those who do not have an employer benefit plan are almost always in a contributory plan, not a defined benefit plan.

The minister did not present any comparative statistics on benefit rates, and with good reason. While his proposal gives MPs a benefit rate of 4 per cent per year of service, only 2 per cent of all pension plan members have a benefit rate above half of that.

*Government Orders*

One departmental official, when I asked how many other Canadians had this kind of benefit rate, conceded none to his knowledge. There could be the odd chief executive officer with a special deal but none he is aware of.

Similarly, the President of the Treasury Board did not bother to present any statistics on the minimum age for collection of benefits, which is 55 in the bill. However, in over 90 per cent of all registered pension plans the normal age of retirement is 65. A hearing is going on today just down the street in the federal court, the Information Commissioner versus the Minister of Public Works and Government Services. The government has asked that the hearings regarding the release of information on MP pension benefits be held in camera. It does not even want taxpayers to hear its argument for not releasing the information.

(1130)

I would have thought if it had some reasonable reasons for suppressing the information, and I cannot imagine what they would be, it would want the voters to know what the reasons might be.

In my opinion it is in the best interests of the public for the information to be readily available. It will affect who is elected. That will affect the quality of government. Voters have a right to know how their tax dollars are being spent.

As I pointed out previously in the House, individual member's salaries and expenses are printed in the public accounts. Why are their pension benefits or at least the cost of those benefits not available to the taxpayers? So much for more open government. So much for government with integrity. On this kind of issue we might as well have had Brian Mulroney and his Tory party sitting across the way.

**An hon. member:** It might be an improvement.

**Mr. Harper (Calgary West):** Let me talk about the opt out once again. I want government members, even though they are going to march in here and vote for the bill, to seriously consider the opt out. The opt out is not ideal. I have said this before and I will say it again, the ideal situation is a fair pension plan for members of Parliament, not nothing but not too generous. Since those are the choices, I would suggest we opt out.

What the government is doing to convince the public that this is okay is simply not working. I have made some reference already to the tactic. One has been to misquote figures, to try and rationalize this as somehow not really better than what anyone else is getting. Nobody believes that. Not an expert in the country will come forward to verify those numbers.

The other attempt to rationalize this has been to basically slander various Reform members of Parliament. For example, the member for Beaver River is opportunistic in opting out.

There have been other slanders and fabrications against her which I will not get into.

It is also said that ex-military members are double dipping. This is an interesting definition of double dipping. Suddenly all Canadians, who after having had a career and qualifying for a pension in a normal way and who enter a second career, are somehow double dipping. Now we have hundreds of thousands of Canadians who are now defined as double dippers.

There was the great one members actually thought they had going for a few days which was that the member for Calgary Centre had advocated massive pay increases when, in fact, what he was suggesting was that the government be transparent about the salaries the MPs are actually being paid, taking into consideration all the benefits, all of their untaxed allowances and all their accrued pensions.

What is interesting about all of these things is that they are not in the bill. That definition of double dipping is not in the government's legislation. The government, while it continues to raise the compensation issue, did not raise it in the legislation. It is only a bill on MP pensions.

There has been a lot of talk about the pay issue but I want to get something on the record because my views on the pay issue are a little different than most of the people in the House and probably a little different from some members of my party. This party has consistently said: "Cut the pension to normal with no pay increase whatsoever". We tabled amendments to that effect and the Liberal members all voted against them.

However, let me talk about the process of determining pay. There have been commissions to study the pay issue. In fact, one thing we noticed when we had the committee hearings for one day was that the commissions appointed by this federal government such as the Lapointe or Sobeco study, had considerably more generous views of remuneration than some of the commissions that had been appointed in the provinces. All of them had concluded that MPs or ex-MPs were basically underpaid and they gave some reasons for that which deserve study. However let us be very clear about how they arrived at that conclusion.

First, all these commissions proceed by essentially asking members of Parliament and former members of Parliament what they do, how much they could earn elsewhere and how much they think it is worth. That is essentially how the commissions operate. They then come up with a recommendation that we are all underpaid. They accept the stories that all members of Parliament tend to tell, which is that prior to coming here they had brilliant careers and were earning hundreds of thousands of dollars somewhere else. Some were. As we all know, the member for Calgary Centre was. The Minister of Justice was. There are some other members who had very brilliant careers both in this House and in the previous Houses.

*Government Orders*

(1135)

However, that is not always true. Before I was elected, I worked around here and I know about some of the brilliant careers.

The second story told is that all members of Parliament do valuable work while they are here. They work long and hard hours all the time, on critical tasks of great importance to the nation and their constituents.

The third story told is that through no fault of their own, members suddenly find that when they are turfed out of office, despite their previous brilliance and their brilliance while here, they find themselves virtually unemployable and can find no work.

There are elements of truth in all of these statements but I do not think we should accept them at face value. Some of these commissions should have examined this a little more closely. I will not talk about careers. As I say, some people clearly have had good careers and some people, depending on their occupational background, have an chance at adjusting back into the workforce. I know the member for Halton—Peel and I have discussed the fact that certain occupations are given to readjustment to the workforce while others are not.

I would like to talk for a minute on this one point about the valuable and hard work because it is important. It is time we started calling a spade a spade around here. Have we worked hard this week? You had better believe it, Madam Speaker. We have worked bloody hard. We have been up every day this week until midnight and 1 a.m. voting on bills.

What about those votes? Those votes were all predetermined. There were no surprises in any of them, although there were a couple of little surprises, but all of these votes were predetermined. In fact, they were so predetermined that half of the time people did not even know what they were voting on. However, they certainly did not need to know what they were voting on even if they did.

The question that the taxpayers should be asking is not whether this is hard work, because this is hard work, but whether it is valuable work. They should be asking whether staying up all night to go through these rituals has been worth a hell of a lot of money to them.

Let me mention another example. We sat in a committee all day. We had flown in witnesses from across the country to study the MP pension bill. They came in early in the morning and we sat there all day, morning, afternoon and evening. Did we stop for five minutes to review or discuss any of the committee testimony to determine whether there was anything in it that might apply to the legislation? No. We proceeded to clause by clause consideration and did the bill in 12 minutes. Therefore, we went through the ritual of flying these people in and hearing from them.

The question once again is: Hard work costs a lot of money. Was it of any value? The truth is, and this is not a phenomenon restricted to Canada but certainly one that has become worse here, that many MPs play very little or any real legislative role. It does not matter whether they are ignoring their constituents' views, their election commitments or their personal principles and knowledge, we know that most MPs will simply vote with the party no matter what the bill is about and whether they have read it or not.

What really is the value of that? What really is the equivalent to that? Is that equivalent, as some would tell us, to being a senior executive? If that is the way the government and others believe the House of Commons should work, maybe MPs are regional sales reps for their political parties. Maybe that is the comparison we should be making.

I am just giving another point of view. An independent commission should look at those kinds of issues. Maybe it would end up not looking at how we are remunerated but what we are doing around here and whether we can make it more effective.

There is one little item of which I have to make some mention. I normally do not talk at all about my personal life but let me digress for a second. In the committee meeting, the President of the Treasury Board said, and the parliamentary secretary repeated it today, that before we opt out of these pensions we should consult our families. He said that we were really doing our families wrong by doing this. It was a valuable suggestion.

(1140)

I got married just after I came to the House. I have been married a year and a half. I am starting to understand this marriage thing. I said: "Before I opt out I should really consult my wife. It concerns the future and our future". I thought it was the right thing to do to opt out but I thought: "Yes, this wise advice. I should consult my wife". The treasury board president, the expert on family values that he is, advised me to do this.

I talked to my wife Lauren and explained that this potentially could be very expensive for us. I tried to explain it to her. This point is important because in the riding she talks to people. She is in touch with her family. She is not in this cocoon. She said to me: "There may be some truth in what you are saying but the reality is that both you and I know that the pension plan is way too generous. We know what the public thinks about it and we know what it is". She said: "You did not get elected to rip off the taxpayers. Frankly, if you or I ever find ourselves in a financial situation on the job or any other job where we are doing that, then we had better find other work". That is the only way to look at this.

Reform MPs in opting out are not making a political point on a particular day. Let me be very clear to Liberal members about this, those who are thinking of participating. In opting out we are making a solemn pact with the taxpayers. The pact is the following. This pension plan is not reformed satisfactorily. It is

*Government Orders*

not an acceptable plan. By opting out we have no stake in it whatsoever.

The government can refuse future opt outs and it can grandfather the present recipients if it wants but if we form the government we have no vested interest whatsoever in this scam. When we have the chance to put in a plan, if this is not changed, there will be no grandfathering. There will be no trough regular and trough lite. We will take every legal step necessary to cut benefits that were not adequately contributed to by members of Parliament. We will lead by example in reforming the fiscal situation of this country. We will start here and we will not spare the people who made the decision to opt into that plan. That is our commitment.

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak today on third reading of Bill C-85, which proposes amendments to the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act.

Before I begin, I want to highlight the points that I wish to make during my comments. First, it has to do with the question of total compensation. Most members would agree that the pension plan is an integral part of the compensation of any employee. When an employee looks at a position that pension plan is part of the compensation in this debate and in the comments made by hon. members.

They know very well that they are dealing with pension plans as a stand alone item without reference to the total compensation package. That is the first point.

The second point is that the salaries of members of Parliament have been frozen since 1991 and will be frozen and have been designated to be frozen until 1997. That is the commitment the government has made and members of Parliament have made, to have their salaries frozen for seven years.

The third point is that independent consultants have been asked to assess the total compensation offered to members of Parliament. Their conclusion was that the total compensation of members of Parliament was not out of line with comparable work in other sectors.

The fourth point that I am going to make has to do with this bill and what it does. The bill reduces the value of the pension plan that members of Parliament presently enjoy. It eliminates things called double dipping. It sets a minimum age that must be reached before a member can start collecting. It also reduces the accrual rate. This bill reduces the value of the pension plan. To defeat this bill would mean that the existing plan would stay intact. As a result it is clear all members of Parliament will be supporting this bill, if not at least in principle.

(1145)

I am going to touch on the two options that have been suggested particularly by the Reform Party. I intend to demonstrate that the actual cost of those options would be more to the Canadian taxpayers.

Some individuals and organizations have waged a constant publicity battle against the bill and its provisions as being too generous. They have targeted the earned pension entitlements of individual members. Some of this outside criticism has involved exaggeration that treats pensions in isolation removing them from the total compensation context which is where they properly belong.

The independent study conducted by Sobeco Ernst and Young and tabled in this House in March of last year did not find MPs' total compensation package to be overly generous but I emphasize that it did recommend a redistribution of the various elements of that package. Sobeco Ernst and Young recommended increases in direct compensation with corresponding decreases in indirect compensation including pensions.

This is point number one. We are talking about total compensation. In fact the total compensation is not overly generous but the distribution of that income between the various forms of income should be readdressed.

The Lapointe commission report which was tabled last July also recommends changes. Among other things it recommends that pensions should not be payable before age 55 and that basic indemnities should be increased once the salary freeze is lifted. Again an independent commission has recommended, and the government has accepted the recommendation, that pensions not be payable until age 55 or later and that the basic components of the total compensation should be dealt with but not until the freeze on salaries is lifted. It would be inappropriate at this time to increase the basic salary of members and reduce the pension. We are going to respect the salary freeze that has been accepted by all the civil service and all members of Parliament.

A variety of views have been expressed during the course of debates on the pension issue. Some members no doubt would like to stay with the status quo while others seek radical change. I doubt that there is a single member who has not been affected by all the criticisms that have been made. One thing I am certain of though is that we have all heard from our constituents and we have listened to them.

The government has paid particular attention to what Canadians have had to say on the issue. Bill C-85 fulfils our commitment set out in the election platform with respect to double dipping and the minimum age at which pensions will begin to be paid. It further fulfils the President of the Treasury

*Government Orders*

Board's commitment made in February of this year to table legislation before the end of April.

I believe that the amendments proposed in the bill are balanced and fair both to the taxpayers of this country and to members of Parliament. The proposed changes show Canadians that the government has taken note of their concerns and has acted upon them.

At the same time the government is conscious of the fact that in periods of deficits and public sector salary freezes, it would not be ethical to increase members' basic indemnities as recommended by the Sobeco Ernst & Young report. Consequently it would be inappropriate to implement the recommended cut-backs to MP pensions at this time.

As I have said, the changes proposed in this bill are reasonable and fair. Nevertheless not everyone will agree with them. There will be criticism within and outside this House that the changes do not go far enough. This said, I think we will all do well to remind ourselves that no matter how hard we try we cannot please everyone. I do believe that this bill represents a fair and justifiable compromise that seeks to accommodate various points of view.

(1150)

I would like to go briefly through the main changes to the pension plan proposed by Bill C-85. The new minimum pensionable age will be 55. In the future, senators and members of Parliament who earn over \$5,000 a year from an appointment, employment or other personal service contracts in the federal public sector will see their pensions reduced on a dollar for dollar basis by their earnings. The pension accrual on future service will drop from 5 per cent for each year of service to 4 per cent. The contribution rate on future service for members of the House of Commons will drop from 11 per cent to 9 per cent of salary. Common law spouses will be recognized for survivor benefit purposes just as they are under the public service, Canadian forces and RCMP pension plans.

In keeping with the generally accepted practice in Canada that when changes are made in pension plans they do not reduce benefits accrued to date, all of these changes, with the exception of changes to the survivor benefit arrangements, will apply only to pensions or portions of pensions earned on service that occurs after the date this bill receives royal assent. This represents a fair and equitable approach. It means that members who have organized their financial affairs taking into account the pensions they have earned to date will not see rules changed midstream leaving them potentially adversely affected.

As I have said, it is simply not possible to please everyone. Consequently, those members of Parliament who do not agree with the changes and reductions proposed by Bill C-85 or who do not believe them to be far reaching enough will not be obliged to continue participating in the plan. As the Prime Minister promised, all members of Parliament will be given a choice.

They will have 60 days from the date this bill receives royal assent to exercise an option to stay in the plan.

Having touched briefly on the main changes proposed by Bill C-85, I would now like to focus on the issue of the new minimum age for payment of members' pensions. As we all know once a member has six years of service, the present provisions see the pension commence as soon as the member leaves office. I would like to repeat that because some of my constituents have understood it differently. There is no pension payable when a member completes six years. Six years is the earliest date at which a member could collect, but he or she must have left office to commence receipt of pension payments.

I do not believe this provision was the result of some arbitrary decision. There were sound philosophical and practical reasons behind it. The provision was introduced so a member would have an immediate income on which to draw to assist him or her in the often difficult transition from public to private life. This is the only immediate income available to a member with an immediate pension entitlement. There are no cash settlements, no lump sum severance benefits. In fact, members of Parliament do not qualify for unemployment insurance benefits under the current legislation.

I would remind those who believe the immediate payment of a pension is indefensible that not a single member of this House enjoys any kind of job security. There is absolutely no guarantee of a career as a member of Parliament. Every four or five years we must seek re-election and many of us find our tenure in this House brought to an abrupt end.

Nevertheless, despite these considerations a general consensus was reached that the minimum pensionable age should be raised. In addition, after considering recommendations from both the Sobeco Ernst & Young and the Lapointe commission reports, the government accepted the recommendation that 55 was a reasonable pensionable age.

This new age will only apply to pensions or portions of pensions earned after the bill receives royal assent. This means that any pension earned prior to royal assent will still be payable according to the existing rules, that is, as soon as a member leaves office. Once again I should emphasize the government believes this to be a fair and equitable approach and one that is consistent with generally accepted and legislated pension practice, namely the protection of accrued pension rights and benefits.

I know full well there will be critics who say we are not going far enough, that possibly the minimum pensionable age should be 60 or 65. To such critics I would again emphasize the precarious nature of an MP's career and the likelihood of a member suddenly finding himself or herself unemployed. We all know it is not easy to switch careers in midstream and once a person has turned 50 years of age it can often prove impossible to find new employment. Therefore, I would suggest that it is

*Government Orders*

not unreasonable to propose in future MP pensions should go into pay once a former member reaches age 55.

(1155)

How does age 55 compare with the pensionable age under provincial pension plans for members of respective legislative assemblies? The government's proposal of age 55 appears to be very much in keeping with the majority of those plans. Let me give some examples. Age 55 is the earliest pensionable age for MLAs in Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia, Yukon and the Northwest Territories.

Some provinces have adopted a formula approach. In Newfoundland the pension starts when age and service total 60. In Ontario it starts when a member's age and service total 55. British Columbia has a combination of straight minimum age and a formula requirement. The pension is paid when a member reaches age 55 or when age and years of service total 60. Quebec has a similar arrangement whereby the pension goes into pay when a member's age and service equal 65, but the member must be at least 50 years of age.

Only the province of New Brunswick still has no minimum pensionable age. Alberta has terminated the MLAs pension plan and Prince Edward Island has discontinued its pension arrangements for its present MLAs, although new arrangements are under review by an independent commission. The recent election in Manitoba was to see the existing pension arrangements terminated and replaced by a registered retirement savings plan, to which both MLAs and the province would contribute.

If we look at the pensionable age for elected representatives in some other western democracies, we also see a variety of practices, some of which contain a service component, some of which are based on age alone once the pension is vested. For example, in Australia a pension is paid after 12 years of service or at age 60 with at least eight years of service. In Belgium the minimum pensionable age is 55 or age 52 with eight years of service. In France the pension is based on age alone, age 55, while in Sweden it is based on service alone being 12 years. In the United Kingdom the pension is payable at age 65, or age 60 if the age and service equal 80. In the United States it is the age of 62 or age 50 with 20 years of service or 25 years of service with no age qualification.

I would suggest that these various combinations of age alone, service alone, or age and years of service together have been developed in recognition, and I stress in recognition, of the uniqueness of service as an elected representative, in recognition of the fact that there is no guaranteed career as such. I would suggest that the government's decision to set age 55 as the new minimum pensionable age is well within the range of those

generally accepted for elected representatives of the countries I have just mentioned.

We have looked at the pensionable age ranges for the MLAs of the provinces and we have looked at the arrangements for elected representatives in some of our fellow western democracies. I do know there are some people who will ask how a pensionable age of 55 compares with the pensionable age for ordinary Canadians. I go back again to the unique and specialized nature of our employment here on the Hill and I point out that it is not unusual to tailor pension plans to meet specific career needs to accommodate career patterns that differ from the norm.

I would light to highlight the special early retirement provisions that have been put in place for air traffic controllers, members of the Canadian forces and the many police forces across the country. These all recognize the vagaries, demands and requirements on career patterns that do not correspond at all to career patterns of the majority of Canadians.

I would like to go back and look at the options Reform members have presented to the House. I should like to address the general feeling of many of their speakers that pensions of members of Parliament should have the same provisions as those applicable to the private sector.

(1200)

One aspect of private sector pension plans to which those members have not given consideration is the vesting differential. Vesting is the point at which the contributions of the employer become the property of the employee. As an example, in many plans in the private sector companies have plans which allow members to start accumulating pension benefits after only two years of service, whereas presently members of Parliament do not have that kind of provision.

If we were to adopt two years of service before vesting began, each and every member of Parliament who has served in this place would qualify for a pension, when in fact less than half of members of Parliament ultimately qualify for pensions. On that basis alone, to simply change that aspect of a pension plan would mean that the cost to the Canadian taxpayers would double.

There are some differences. For instance, members of Parliament are required to pay 11 per cent of salary and the basic salary for a member of Parliament is \$64,400 a year. Eleven per cent of that salary or some \$7,000 per year must be paid into the plan. No private plan requires 11 per cent. Most plans only require about a 3 per cent contribution rate to a maximum of some \$3,000 to \$5,000. In terms of the actual contribution on behalf of members, it is substantially higher than we see in private plans.

*Government Orders*

The vesting for members begins after six years, whereas private plans begin vesting after two years and employees could qualify for a pension after only two years of service.

Members of Parliament also have their eligible RRSP contributions reduced by the amount of pension benefits accrued in the plan. Should a member not qualify for the pension, the funds they have contributed would be returned to the member, but the RRSP limits that were forgone because of the MP pension plan are not recoverable.

Members can qualify for pensions after 19 years of service of up to 75 per cent of their salary. Many plans pay up to 90 per cent. I give examples of teachers, school boards and firefighters.

The hon. member for Calgary Centre said that members of Parliament should not receive any expense allowance and that they should be paid \$150,000 a year. That is the wrong time to increase members' salaries.

I simply close by saying that I have no hesitation in supporting Bill C-85 which brings into effect important changes that can be fairly and reasonably implemented at this time.

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I notice members opposite making fun of the tie which I happen to be wearing. The tie is for the benefit of members opposite. It is what is commonly referred to by many of my constituents as the piggy plan, not the pension plan.

At the outset I inform the House that I will be splitting my time with one of my colleagues.

Why is the Liberal government changing the MP pension plan? We would think it would be doing it for reasons of integrity. The Liberal government is only addressing MP pensions to try to deflect public criticism. It knew Canadians wanted real changes so it made red book promises. However the promises were minimal and the government is doing the absolute minimum to barely meet those promises.

What were the promises? They were to end double dipping and to change the minimum age for collecting an MP pension, two of the many things that have outraged Canadians. The bill includes provisions to change those two things, which I commend, but the plan needs a major overhaul. This is just a start.

When questioned about the continuing generosity of the MP pension plan most Liberals throw up smoke screens and whine about how underpaid politicians are. They do not understand that the salaries of working MPs are unrelated to how much retired MPs should be making.

(1205)

Over the past decade whenever the public has called for MP accountability and questioned the unsustainable and bloated pension package, the government has protected the plan and met the criticism by freezing MP salaries in major PR campaigns. It seemed to work before but not any more. Canadians are looking at the pension plans. Let us stick with the issue and not talk about low MPs salaries to defend high MP pensions.

Today the Liberals are pointing to studies that say MPs are underpaid while they are working. They respond by retaining this overinflated pension plan. Next year or the year after they will point to the same studies and say: "Gosh, look, we are underpaid. The studies prove it". They will pull out the sob stories and gain public support for salary increases. Just as they have refused to discuss the real issues on MP pensions now, they will refuse to discuss the MP pension plan then. That is because it is indefensible.

The government members go to great lengths to talk about anything but why they should be entitled to a two-tier pension plan. However some members of the government do not deny that the plan is generous. Just last Friday the hon. parliamentary secretary to the leader admitted:

The pension plan was generous. It is generous, and remains generous. However, the members of Parliament who entered the lists for the election in 1988 and in all previous elections did so on the basis that at the end of their term of office they would be compensated in some way that was generous but was designed to make up for the loss of income they suffered in being elected to Parliament in the first place.

He continued:

Most people enter a career looking at the remuneration package and seeing what it is like.

I think I speak for my colleagues on this side of the House when I say that Reformers did not switch careers and enter politics for the remuneration package. We came to Ottawa to represent our constituents and to make some long overdue changes. Altering the platinum plated MP pension plan is just one such change.

It saddens me to think that the main reason some of my hon. colleagues across the way entered politics was for the promised pension reward following their retirement from public service, and this is by their own admission. I would like to believe my colleagues opposite are honourable so I return to my first question. Is the Liberal government committed to making significant and necessary changes to the MP pension plan? Will those changes bring it into line with other Canadian pension plans?

**Mr. Mills (Red Deer):** Of course not.

**Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River):** That is right. The simple answer is no. One would think the government with its penchant for political correctness would want to do the right thing. Unfortunately when Liberals are doing the right thing it

*Government Orders*

means they are only addressing public perceptions, not reality. These are the Liberal code words for entrenching inequality.

The last time I heard someone use those words in the House it was the Liberal member opposite from Halifax. She said that her government was doing the right thing when defending the inclusion of special protection based on sexual orientation in Bill C-41.

First the Liberals argued that jail terms and community service were supposed to be deterrents. They then told judges to increase sentences if the victim fell into one of the categories listed in section 718.2, such as having a different sexual orientation than the person committing the assault. If longer and harsher sentences are supposed to be a deterrent and certain victims incur those longer sentences, does that not sound like special protection? Does it not smack of inequality when some Canadian lives are worth more than others?

The Liberals are now doing what they call the right thing with MP pensions. They are making cosmetic changes and protecting their own fully indexed MP retirement funds at the same time as they are talking about reducing RRSP contribution levels for other Canadians and pondering how long the Canada pension plan will survive. That sure sounds like a two-tier pension system to me. Every time I hear the phrase doing the right thing from a Liberal it means make some people more equal than others. In this case it is retired MPs.

When a Reformer talks about doing the right thing we mean equality for all Canadians. This means equal protection before the law, equal pay for the same job, equal opportunity and equal treatment of pension plans under the Income Tax Act. Why should MPs be exempted from the pension rules they impose on other Canadians?

(1210)

During the review of Bill C-85 in the House procedures committee only seven witnesses were heard. I find it incredible that the committee tried to prevent the National Citizens' Coalition and the Canadian Taxpayers Federation from attending. These groups have spent considerable time reviewing MPs pensions and were instrumental in drawing the excesses of the plan to the attention of the media and the public. To deny them the opportunity to speak is unconscionable.

In fact only six witnesses were invited. Not to be thwarted, the Canadian Taxpayers Federation showed up in any event. The committee had no choice but to hear the association or be faced with a major media scandal.

The amazing thing is that even the carefully selected witnesses all agreed this was an extremely generous plan. While proposing an MP RRSP plan one witness said:

You live by the same rules you make for other Canadians.

If MPs were reliant on a similar RRSP pension plan they might be a little more cautious about the laws they pass that will affect all Canadians.

According to the Income Tax Act pension plans must comply with certain criteria to be valid. One such criterion is a limit on the accrual rate. It can be no more than 2 per cent of the final three-year average salary. It is also only payable after the age of 60.

The government is acting as if it has made major concessions in the MP pension plan and in Bill C-85. As the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister proudly pointed out, the pension plan will reduce the existing accrual rate by 20 per cent. At first that sounds great. All it really means is that the accrual rate was dropped from 5 per cent to 4 per cent. Yes, that is a 20 per cent reduction, but it is still 100 per cent more than the 2 per cent accrual rate all other Canadians are allowed under the Income Tax Act.

Further, the Income Tax Act states that such a pension scheme is only payable after the age of 60. The government has decided that only applies to other Canadians. Members are eligible at 55.

In the past MPs who served six years were eligible to collect the pension no matter how young they were; 36-year-olds could collect. I would hardly consider that selfless service in the interest of the public good. How many other Canadians receive a substantial pension after six years in the job? Surely it is an indication that the plan has been exceedingly generous for far too long. Moving the age of eligibility to 55, not 60 like the rest of Canadians, is considered a significant step by the government.

I applaud the government on increasing the age of eligibility to age 55, but why did it not go that small step further to 60 so that the MP pension plan complies with the Income Tax Act?

Apparently it will save taxpayers \$3.3 million in the first year. How much more will be saved in the future because all Reformers will opt out? More important, the government is acting like taxpayers will continue to realize significant savings. Under the plan taxpayers will contribute \$3.60 for every \$1 an MP contributes.

There is one promise we intend to keep. When Reform is elected government following the next election, we will really be reforming this travesty into a pension plan that is completely compatible with that of the private sector, and we will be making it retroactive.

**Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I listened attentively to the member's remarks. I point out a couple of items that I believe the member did not include in his speech.

I think all members would agree that serving in the House of Commons is a real privilege and a real honour. If we could afford to be here and work for nothing, I am sure 99 per cent of us would do that. The fact of the matter remains that most of us



*Government Orders*

need an income to sustain two homes. Most Canadians do not realize that what we make as MPs—

(1215)

**Mr. Silye:** The pension does not pay for your home.

**Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood):** I am going to get to the pensions, just bear with me. I have a couple of minutes here.

Members of Parliament make approximately \$14 an hour. By the way, I for one happen to support the member from Calgary, and I say this with no shame, who believes that we are worth \$30 an hour. I support that position. But what the Reform Party is missing is that most members of Parliament do not retire from this place. They are defeated.

When you are a defeated member of Parliament, you are usually defeated because you took on causes, went against the wind, and there are a lot of people in your own community after you are defeated, with all your education and previous experience, who will not readily hire you.

I for one have seen many good men and women who have served this House who have been defeated brutally, not through their own work but through party work, and who are out there walking the streets with absolutely no income. I believe that Canadians do not want to see members of Parliament who have served this House well go on welfare after they are defeated. I do not think they want that to happen.

I am all for reviewing the pension fund, but if the Reform Party is going to be straight with Canadians its members have to include, as the member from Calgary has included, in this debate the fact that maybe this plan in some respects could be perceived to be a little generous, but when you take all factors into account after you have been defeated, what bank in Canada or business doing business with a bank would want to hire you after you are defeated in this House?

Being a good member of Parliament in this House means you have to take on causes and go against the wind. The Reform Party, in fairness to this debate, is not including all factors.

**Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his comments.

I listened in this House to his defence of this gold plated plan. He seems to believe that when members are ultimately defeated, retire, or quit they end up on skid row. I do not know of any retired MPs who are on skid row or on welfare rolls. I would be interested to know their names if the hon. member is aware of some.

Further, he addressed the whole issue of the salary and the total remuneration package. I said in a speech on this bill that if we are going to address the salary issue, let us address it separately. Let us not confuse pension with salary. That is what the members are saying.

I beg to differ. My hon. colleague from Calgary did not suggest that we should be paid \$30 an hour. He suggested that we make the system transparent, that we roll everything in and do not have any special concessions built into the wage package. He said he does not believe we should have tax free allowances, that we should all be the same. That is what he was trying to drive at, and I support that. Let us make the system that pertains to MPs exactly the same as for all the rest of Canadians. Let us have a transparent system. We pay taxes the same as everyone else, and we should not have a two-tiered pension plan in this country.

**Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, this debate is not about money. So far all I have heard is about money and how much this will save the taxpayers. This debate is about integrity, and integrity means honesty.

The Reform Party of Canada is the only party in this House that says the pension plan is still too generous, notwithstanding the changes. It is four times better than the private sector, seven times better than any other public sector pension plan. Because of this and on principle, we are opting out. It would be hypocritical of us to accept it after having criticized it. We believe in what we are saying and we are prepared to act.

The Liberal government's feeble response has been Bill C-85, which effectively ends double dipping and raises the qualifying age for a pension to 55. It also increases the amount of time an MP has to serve to receive a maximum pension of 75 per cent—5 per cent better than the private sector—of the best six years of earnings. In 19 years MPs will now get 75 per cent of their salary in pension, rather than 15, as it was before, rather than the 35 to 40 years it takes anybody in this gallery, anybody who is not down at this level, to receive a pension plan. That is the difference, and that is why it is too lucrative.

(1220)

The generous pensions MPs are paid are almost universally viewed as reasonable compensation for the fact that we do not pay members of Parliament enough in salaries. This is the Liberal government view, and this is the view that has resulted in two undesirable patterns in Canadian politics. First, it is difficult to attract top calibre candidates because the pay is not high enough. Forget about idealistic arguments that elected office is a higher calling and that people should be prepared to make sacrifices to serve. The reality is that they have mortgages to pay and families to feed too.

*Government Orders*

Second, big pensions at the end of the rainbow tend to make politicians acutely aware of the need to be re-elected. That generates more survival mode thinking and less commitment to tackle the tough issues and do what is right for constituents and the nation.

I would like to read a letter to the editor that I saw in the *Financial Post* written by an individual named Paul Arnold, from Victoria. This was on the heels of my comments during debate on this bill at second reading when I talked about how we should be looking at the whole remuneration package, not just the pension separately and justifying the high pension based on the low salary. This is "Some straight talk on MPs' pensions":

We should extend thanks to Reform Party MP Jim Silye for having the courage to expose the deceptive way in which MPs pay themselves with our tax dollars, and for opening the door to a long overdue public debate on this sensitive issue.

Professional politicians such as Jean Chrétien and Sheila Copps often grumble about how hard they work and how underpaid they are. Neither, however, likes to talk very much about their tax free expense accounts, their litany of perks and special privileges or, above all, their lucrative gold plated pension plan that in Copps's case will be worth millions of dollars.

Silye is simply saying that MPs should be compensated fairly for the work they do. They should receive a salary that is comparable to others in both the public and private sectors with similar workloads and responsibilities. Their salaries should be transparent and all hidden tax free expense accounts, perks, privileges and gold plated pensions should be eliminated entirely.

Most Canadians do not object to paying our elected officials well for doing what must be a very demanding and stressful job. They want MPs to plan for their own retirements by investing in RRSPs, just like the rest of us. What Canadians detest is the underhanded way that MPs feed at the public trough and the way the taxpayers keep retired MPs living in the lap of luxury for the rest of their lives.

There are 205 rookies in this Parliament. It is not their fault this pension plan and its method of distribution is in its current state. However, it disappoints me that the 205 rookies in this Parliament could have done something about it. I cannot believe the rookies on that side allowed 70 veteran MPs to walk away from this House and within 30 days of leaving they will start to receive their pensions. Why are they not ruled the same way? Why is it the class of '88 gets to opt out, our class gets to opt out, but future classes do not get to opt out? All future MPs should have the choice to opt out as well.

A transparent, taxable salary could replace the current compensation or remuneration of an MP. Here is this low salary that MPs receive that the President of the Treasury Board uses to justify this high goldplated pension plan. This is what he says is too low and why we need this pension plan. Here is what MPs receive: a taxable salary of \$64,400; a tax free allowance of \$21,300, which is equivalent to a pretax value of \$42,600 if we make it transparent and taxable; the tax free travel status of \$6,000. These are tax free benefits. In the private sector, of

which I was a part two years ago, my company and I had to pay taxes on these benefits.

We in this House do not have to pay taxes on the following benefits: free VIA Rail pass; free personal long distance telephone calls; free health and dental package; free parking; free air travel for family; free insurance policy with spouse and dependent children; free second language lessons; a severance payment of \$32,000 when defeated or retired; a re-entry allocation of \$9,000 when defeated or retired.

(1225 )

On top of that is the lucrative, double standard, gold plated MP pension plan for a six-year member, worth between \$500,000 and \$4.5 million, depending upon the years of service, and valued at \$28,000 per year by the independent consulting group Sobeco, Ernst & Young in February 1994.

This is why I believe MPs, notably the class of '88 and the class of '93 and all future classes, should have the right to opt out. A remuneration committee should be struck, with no MPs on the committee, and the mandate of the committee on behalf of all Canadians should be to set and establish a transparent taxable salary for MPs, which includes all expenses that can be receipted, and a pension plan of a certain amount that MPs will themselves look after.

The mistake I made when I gave a dollar figure of \$150,000 was that that is self-serving. It is not my place and it should not be my place to set the amount. It should be done at arm's length by an independent body. There are some good groups out there that could do that. That is why I criticized the 205 rookies—or the 150 rookies, because Reform rookies are doing what they said they would do.

Let us fix it. The Liberals have an opportunity to fix it, and that would be the way to do it. We would get the public off the backs of MPs. We would restore integrity to politicians, because they would be paid a salary and benefits the Canadian public agrees with. They would not set it themselves; it would be set by an independent body. That would include the salary, benefits, and a pension plan that MPs could look after. That is how the problem could be solved, and we would not be yelling across the floor at each other about what is going on.

On an overall compensation and remuneration package, we have argued long and strong on this side of the House that the pension plan is far too generous. It has to be reduced and brought into line with the private sector. That is what Canadians and Reformers want. That is what Reformers are promising and that is why Reformers are opting out. We are putting our money where our mouths are.

We really believe that all members who do not opt out, those who had the opportunity to opt out, will be voted out, because they are treating themselves on a different level and on a different standard from the rest of Canadians. We are no better than the rest of Canadians. We are serving Canadians. If we

*Government Orders*

really want to serve Canadians, we should accept the amount that would be given by an independent board.

I think the MP pension plan should definitely be looked at and reviewed and brought into line with that of the private sector.

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I listened with interest and I want to address at least one point the member has raised.

He continues to suggest in the House that the expense allowance members of Parliament receive should be doubled and added to salary. This is absolutely a wrong approach. The member is slowly back pedalling. He has said in the House on many occasions that all the benefits should go away and members of Parliament should be paid \$150,000 a year. He justifies that by saying that the expenses somehow should be doubled to be on a pretax basis and added to salary.

In fact what the member has failed to realize is that if expenses were added to salary it would be the same as telling a travelling salesman who received a \$5,000 reimbursement for his housing, travel, and lodging that somehow he should get \$10,000 added to salary instead of being reimbursed for the expenses.

Members of Parliament do have legitimate expenses: a second housing allowance, travel, food, et cetera, all of which are part of doing this job. They are reimbursement of expenses.

Perhaps the member would like to calculate what the equivalent pretax would be. What he has failed to do is understand that all the expenses incurred by members of Parliament would be deductible for tax purposes against that salary. In fact the amount of \$150,000 represents a 30 per cent salary increase to members of Parliament as proposed by the Reform Party.

(1230)

I simply ask the hon. member for Calgary Centre if he would explain to the House why he believes we should change our pension plan to make it the same as the private sector's and why is the Reform Party recommending a 30 per cent salary increase to members of Parliament?

**Mr. Silye:** Madam Speaker, we have an issue where, on the basis of a low salary, the government tries to justify a high pension. I have tried to take a look at the complete remuneration package of MPs, which includes the so-called low salary and the pension. If we add them together what do we get? It is too low on the one end and too high on the other. Why not bring them together and look at it that way?

As far as the doubling up of expenses, that \$21,300 is called an expense allowance but all the members who live in Ottawa and the surrounding area get it and they do not have two residences. I use all the expense money because I live in Calgary and I have a residence here. According to Sobeco, Ernst & Young, not all of that expense money is used up. However, that is not really the issue.

The issue is we should come clean and say: "To be a member of Parliament this is your job description and this is the head office. You come from all across Canada to work in the head office. If you come here we will pay you this much in a transparent taxable salary. Receipt your expenses and we will reimburse you. Within that benefit package we will give you some of these benefits, like a life insurance policy, a health and dental policy, parking, and the value of that is determined by—"

**Mr. Szabo:** Why are you recommending \$150,000?

**Mr. Silye:** I should not have recommended a number. If it were \$150,000 the net amount we would get is \$75,000 to look after everything, all expenses, the second residence and everything else.

What the hon. member gets right now is about \$72,000 net. He is within \$3,000 of that same figure. I can show that based on the total compensation package.

The solution is not to keep defending this gold plated, trough regular, trough light and trough stout plan. Even members of the government do not understand the pension plan. They keep defending it rather than asking how they can fix it. I have put forward a suggestion and a solution. The pension plan is too generous. Get rid of it. Make it no better than the private sector's. That is what Canadians want. That is what we have to do. Listen to what Canadians have said and do that.

If we do that there is a problem with the rest of the equation and we will have to fix it. However, there will be another time to talk about remuneration. We have to bring one down and bring out all of the perks which are under the table.

**Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it was not my intention to participate in this debate but as I was listening to Reform members I could not believe they were not discussing some of the other relevant factors in the debate.

Before the member for Calgary Centre leaves I would like to make sure I understood his quote accurately that the person who wrote the article said members of Parliament should receive a salary commensurate with what they would receive in the private sector. The member nodded that is what this article stated.

(1235)

That is an interesting point to debate. From the same *Financial Post* last week we saw a list of the top 100 executives in Canada and what they made. For members who did not see the article I will give some highlights. The top executive in Canada, my former employer Mr. Stronach from Magna, made

*Government Orders*

approximately \$14 million. The last one on the list received approximately \$1 million.

Of the top 100 executives in Canada, the men and women given judgment by their peers to be the top 100 in terms of their business accomplishments, achievements and contributions to the community, the lowest paid makes \$1 million and the highest approximately \$14 million.

In no way, shape or form do I want to suggest the salaries in the House should be commensurate with the top 100 executives in Canada. However, I believe the work we do in this board room is every bit as important as the work those executives do in the private sector. Our responsibilities are as great. There are a lot of men and women in the country who if they were in the private sector would probably be in that top 100.

There are men and women in the Chamber whom I have watched in committee and in the House. I have watched them travel the country and the world. They work harder than a lot of the top 100 executives. A lot of the top 100 executives could not keep up with most members of Parliament.

The Reform Party is trying to depreciate the contribution the men and women of the Chamber make on behalf of their constituents and on behalf of their country. The member for Calgary Centre said let us have integrity, let us be transparent. He talked about free rail passes, that we have plane tickets to travel Canada and that we have a telephone code in order to make long distance calls. He tried to spin that these are perks.

These are not perks. These are tools the men and women in the Chamber need to do their job. How many of us in the Chamber have ever used our rail passes? This is my second term as an MP and I think I have used my rail pass once to go from Ottawa to Toronto. I would like to get on the train instead of taking a fast ride to Vancouver to give a speech. I would love to have the luxury of taking a week to get there and a week to get back on our rail system, what is left of it. However, a lot of us do not have the luxury to enjoy the rail pass the way the member for Calgary Centre tried to insinuate.

This whole notion of depreciating the work members of Parliament do is really not fair. It is fair to debate the notion the pension plan might be perceived as too high or too generous but I do not when we consider the whole package involved.

(1240)

On the notion in the *Financial Post* which someone in the private sector wrote to the member about salaries being commensurate with the private sector's, what member of Parliament will lead the campaign that we want \$.5 million a year for all members of Parliament? They would be dead.

I have had a lot of experience in the private sector and I have met most of those people in the top 100. A lot of members of Parliament are worth every nickel of the \$.5 million a year if we want to compare them to the contributions those top 100 executives make.

If we are to be fair and constructive in this debate we should include all factors and we should not mislead Canadians. Rail passes and plane passes are not there as perks. They are there for us to go out and give speeches, listen to people in all parts of the country. We do not serve only our own communities in the Chamber, we serve coast to coast. That is why we have those instruments. To spin them as perks I do not think is responsible.

**Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to participate in the discussion on Bill C-85, a bill which lives up to our red book commitments and goes beyond.

The bill makes important reforms to MP pension arrangements and has the effect of lowering the costs to taxpayers of the plan by some 33 per cent. The bill proposes a package of what are essentially cutbacks to one element of parliamentarians' compensation, our pension plan. Because the other elements of our package remain frozen they could not be used for any offsetting adjustments.

Members today are being asked to accept a pensionable age of 55 and a 20 per cent reduction in our pension formula for our future service. I believe this is a fair bargain. I hope members will join me in supporting the bill.

The changes to the pension arrangements contained in Bill C-85 are being proposed after somewhat long and careful study. Part of this was carried out through the review process set up under the Parliament of Canada Act. Under this act a commission is required to be established after each federal election to review the adequacy of MP compensation and allowances.

The most recent commission established in January 1994 was headed by the Hon. Charles Lapointe and made its report in July 1994. Even before the Lapointe commission report, however, a special study of parliamentarians' compensation had already been commissioned by the prior government. This study was carried out by Sobeco, Ernst & Young, a reputable Montreal consulting firm. Its report was tabled in Parliament in February 1994 and was then referred to the Lapointe commission for review.

[*Translation*]

Sobeco, Ernst & Young examined several elements, including the questioning of the basic principles governing parliamentarians' pensions. They also suggested a number of discussion topics, such as tying sessional indemnities to parliamentarians' private income and rates of pay to their performance.

*Government Orders*

The government welcomes these two reports on the whole issue of parliamentarians' compensation and allowances. As part of this study, not only were extensive consultations carried out with citizen groups, business associations, compensation experts and other stakeholders, but present and former members were also consulted. Throughout the process, the objective was to come up with a series of changes which would be fair and, while alleviating taxpayers' concerns, would continue to meet the needs of members.

Let me first quote a few of the recommendations contained in the independent report presented by Sobeco, Ernst & Young, which reviewed the entire parliamentary compensation scheme.

[*English*]

This study looked at each aspect of our compensation package, from sessional indemnities through pensions, insurance, health benefits and travel. A value was assigned to each component which in turn allowed the consultants to value the total package. The components and package were then compared with the compensation packages provided in other Canadian jurisdictions, public and private, and in selected international jurisdictions. When total compensation is taken into account and compared to similar occupations in private and public sectors, the study noted that MPs' compensation exceeds that of managers in all companies but as was pointed out it is still less than executives.

(1245)

Both the general feelings and the formal comparisons arising from the study support the position that parliamentarians' basic salaries are relatively modest but our pension arrangements are overall too generous.

The study recommended a realignment of our expense allowance to include an accommodation allowance and an accountable expense portion. It recommended minor changes to the travel benefits, insurance benefits and career transition provisions. At the same time it recommended that the pension plan be scaled back essentially to levels more commonly found in the private sector. The study also recommended increasing the salary of an MP from the current \$64,400 to \$88,500.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that the consultants recognized however that it may not be the right time, in the present situation, to vote the salary increases they were recommending. At any rate, they indicated that the proposed decrease in the retirement plan, if approved, would necessitate an increase in wages so that the overall compensation level would remain the same.

[*English*]

A true pension plan must have a retirement pension goal guaranteeing a revenue replacement target at retirement which does not depend on investment return over the accumulation period, salary increases or in some cases, age of retirement.

Such an objective may be reached only through a defined benefit plan because employer's contributions can be applied to level the fluctuations in retirement pensions resulting from variations in investment returns over the years.

The consultants' bottom line recommendation on this issue is that if the Canadian public's concerns were that pension costs were too high, the solution should be to reduce the cost by reducing benefits rather than to replace the plan with a retirement savings plan which had no clear income replacement goals.

[*Translation*]

As the hon. members probably noticed when they read Bill C-85, this is the solution advocated by the Treasury Board president. The measures contained in this bill will help reduce costs to taxpayers substantially.

Sobeco, Ernst & Young also made recommendations on double dipping. As the hon. members know, the bill before us provides for major restrictions in that regard.

The pension payable to former members who receive, in respect of a federal position, a salary or fee paid through the CRF or appropriations will be reduced or cancelled if they earn more than \$5,000 per year from that job.

[*English*]

As my final comment on the Sobeco, Ernst & Young report, I would like to read what the consultants considered an important goal in setting parliamentarians' compensation: "MPs' compensation should contribute to making members proud to serve their country and convinced that their financial reward for doing so is fair and to making Canadians in turn satisfied with the levels paid to their representatives". I think all members can endorse this goal.

As I indicated earlier, the Sobeco, Ernst & Young report was subsequently referred to the Lapointe commission. Traditionally that commission has not looked at issues such as pension benefits. Nevertheless, it did so on this occasion. The Lapointe commission made recommendations in two main areas, first, the area of MPs' and senators' compensation and second, in the matter of the public's attitude about parliamentarians' compensation overall.

Like the Sobeco study before it, the author noted that there was a great deal of misunderstanding and lack of knowledge about the compensation paid to parliamentarians. Like Sobeco, the Lapointe commission also recommended an increase in sessional indemnities to take effect as soon as the salary freeze is lifted in 1997.

The commission recommended replacement of our tax free allowances with fully accountable capped expense accounts. As hon. members know, the bill before us adopts the recommendation of the Lapointe commission and sets age 55 as the pensionable age under the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act. The Lapointe commission agreed with Sobeco that incidents of double dipping would be greatly reduced through imposition of a pensionable age and that no additional measures

were needed. However, our government does not agree. That is why Bill C-85 has a provision which eliminates double dipping.

(1250)

[*Translation*]

These studies should be a great source of inspiration. They identify all the factors to consider and the areas where adjustments are required. However, the fact that fiscal restraint is still the order of the day gives the President of the Treasury Board little leeway in making changes to the members' compensation scheme. Not only would a decrease in our retirement benefits be unfair to us if it were not offset by some adjustment, but it would make public office much less attractive in the future.

[*English*]

On this side of the House we believe that the proposed reduction in our future benefits of 20 per cent and the reduction of taxpayers' costs by one-third have gone a considerable way to reforming our pension plan in a period when the government is committed to maintaining the wage freeze for parliamentarians.

The Lapointe commission's final pension recommendation concerned the contribution rate to the pension plan which it recommended should be reviewed. Bill C-85 recognizes that members' pension benefits will be reduced in the future and sets a revised member contribution rate of 9 per cent of session indemnities and additional salary if applicable.

In conclusion, it is clear that Bill C-85 meets many of the objectives outlined in the Lapointe commission report. We could have gone further but I believe we have met our red book commitments and gone beyond them. Maybe it is not to the satisfaction of everyone, but we have accepted much of the advice of many who have spoken on the reform of MP pensions. This bill is proof positive that we have kept our promises.

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, a very wise man once said that when you are in a hole and you want to get out, the first thing you should do is to stop digging. It is interesting to hear members opposite speak today and try to validate the change to the MP gold plated pension plan when in actual fact what they should probably do is to just stop digging. Some members and Canadians have deemed this to be an unjust and unfair form of remuneration, when in actual fact it should be a pure pension plan. We should separate salary and pension.

I would like to ask the member a question regarding the actuarially sound propositions in the pension plans, the old and the new proposition being put forward for consideration of the House.

### *Government Orders*

The Liberals have done some things. They have reduced the rate at which the benefits accumulate from 5 per cent to 4 per cent. They have also reduced the amount members actually pay into the pension plan from 11 per cent to 9 per cent.

In looking at the plan we should try to figure out if it is actuarially sound. I think all members of the House and all Canadians would agree that something we at least owe the public of Canada is to make sure the program is actuarially sound. Witnesses stated before the committee that to make it actuarially sound we should be paying in close to 30 per cent. I believe the figure was between 26 per cent and 30 per cent.

How can the member square this with his constituents when what we are doing with this plan is making the taxpayer pick up the difference? We should be paying approximately 26 per cent to make it actuarially sound.

**Mr. Discepolo:** Madam Speaker, I have no problem standing here before my constituents and supporting Bill C-85 because during the election we campaigned on the question of pension reform. I will save members the trouble of reading the red book commitment, and hopefully they have read it. Two issues came up time and time again.

One was the age. I agree totally that no one should be able to retrieve a pension right after leaving office, despite the fact that the average tenure in the Chamber is less than six years. In private industry the normal vesting period is two years. In our case it is six years and the majority of us do not receive the pension plan. The Bloc Québécois, for example, has stated categorically that it is not interested in the debate because its members do not plan to be here in six years.

(1255)

The contribution which we make as MPs has been substantially reduced. It has decreased from 5 per cent to 4 per cent. Our contributions have been decreased from 11 per cent to 9 per cent. That will save taxpayers over \$3 million a year, which amounts to 33 per cent of the cost.

We have done our share. I will have no qualms justifying that to my constituents in the next election campaign. I will be proud to stand and justify my contribution to the constituents of Vaudreuil. I guarantee to members of the Reform Party that I will be here after the next election because my constituents have confidence in me.

It is not a single issue which will dictate whether a member will return to the House. The Reform Party has chosen minor issues such as this one to make big political gains. It might work. I wish Reform members luck. But by George, if we had expended half of the energy that we have in this debate on the real

*Government Orders*

problems which face the country, such as job creation and growth, we would have been much better off.

I am glad this is the last day of debate on the bill. I wish Reform members a merry summer as they travel to the east exploiting some aspects of the bill for their own political gain and I wish them luck in their recruitment process for the Reform Party.

**Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, it gives me pleasure to speak on Bill C-85. I will be splitting my time with the member for Fraser Valley West.

Major problems exist in Canada. There is the debt and the deficit. There is the criminal justice system and all the reforms which are necessary. There is parliamentary reform, which rates fairly high with Canadians. We certainly need to look at the other place; all of us would agree many changes are required there. Free votes. Recall of MPs so we can get rid of the bad ones. Referenda. Those are the issues people are talking about. The other things they are talking about are things which are not compatible with what they see as being fair. Certainly MP pensions fit into that category.

Canadians are now very aware that over the last number of years we have built a \$553 billion debt and that the debt deepens by \$110 million per day. By the time the next election comes the country will be another \$100 billion in debt.

When those are the problems, Canadians do not want us to waste our time talking about things like pensions and how we are going to take care of members of Parliament. We have wasted our time talking about things like gun control, quotas, the \$2 coin and the minor changes we will make to the pension plan. People are saying there are some big problems which we should be addressing. Canadians are asking us to get on with the job of addressing those problems.

When talking about the pension plan Canadians ask how the Liberals can justify the pension. How do they do that? What do the Liberals say when they are in the House of Commons to justify their pension plan? Let us look at the kinds of things we have heard during the debate.

First, we have heard about the red book. The red book says that we are going to change the pension plan. The Liberals say they have done that. They have made the eligibility age 55. The rest of the country of course is looking at 65, 67 and a much higher age in the future. Double dipping is not allowed any more. "Big deal", is what most people will say about that. They say they have gone further than what they had planned. I think the Reform Party can take some credit for that.

(1300)

We hear: "When you leave one job, you are going to have a hard time finding another one". I believe that if one has done his

or her job here one will probably have an easier time finding another job. The people here who have done a good job will be sought after by industry.

What about job security? That is a little hard to sell as well. In what other job does one find security any more? If people do their jobs they will have security, which is what we should have here.

Members have said that when they leave their jobs this pension is compensation for a low salary. It has been made very clear by the member for Calgary Centre that there are other parts to this job. All Canadians are asking for is to have things up front. They want to know what MPs get.

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In view of the fact that Bill C-85 is such an important issue, I wonder if it might be in order to ask a few of the Liberals to attend in this House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** The hon. member knows very well that we do not refer to the presence or absence of any member. I would like to reiterate something I mentioned this morning. Because of the emotional issue we are dealing with, we could deal with it more calmly.

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** Madam Speaker, I do not see a quorum.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I do not see a quorum.

*And the count having been taken:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** The hon. member for Red Deer.

**Mr. Mills (Red Deer):** Madam Speaker, it is amazing how that works. It certainly is nice to give a speech to somebody. It makes my point about democracy and how little there is of that in this House as we have gone on.

I would like to go back to the pension and how Liberals justify it. I have pointed out that this attempt at justifying the pension plan is going to fall on deaf ears. I think to the next election and about bringing up the trough charts that will be available as we show who is at the trough and what sorts of benefits there will be.

I also think about that PC candidate who is going to say: "I cannot opt out of the plan". I think of the Liberal and NDP who will say: "Our party did not opt out of the plan". I also think of the position we are going to be in when we say: "We all opted out of the plan when given that opportunity".

An article in today's *Gazette* is interesting. It states that the voters will not forgive MPs for keeping their lavish pensions. This is where it is really at. By voting themselves reduced but still lavish pensions this week, many Liberal MPs might be signing their own political death warrants. I guess we should say

*Government Orders*

hurrah for that and right on because that certainly is going to help our campaign.

The public is not stupid. The public knows what is happening. The public has sent the message that it should come from the constituency to Ottawa and that is where the message has to be. It is a clear message. The message on pensions is that they are too rich, too gold plated. Eighty per cent of Canadians are saying that. That is what the polls are saying about the MP gold plated pension plan. They do not believe that the party knows best. They do not believe that this is a fair item.

For the member for Kingston and the Islands who brings out his green book, his little, little green book, I have a little, little red book. If I might paraphrase from this little, little red book concerning the topic of punishment of backbenchers, it says that MPs must learn to stop listening to the views of their constituents and remember their loyalty is to the party. That is exactly what the message in the pension plan is, loyalty to the party.

(1305)

So we will quote from this little, little red book because this little, little red book—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Could I ask the member to keep his objects on his desk please.

**Mr. Mills (Red Deer):** The member from Kingston certainly holds his little, little green book up. I thought with all of his experience I could do it as well.

This lack of democracy, this lack of listening to people, is probably the biggest concern I have. Let us look at the pension plan without mixing it up with salaries and other things. Its clause by clause study was done in 12 minutes.

Look at the committee hearings where so much is done. We invite selected guests and give them one day to tell us what we want to hear. They would not even tell us what the government wanted to hear. So there are no amendments of substance and if there are they are defeated by the powers that be, by the Madam Speaker dictatorship that rules this House.

We now have a two-tier system being proposed, a trough lite and a trough regular. The trough regular gives us figures that are unimaginable. We have members who would get \$4 million if they were to retire and live to age 75. They could never get that in the private sector. The pension plan is three and one-half times greater than one could get in the private sector.

The public is not saying that members do not deserve a pension. They are saying we should make it the same as we could get in the private sector. They are not saying—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I am sorry, the hon. member's time has expired.

**Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I have to sometimes apologize for my colleagues because I want to give credit where credit is due. Some credit should be given to the Liberal Party.

When I was flying to Ottawa a couple of weeks ago I met this fellow on the plane who said: "I want to give credit where credit is due to the Liberals because they made me a millionaire". I said: "A millionaire, so why are you so sad and forlorn? What were you before?" He replied that he had been a multimillionaire. It brings me back to this pension plan to ask: "Who is becoming the millionaire, the businessman or the member of Parliament from the Liberals or this separatist group over here?"

I am wearing an appropriate tie today. It has some little piggies on it. It reminds me of the poem I learned in grade three when I was 22 or so. It goes:

This little piggy went to the pension market over here  
And this little piggy can buy a new home  
And this little piggy buys the best of roast beef  
But all these little piggies will ultimately get none

That is my little piggy story. If the government thinks we are kidding it had better bear in mind the word retroactive because when the next election comes and the present government is out, we will be back visiting Bill C-85.

I have listened to a lot of things in this House of Commons during this past session. The other day when the Prime Minister—he has done this numerous times but I am speaking of recently—stood up in the House of Commons he had the nerve to compare himself with a hockey player to justify this fat cat pension plan. It was absurd for the chief politician in Canada.

(1310)

Why these folks over there try to mix salary and pension is beyond me. There are people like the President of the Treasury Board, who should know better and who also will pick up a good pension. Why are they not listening to the people, through the Reform Party, through all the contacts that they have, through all the organizations in this country, about pensions? I will never know. It is certainly not a populist organization at all.

One member recently in making a comment to one of my colleagues suggested that my colleague should resign if he does not like the pension plan. I think the shoe should be on the other foot. This group should resign for putting in the pension plan. If they will not resign we will be back talking in a couple of years through an election.

For years as I was growing up I was concerned about political remoteness. When I lived in Atlantic Canada I heard that when I was a young man and later when I moved to British Columbia. Everyone you talk to talks about political remoteness and how Ottawa does not resemble what is really going on in the country.



*Government Orders*

This pension plan is just so representative of that political remoteness.

During the election campaign in my riding there were three big issues: the economy, the criminal justice system and the pension plan. Even before the election, I decided to opt out of the pension plan, as my colleagues have. I still kept thinking about this political remoteness.

When we talk about things here in the House of Commons from day to day, you cannot understand for instance these separatists who come into this House wanting and agreeing with a pension plan. I think it is absurd enough that they are getting a salary, much less asking for a pension plan at a cost to hard working Canadian citizens.

I also wonder why it is that the Liberals keep hanging on to this and why it is they try to keep mixing it up with the statement that we are not paid enough, we need a future, we need a pension plan. I cannot understand how they are missing the boat. I guess it is political remoteness. They just do not understand.

Three bills have just gone through the House—this is the last one—where the government has restricted debate and enforced time limitation. They were Bill C-68, the gun law; Bill C-41, commonly known now as the hate law, and sex crimes too if we consider sexual orientation; and Bill C-85. All three are on very important issues and the government has the audacity to limit debate.

Some of the other bills which have gone through are just plain useless but government members debated and debated and debated. When it comes down to the three important bills which the government has goofed up on it limits debate. When we talk about political remoteness it is here in this House.

If the government thinks for a moment that this Reform Party is going away, it is just starting and it is growing. It is growing in Ontario, it is growing in Atlantic Canada. The government can stick to its polls. It tried that in the last election and there were 52 Reform MPs brought here. The government can stick to its polls but it will not work. The Liberals are going to the same Jurassic Park as that other group did. That is where they are going.

What is wrong with a plan that is no better than other people get; a one for one contribution? What is wrong with that? Why must they have more? What is in it for them? What is not in it for the taxpayer? People in my community do not understand it, yet Liberals say they represent people all across Canada. It is political remoteness.

(1315)

I have seen here problems with ethics, problems with integrity and problems with arrogance to the hilt. However the real problem in the House is a four-letter word called greed. It can be called nothing better than that.

**An hon. member:** It is a five-letter word.

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** That is what I should have said, five. I am only an accountant. I guess these things do not add up for me. That is how one gets out of it. That is why I have colleagues here. Accountants kind of get off track.

What really irritates in the whole discussion is when government members opposite have been known to say that the member for Beaver River is opportunistic in opting out or not opting into the plan. That is about as low as we can get from members opposite.

The individual is personally going to be out probably a couple of million dollars. That is not opportunistic. That is real commitment. That is the kind of commitment and principles one gets from this side, not the hogwash we have been hearing over there. They were the very people, when the Conservatives were over there, who stood over here and said: "You don't have any ethics. You don't have any integrity".

What is happening today? It is the same old story. Liberal, Tory, the same old story. The two words I want to talk about in the final analysis are my five-letter word and I do not even want to say how many letters are in retroactive. It does not matter.

The word retroactive will be indelible in the minds of Reformers. When we move opposite we will make a change. There will be changes to Bill C-68. There will be changes to Bill C-41 and there will be changes to Bill C-85. They had better remember the word retroactive.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it goes without saying that the issue of members' pensions is of interest to every member of Parliament as well as to Canadians in general.

[*English*]

Many have strong opinions as can be seen by the debate in the House today with members speaking both in support of and in opposition to Bill C-85.

There is one thing all members of the House can agree on: the bill before the House is an improvement on the existing pension plan. It is a step in the right direction. I understand hon. members opposite think it should go further, but it is a step in the right direction.

The basics of it are that we are living up to our red book commitment. Our red book commitment in the election campaign said that we would end double dipping: the practice of members leaving the House or leaving the Senate and getting another job on the federal public payroll or an appointment and being able to collect their pension and a salary at the same time. That is now over. That is over with the bill and it is over with the practice the Prime Minister instituted in Parliament in an

*Government Orders*

informal fashion prior to the bill formally being adopted and coming into law. That is covered.

Canadians are concerned that there be a minimum age, that members of Parliament leaving in their forties not be collecting a pension at such a young age. The age was reviewed by a commission of Parliament, the Lapointe commission which recommended age 55. A consultant study that was commissioned by the previous federal government also recommended age 55, and that is what is being implemented in Bill C-85. Again we have lived up to the commitment that was made in the election campaign to deal with the matter of a minimum age.

(1320)

We have gone beyond that because we have recognized in this time of fiscal restraint, this time of needing to reduce the cost of government, that we should take a leadership role and therefore we have by reducing the benefit rate for pensions collected by retired members of Parliament. In doing so I have been able to cut the cost to the taxpayer by some 33 per cent. A 33 per cent reduction in the cost of the pension plan for members of Parliament is again an improvement, a step in the right direction.

We also have to look at the pension plan in the context of overall compensation for members of Parliament. That has been raised not only by the Lapointe commission and by the consultant study which said that we should go up in the salary and down in the pensions, keeping the overall remuneration level the same. Not only has it been suggested by them and by various witnesses who have appeared before the Lapointe commission, but it has also been a point that the Reform Party through its whip has particularly highlighted. The whip of the Reform Party was suggesting that we should perhaps be going up in salaries far in excess of what they are today, which would amount to increases in the neighbourhood of 100 per cent to 130 per cent.

We just cannot afford to do that. For the Reform Party to suggest in this time of fiscal restraint that we should have those kinds of salary increases is a terribly unreasonable position and not one that I am sure would be supported by the taxpayers at all.

We have to look at the total context of the compensation package here. Members of Parliament have chosen to pay more for pensions, for having that kind of benefit when they leave the House, and to sacrifice a higher salary level than the Reform Party whip and others have recommended.

While they talk about the pension being greater than what other people may get in the private sector, they fail to point out that members of Parliament pay a lot more. With any pension plan, whether it be private sector or public sector, one gets according to the amount of money one invests in it. Members of Parliament invest a substantial amount more. That is something they conveniently overlook.

In putting this matter in the context of total compensation, there are some words that are particularly important to note because they were used by a member of the Lapointe commission, Professor C. E. S. Franks from Queen's University. He later appeared before the standing committee of the House reviewing Bill C-85. I think he put the matter in a good context and it is relevant to quote his words. He said:

The majority of ex-MPs have served too short a time, in fact less than six years, to receive any parliamentary pension whatsoever. In fact a great many ex-members not only do not have a pension but have a difficult time in finding employment and re-establishing themselves after serving as a member.

Professor Franks went on to say:

The issue of MP pensions should more appropriately be considered in the context of overall remuneration of elected representatives. Members of Parliament are significantly less well paid than other Canadian professionals. International comparisons prove Canadian MPs to be among the lowest paid. If other factors were to be taken into account, like the length of sessions, the opportunities for other income generating activities, the likelihood of serving long enough to make a career as a politician and to earn a pension sufficient for support in old age, then Canadian elected representatives are even worse off than those of other countries. This low remuneration has effect on representation in Canada.

Professor Franks went on further in his testimony to indicate:

A higher proportion of Canadian MPs choose voluntarily to retire from the House and not to run in an election than leave by any means, death, defeat or desire, than in Britain, than the United States or continental Europe.

There is something deeply dissatisfying in the work world of the Canadian member of Parliament to create such a rapid turnover and desire to leave. It might be argued that this turnover does not matter and that a steady influx of new members is a good thing in the House, but what happens in Canada goes beyond what is a good thing.

Comparative studies of legislatures and the legislative process have shown that a necessary requirement and precondition for a strong legislature, independent and effective representation, and strong legislative committees is a body of experience, experienced long term members who make a career in the legislature.

The Canadian Parliament does not have this sort of long serving membership. The Canadian Parliament is correspondingly weakened in its ability to hold government accountable, in its efforts to obtain redress of grievances for citizens, and in its debate and investigation of important issues.

(1325)

The important point illustrated by his words is that the failure to appropriately compensate members of Parliament weakens the institution and in turn is detrimental to Canadians.

*Government Orders*

He also noted, as did other witnesses, that half of former MPs go without any pension. We are talking about a situation where half the people in the House will never collect a pension. There is not an enormous cost to the Canadian taxpayer when we consider that. Members put in a lot of time and effort and do not receive any pension or contribution from the government.

The Reform Party prefers to point out that there are some members who might do well with a pension because of their length of service. They have even used some figures they obtained from the National Citizens' Coalition. I have looked at those figures and they are wildly out of line with reality. They are just not true at all.

For example, they used one figure of \$2.5 million relevant to one member of the House when the actual figure is almost half that in terms of the accumulation of a pension collection over a great number of years. The assumption is that the member would be leaving now and collecting a pension until age 70. There is also the assumption that the inflation rate is 5 per cent. The inflation rate is actually less than half of that. The figures were grossly exaggerated. Again I point out that only half the members who leave the House receive a pension.

Professor Franks' comments, the Sobeco, Ernst & Young report, the Lapointe commission and the hon. whip of the Reform Party have all raised the question of why we do not raise the salaries. We just cannot. Members of Parliament have had their salaries frozen for some six years now. Public servants' salaries have also been frozen. In this kind of climate it would be a bad message and bad point of leadership to suggest that we should increase our salaries. I am sorry, I say to the whip of the Reform Party and other members who support him. We just cannot in this context deal with a salary increase.

Meanwhile, we have indicated strong leadership in terms of moving in the right direction, living up to our commitments made during the election campaign as printed in the red book, and reducing the cost of the pension plan to the taxpayers by some 33 per cent.

[*Translation*]

It is anticipated that the amendments proposed in Bill C-85 will result in annual savings of some \$3.3 million.

[*English*]

This bill is a move in the right direction. It reduces the overall cost of the MP pension plan to taxpayers.

**Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the hon. member for Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt.

I point out to the House at the outset that I am not pleased with the method the government is using to force this particularly biased legislation through the House.

(1330)

The government cannot be at all comfortable with this legislation or it would allow members of Parliament free debate. That is not happening. What do we see? We see a government slipping this through as quickly as possible during the last day in an attempt to hide it from public scrutiny.

Canadians are not stupid. They will see through this strategy, through the government's attempt to put one over at the very last minute. They will not be fooled by this undemocratic strategy.

The Liberals, like the government before them, are underestimating the Canadian public. The new plan does not address Canadians' demands for a fair system of MP pensions. The new plan is hardly any better or any different from the old plan.

It provides for a few adjustments by taking from one area and adding somewhere else, all at taxpayers' expense of course. This plan simply raises members' take home salary by reducing MP contribution rates.

Liberals in the committee on procedure and House affairs excluded witnesses from coming forward to speak on the bill. The government claimed it would allow witnesses only who could prove they were experts in MP pensions in an effort to eliminate groups such as the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, which has been very outspoken in its efforts to push the government into bringing MP pensions in line.

The government's exclusionary tactics have denied ordinary Canadians the right to appear before committee to express their views. Who does the government think pays the MP pensions? The Canadian taxpayers do and they deserve a right to be before the committee and have their views heard.

The Liberals in committee also objected to witnesses who refer to the trough goers in derogatory terms unless they jammed all the witnesses into a one-day session. It appears when it comes to the greedy personal interests of members across the floor, there simply cannot be any discussion.

Regardless of general consensus against the new plan by witnesses, the Liberal majority on the standing committee after just 12 minutes of deliberations pushed the bill through with not one change at all, what a sham.

We now see why the ethics commissioners is only a figure-head. It is because there are no ethics regarding policies of the members opposite. Why should taxpayers have to continue to pay this ridiculous subsidy to members of Parliament?

One witness to the standing committee estimated the new pension plan is seven times more generous than the typical public sector plan and four times more generous than the typical private sector plan.

*Government Orders*

MPs are in a very privileged position. Unlike most working Canadians, they can set their own remuneration. MPs set their salaries, their perks and their pensions. This is a heavy responsibility which few are entrusted with, and with that responsibility comes a great deal of trust and expectation for fellow Canadians.

The very nature of this pension plan is an abuse of not only MP privileges but also an abuse of the legislation that governs Canadians. The plan is out of line with regulations and rules governing pensions in the Income Tax Act.

I make reference to the accrual rate. The Income Tax Act allows only a 2 per cent accrual rate. The previous MP pension plan allowed for a 5 per cent accrual. This plan drops it to four, still twice that of the Income Tax Act.

Why are MPs different? The Liberals say they are proposing to reduce the amount of pensions, raise the minimum age for collecting pensions and eliminate double dipping. They will not say the full extent of the plan and why it is so distasteful that 52 Reform MPs, all Reform MPs, and a few ethical Liberal MPs will have nothing to do with it and will volunteer to opt out of the plan.

In addition, the Liberals in their amendments to this plan have taken the liberty of giving themselves a better deal by reducing MP contributions from 11 per cent to 9 per cent. In doing so what have they done? They have actually given themselves a raise as their take home pay will be increased by the reduction in the contributions—here we go again.

It is obvious the self-serving interests of some members on the opposite side have dictated the contents of the bill. It would be far better for MP pensions to be set up by an independent body at arm's length to the government.

Obviously many members cannot handle this responsibility themselves. At least at arm's length the agency would be better able to make an objective assessment of MP pensions.

Members on the opposite side are arguing the new MP pension plan is fair just because they feel they work hard and deserve fair compensation. For many MPs it appears their definition of fair compensation should be much more fair than for other Canadians.

(1335)

I am sure many Canadians would be more than pleased to receive such generous compensation packages they were allowed, but they cannot play by the same rules.

This plan is not realistic and cannot be extended to the public because if it did we would bankrupt the country. Members with any conscience will think twice before gorging into this tax trough and will opt out. Members here to serve Canada and not themselves will and should do the right thing.

It is not easy to give up a hefty sum of tax dollars but if members think this over carefully and weigh it in their conscience, those who have one, they will do the right thing and opt out of the plan.

This newly revised trough plan will become very evident to Canadians and they will demand their MP take the decent course of action and stop robbing their tax dollars. They will demand their MP take the high road and opt out. Many will see why the Liberals are attempting to push the bill through. This plan will make many of these politicians millionaires. These MPs do not want to give up such a lucrative fortune, let alone negotiate a normal pension. They refuse to be pressured by the electorate to get their hands out of the cookie jar and start doling out taxpayers dollars fairly.

However, the Liberals have failed to gauge the mood of the voting public, just as the Conservatives did. The Liberals will suffer the same fate for not listening. This is what the Liberals fear, reprisals from their own constituents. That is why the government will not allow a simple provision in the bill for MPs to opt out at any time, not just a once only window but any time.

The Liberals clearly want to protect their fortunes. They have no scruples to lay off public servants, cut back on medicare funding or social services as long as they can protect their own greedy little self-interest. They tell Canadians to cut back and make sacrifices, but sacrifices are easy when they are in somebody else's backyard or come out of somebody else's pocket.

It is time for the government to look in its own backyard and do what Canadians expect, offer an MP pension plan similar to that available in the private sector.

I support an MP pension plan comparable to those which Canadians receive in the private sector and which meets all the requirements for registration under the Income Tax Act. The bill does not accomplish this as it stands. I, along with most Canadians, will have no part of it. All 52 Reform MPs will be opting out of the plan and it will save Canadian taxpayers \$38 million.

I want the members opposite to clearly understand that when Reform forms the next government, the Liberals can kiss their extravagant pension plan goodbye. Reform will retroactively adjust all present and past pensions for any living MP to reasonable levels. We will remove the porkers from the trough because the government, as reflected in Bill C-85, is incapable of doing what Canadians expect. Old style politics lives on. The Conservatives paid the price for not listening and the Liberals are about to suffer the same fate.

**Mr. Julian Reed (Halton—Peel, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I remind my friend from Comox—Alberni his accusation of the government's not reading the mood of the people is quite interesting. The latest polls came out this morning, showing the Reform Party at a resounding 10 per cent. That is a drop of about half from what it was at the time of the election.

*Government Orders*

I ask the hon. member if he has ever terminated employment at some time and tried to resume a career after that termination? The hon. member is probably not as old as I am and so he is probably more marketable as a commodity in the private sector than I am at my age.

(1340)

A large number of his colleagues in the Reform Party will be facing that onerous challenge at the end of this term, the challenge of resuming a career in the private sector. Members of the Reform Party for the sake of the people who will follow them, some will be Reform members, should think seriously about that.

I have had that experience. Being self-employed I thought it would be the easiest thing in the world to terminate my career in Ontario politics and resume my previous career. It took four years to resume that income level, that level of activity. When I went back I was a different person. Many of my colleagues I have worked with and worked for prior to that time had gone on to other things and some had even died. It was a matter of starting all over again.

I respectfully ask the member, whose righteousness reflects his colleagues', if he has ever had that experience and if he really knows what it is like to go back.

**Mr. Gilmour:** Madam Speaker, on the first point on the polls, only one poll will count. The Conservatives found that in the last election and it will be the same poll for these people. They are on a downhill slide. Self-serving legislation like this will not do them any good at all.

On the second point of the hon. member's question, the purpose of coming to Parliament as an MP is not to set yourself up because you cannot get a job when you go out. If you were good enough when you came into this place you will find a job when you go back out.

I do not expect any guarantees when I go out of this place. I will not set myself up and use this place as a big trough to get in knee deep so that I can set myself up on the way out.

I will go out with a normal pension or I will go out with no pension at all. This is not the place to set ourselves up for the future.

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the member talked about our ramming it through. I wonder how he can say that when the bill has been around since the end of April. Prior to that Reformers questioned us for some period of time, when would we bring in the bill. They were so anxious to have it that when we finally brought it in they asked why we are putting it through.

The issue has been around since the last election. It was around during the last election. It has certainly been around through this Parliament. I do not understand how they can say we are ramming it through. As well, at committee they did not even move any amendments. I do not understand that. Perhaps he could explain that a little further.

Also on the question of the Income Tax Act, I do not understand it because this complies with the act. There is additional compensation but it is paid for by the members. I do not understand the member's—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I am sorry, there is barely any time, 30 seconds. The hon. member Comox—Alberni.

**Mr. Gilmour:** Madam Speaker, if we are not ramming this legislation through why are we standing here on the last day of the session talking about it? If it has been around for so long, explain why we are here on the last day.

Good grief, that answers it right there. Give me a break.

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I rise on behalf of the constituents of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt to speak to Bill C-85, the government's bill to amend the pension plan for members of Parliament.

The Reform Party of Canada in response to pre-election demands of Canadians promised to make changes to the MP pension plan one of our highest priorities. We promised radical change to the plan.

The Liberals have waited a very long time. They are merely tinkering with this plan.

(1345)

In my recent householder I conducted a poll of my constituents. Seventy-seven per cent of the respondents believed that members of Parliament should have a pension plan. Eighty-nine per cent said that the current MPs pension plan should be reformed so it cannot be collected until age 60. They also said that the rates and contribution levels should conform with private sector plans.

I would like to make this point very clear: I am opting out of the new plan, and it makes me very angry that this has to be done. Bill C-85 does not go far enough. It does not reflect what Canadians wanted. It is poor legislation.

In the 1990s job security has virtually disappeared across all sectors of the economy. MPs should not have a pension plan that tries to make up for periods of time when an MP becomes unemployed. The Liberals either do not understand that or they simply do not care.

*Government Orders*

The Reform Party was elected on a platform of fiscal responsibility. We will continue to pursue the Liberals in order to force them to respond to the desire of Canadians for leadership by example.

Bill C-85 does not propose a fiscally responsible pension plan. The opting out clause the government has provided can only be interpreted as an admission of a flaw in the new pension plan the Liberals have proposed. If the government had provided a pension plan that would allow members to contribute to their own registered retirement savings plan or a private sector company type of plan with a contribution system of one to one, everyone from all sides of the House would have supported that plan. All Canadians would have supported such a plan.

The Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act requires members of Parliament to contribute 11 per cent of their earnings. Seven per cent of the contributions go to the MP retirement compensation arrangement. Four per cent of contributions go to the retirement allowances account.

The opting out clause proposed by the Liberals is a facade. It is a no win situation for individual members of Parliament. If a member chooses to opt out he or she can roll over their entitlement, which is the 4 per cent, which is the contribution to the retirement allowances act, into a personal pension plan, an RRSP. That seems fair enough. However, the 7 per cent contribution to the retirement compensation arrangement must be taken by the member in a one time payout, a cheque, plus 4 per cent compounded interest. That one time payout is treated as taxable income in the year in which it is received by the member. Any accountant in the country would shudder at this punitive measure.

The Liberals are punishing members of Parliament for opting out of the plan. They can do this because the previous plan was one of mandatory participation, which is normal in any company pension plan. Under the previous plan members were unable to pay into their own RRSPs. Therefore, the opting out becomes a double whammy: number one, the 7 per cent is added to the member's annual income and is taxable in the year it is received; number two, the members lose the amount of time they spent in the old plan in terms of not being able to make up the lost contributions to their RRSPs.

As I said before, Bill C-85 is poor legislation. Again I will state very clearly that I am opting out of the plan. However, I am angry at the ramifications of opting out. The opting out clause is inequitable and unfair. There is no reason why it has to be this way.

Let me make it very simple for the Liberals across the way. Number one, make the MP pension plan reflect private sector standards. Number two, make the MP pension plan available to MPs upon their reaching the age of 60. Number three, if it is too difficult for the government to change the pension plan, simply

scrap it. Let members contribute to their own registered retirement savings plans.

(1350)

Where is the government's sense of responsibility? Where is their sense of morality in this proposed scheme? Where is their leadership? Where is the red book commitment?

Bill C-85 is a broken promise made to Canadians during an election campaign by the Liberals. This plan has not been changed in the way ordinary Canadians would have changed it. The government is putting this legislation on a fast track. The Liberals have placed a time limit on debate on this matter. But this issue is not going away.

It does not matter that the Liberals tried to sweep this one under the rug along with their sexual orientation bill and their gun registry bill. In their haste to dispose of the MP pension plan they have shown Canadians how careless they are with respect to this matter.

The Liberals will try to forget what they have done, but in their nightmares in the next election campaign they will be seeing their constituents vividly in technicolour holding up an MP pension placard and shouting "You broke your promise".

Ordinary Canadians are astounded that they supported the Liberals in the last election. The Liberals have not even come close in delivering on a promise of integrity and restoring confidence in the government.

When I look back to the image of the Conservative Party as pigs at a trough and remember the trouncing that party took at the ballot box, I have no sympathy for the Liberals. They are behaving in the same way as their predecessors. The Tories had two consecutive majority governments reduced to two seats in this Parliament because they would not respect the desires of ordinary Canadians. This Liberal government has not learned the lessons of the Canadian electorate taught by the Tories. This government has the gall to pass pathetic legislation by limiting debate. I can hardly wait for the next election.

The House of Commons, by its name, by its very nature, and by the history that has created this Chamber and our parliamentary system, is supposed to be an arena for the common person to voice his or her concerns before the state. All of us in this place are commoners. The Liberals do not understand that we are representatives of the people and at the same time we are one with the people.

The policies and programs coming from this place should be in line with the common will of the people. Bill C-85 continues to provide members of this Chamber with million dollar pension plans. There is nothing common about such a policy. The Liberals are continuing to ensure that this House of Commons remains a manor of millionaires.

*S. O. 31*

Mr. Speaker, I do not support this legislation. I thank you for your time today.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who just spoke has misled people listening to the debate because he suggested the Liberal government in introducing this bill failed to honour the commitments and promises it made in respect of the pension plan in this country for MPs.

As he will acknowledge, I am sure, in his answer to this comment, the Liberal government promised two things in the red book: to end double dipping for members of Parliament and to install a minimum age for the pension plan so that members under a certain age could not collect. He knows the minimum age provided in the bill before the House is 55; he knows this bill ends double dipping. He should come clean with Canadians and admit that not only has the government fulfilled all of the commitments it made in the red book in respect of the pension plan, but it went further. It reduced the cost of the pension to Canadian taxpayers by one-third by reducing the contribution rate so that members are ineligible to receive the full pension after 15 years and now it will be 19 years. Why does the member do that?

(1355)

Besides suggesting that, he is also pretending to be outraged on the part of the Reform Party with his pension and claims that he is not going to collect his pension. He will not for the very good reason that a member has to be elected twice to this Chamber to collect, and he will have grave difficulty doing that. He knows that in his heart of hearts.

Is he not doing what the other Reformers are doing, opting out of the pension in order to squeeze out of the required contributions and put that money in their pockets instead of facing reality and acknowledging that what other people are doing here is right, honest, and fair?

**The Speaker:** The hon. member has about one minute.

**Mr. Hart:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question.

I knew what I was getting into when I ran for election for the good people of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt. If I do not win in the next election, that will not be a decision made by you but by the good people of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt.

**The Speaker:** Order. The hon. member will please address his remarks to the Chair.

**Mr. Hart:** Of course I meant you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** That is even worse. You have 30 seconds to wrap it up.

**Mr. Hart:** Mr. Speaker, in respect to the pension plan itself and the Liberal commitments, I would like to make a few comments regarding the new pension scheme.

Under the current pension scheme members of Parliament pay approximately 11 per cent into their plan and under the new scheme they will pay 7 per cent. The witnesses who came before the committee were quite clear: they reported it should be 26 per cent. We should actually be putting in approximately \$19,000 to make it actuarially sound.

**The Speaker:** My colleagues, I regret to intervene, but it being 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing order 30(5), the House will now proceed to statements by members.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

### PEACEKEEPING

**Mr. Harry Verran (South West Nova, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the recent opening of the Lester B. Pearson Canadian International Peacekeeping Training Centre at the former military base in Cornwallis.

All of Canada should be proud of the centre and the ability it has already demonstrated to draw an international multidisciplinary clientele to the Annapolis Valley and to the riding of South West Nova. We hope this centre will continue the tradition of peacekeeping established by former Prime Minister Lester Pearson.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, visiting us in the gallery today are the following dignitaries from South West Nova: the MLA for Argyle; the warden of the municipality of Argyle; the warden of Yarmouth County; the mayor of the town of Yarmouth; and the chairman of the Yarmouth Development Authority. I welcome them to this House.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### QUEBEC SOVEREIGNTY

**Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it was five years ago today that the Meech Lake accord was dealt a death-blow. The member for Churchill and Clyde Wells, the current Prime Minister's accomplice, refused to ratify the accord.

"Thanks for the job", said the current Prime Minister of Canada to Clyde Wells, when he clutched him in his arms after becoming leader of the Liberal Party in Calgary.

On that day, thousands of Canadians told Quebecers: "No, you are not a distinct society. Even your most basic demands are unacceptable. You are a province just like the others. Shape up or ship out".

This has now become the Prime Minister's slogan. The choice for Quebecers is to either resign themselves or take control of their destiny. Quebecers will have to make a decision this fall, with the referendum on sovereignty.

[English]

### CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

**Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I requested information through the Access to Information Act concerning a briefing note to the Solicitor General from the RCMP officer who mishandled my request for an investigation into the Canadian Wheat Board.

The briefing note merely explains how my claims were mishandled, which includes the officer's error in not opening a separate file, and subsequent reports. No file or report exists.

The Canadian Wheat Board, on the other hand, insists on laying charges against individual farmers exporting grain without an export permit.

Farmers are merely trying to eke out a living and draw attention to the fact that somebody is ripping them off, yet the RCMP maintains an extensive file and reports on these farmers.

I ask: What is wrong with this picture?

\* \* \*

### ANTIQUÉ CARS

**Mr. Ivan Grose (Oshawa, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Automotive Museum in Oshawa will be hosting for the next year the McDougall collection of 21 antique cars. This collection has been declared Canadian cultural property by the Canadian Property Export Review Board.

It includes a rare supercharged 1928 Mercedes-Benz, the same year as the first car I had only it was a Ford which went for \$15 scrap. I always buy the wrong model. Also included is an Issotta Fraschini once owned by the King of Spain.

For car buffs this provides a rare opportunity to see a priceless collection. For everyone else, come see us in beautiful Oshawa, the city that "motovates" Canada.

\* \* \*

### VESELKA UKRAINIAN CULTURE AND HERITAGE CHURCH

**Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Prince Albert—Churchill River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that the Veselka Ukrainian Culture and Heritage Church in my constituency of Prince Albert—Churchill River is celebrating its fourth annual summer festival on July 7 and 8, 1995.

For many years this church has promoted, fostered and maintained the Ukrainian legacy and culture in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan and area. Its festival comes at an especially important time as the Prince Albert city council has declared the

*S. O. 31*

first week of July Ukrainian Festival Week. During this week there will be many events capturing the spirit and traditions of the Ukraine.

I would like to extend my most sincere congratulations to the Veselka Ukrainian Culture and Heritage Church for its commitment to excellence. Its members have proven through their hard work the benefits of a multicultural and diverse Canada.

On behalf of the House, I would like to wish them all the best for this festival and in the future.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### QUEBEC REGIONS

**Mr. Bernard Deshaies (Abitibi, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Minister of Canadian Heritage showed a lack of respect in this House for Quebec regions by using the expression "reculées", which means out of the way. The words used by the minister clearly show his lack of knowledge regarding Quebec regions, their vitality and their pride. People who live in distant regions, particularly in the Abitibi region, which I represent, cannot accept the message conveyed by the minister that these regions are backward.

The regions form the very core of Quebec's identity, an identity which is promoted on the international scene. To say that these regions are out of the way is to offend hundreds of thousands of Quebecers, particularly when that statement comes from another Quebecer who is supposed to represent them.

I urge the minister to show respect to Quebec regions by retracting the very derogatory comments he made yesterday.

\* \* \*

[English]

### LAC BARRIÈRE BAND

**Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in early May I asked some questions in the House regarding allegations of sexual abuse and misappropriation of funds at the Lac Barrière band. I got no answers on the first occasion and inaccurate responses on the second.

Therefore, my colleague for North Island—Powell River and I met with a segment of the band in late May and then visited the reserve yesterday.

Despite the minister's knowledge of concerns regarding sexual abuse of young band members and financial irregularities involving members of the Liberal Party at Lac Barrière for the past year, no apparent progress has been made in confirming or denying these allegations.



*S. O. 31*

If there is substance to the allegations, they should be dealt with as soon as possible. If there is no substance, they should be thrown out to prevent further division in the community.

[*Translation*]

I demand that the minister initiate a judicial inquiry to shed light on the whole issue, so that members of the band can finally get on with their lives. These people are tired of the government's rhetoric: they want to see results.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

### HOUSE OF COMMONS SECURITY SERVICES

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my sincere congratulations to the men and women of the House of Commons security services who are celebrating their 75th anniversary this year.

(1405)

In 1920 the House of Commons passed a bill which brought about the creation of the protective service. This service was given responsibility for the protection of members of the House, of visiting dignitaries and of the countless visitors and tourists who come to see the Parliament buildings every year.

I am now in my 17th year as a member of Parliament and I can say that I have never once had a complaint about the very professional service provided by these very dedicated men and women.

On behalf of the NDP caucus, and I am sure all members present, I commend them for a job well done. May we never see the day when anybody entertains the idea of contracting out this service. We have lost too many good public servants that way already.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### NATIONAL UNITY

**Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, Quebecers will celebrate Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day. I would like to send all Quebecers my best wishes for a wonderful day.

All Canadians who want to keep the country together and who wish to say "My Canada includes Quebec" truly value the richness of the francophone culture.

According to the polls, most Quebecers want the same thing: united, we are strong, and we can remain united in our diversity.

Canada is a country which is very respected abroad. People everywhere think that we are the last paradise on earth. In one

week, Canadians are going to celebrate Canada Day: on that day we celebrate wide horizons, vast prairies, high mountains, enormous lakes and the multicultural communities in our exceptional country.

All these special gifts can be enjoyed throughout Canada, including Quebec.

I would like to ask my colleagues and all Canadians to celebrate Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day and Canada Day together, in a spirit of harmony and peace.

\* \* \*

### QUEBEC REFERENDUM

**Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as usual, the leader of the Bloc Québécois did not wait for his separatist partners to make an important announcement.

Yesterday, during a press conference, the leader of the Bloc declared that, starting tomorrow, the referendum will be its focus. From then on, the referendum issue will be its only concern.

This came as no surprise since, in fact, the Bloc Québécois has always put its concerns as separatists before its responsibilities as the official opposition.

After having forced the PQ leader to "change his position" and the young Mario Dumont to become an "associate", are we to understand that, by being the one to announce the beginning of the referendum campaign, the leader of the Bloc Québécois has proclaimed himself the leader of the yes side.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

### UNITED NATIONS

**Mr. John English (Kitchener, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago on June 26, 1945, toward the end of the war that shattered nations and killed tens of millions of people, the governments of the world agreed to a United Nations charter.

With the hope of creating a collective security that would prevent future global conflicts, leaders envisaged the UN as the essential body for observing world peace. In exemplary fashion, Canada went to San Francisco committed to the dream of a world where swords would be replaced by ploughshares.

In co-operation with other nations, Canada has sought to realize the goals of the charter through a range of missions: from humanitarian aid to committing peacekeeping troops to troubled areas throughout the world.

As a middle power, Canada has earned world respect for its role in brokering peace agreements and in its unwavering efforts in fostering sustainable human development for those countries burdened by political and economic repression.

S. O. 31

In this year, the 50th anniversary of the United Nations, I ask that all Canadians reflect on the values and principles of this body. Let us recall that the first words of the charter are "We the people". In truth, the UN is us, the dream of what we, the people, might best be.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### FÊTE NATIONALE DU QUÉBEC

**Mr. Laurent Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, Quebecers will be celebrating the fête nationale du Québec on June 24.

For centuries, we have been celebrating the summer solstice with bonfires. In 1834, the newspaper editor Ludger Duvernay organized the first celebration symbolizing the struggle of French Canadians to survive. Over the years, this celebration has become an opportunity for Quebecers to show their determination to create a country for themselves.

Proclaimed fête nationale du Québec in 1977, June 24 has become a day for all inhabitants of Quebec.

This year, Quebecers are invited to celebrate their sense of community at over 700 sites throughout Quebec. Next year, if such is the wish of the people, we will be celebrating our country, our Quebec, on that day.

\* \* \*

[English]

### PENSIONS

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, as the government passes the MP pension bill this afternoon may it ponder this poem called *The Man in the Glass*:

When you get what you want in your struggle for life  
And the world makes you king for a day,  
Just go to a mirror and look at yourself,  
And see what that man has to say.  
For it isn't your father or mother or wife,  
Whose judgement upon you must pass,  
The fellow whose verdict counts most in your life,  
Is the one staring back from the glass.  
Some people may think you a straight-shooting chum,  
And call you a wonderful guy;  
But the man in the glass says you're only a bum,  
If you can't look him straight in the eye.  
He's the fellow to please, never mind all the rest,  
For he's with you clear up to the end,  
And you've passed your most dangerous, difficult test  
If the man in the glass is your friend.  
You may fool the whole world down the pathway of life,  
And get pats on your back as you pass,  
But your final reward will be heartaches and tears,  
If you've cheated the man in the glass.

(1410)

MP pensions: Reformers opt out, Liberals cop out. Shame.

### DAIRY INDUSTRY

**Mr. Murray Calder (Wellington—Grey—Dufferin—Simcoe, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there is a saying around my farm that if it ain't broke, don't fix it. In other words, if something is running smoothly, do not tempt fate to try to make it better.

That is what is happening within the Canadian dairy industry as it relates to the introduction of BST as an enhancer of milk production. Our milk is among the purest. Our cows are among the highest producing in the world. However, there are those who would tamper with this system even though the economic gain to farmers is insignificant when compared to the damage it will do to the dairy industry.

I cannot understand, given the health of the industry, why it is necessary to even contemplate the introduction of BST.

The moratorium on the sale of BST will expire on July 1 unless extended by Health Canada. I would ask that before any decision is made to licence BST, the minister not only consider the damage that might be done to the dairy industry, but the possibility that the long term health of both animals and humans may be at risk.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### VILLAGE OF OKA

**Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, as the member for Argenteuil—Papineau, I rise in the House to speak on behalf of the people of Oka who met recently to discuss the catastrophic situation in their town, five years after what was referred to as the Oka crisis.

Every resident looks forward to the time when peace and calm will return to a municipality where all citizens can live together without fear, and those sentiments are shared by the vast majority of the Mohawks of Kanesatake.

The people of Oka want governments, both federal and provincial, to make a clear statement on all issues concerning aboriginal lands, so as to restore a normal social climate and public security, and to ensure that real estate values and insurance premiums revert to normal levels.

By requesting concrete political action on the part of both levels of government, the people of Oka want to recover their enjoyment of certain freedoms, a basic right that is part of the philosophy of all Quebecers and all Canadians.

*Oral Questions*

[English]

**CANADA POST**

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, as the Reform critic for the post office, I keep receiving disturbing reports of the unfair competitive practices of Canada Post in ad mail delivery and courier services.

Private sector companies and individuals are being undercut and destroyed by Canada Post, which uses its first class monopoly revenue to subsidize the operations in these competitive fields.

It is unconscionable that the very firms which try to earn a living for their employees and pay taxes to the federal government are now being annihilated by this predatory crown corporation.

A recent consultant's report shows that 75 per cent of Canada Post's overhead is charged against its first class letter mail while only 1.7 per cent of the overhead is charged against competitive operations, despite the fact that the first class mail is only 45 per cent of its operation.

We believe that it is wrong, wrong, wrong to use the clout of a huge government granted monopoly to wipe out small businesses. Where is the conscience of the government? When will it bring this immoral practice to a halt?

\* \* \*

**PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

**The Speaker:** I would like to bring to the attention of members the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Anne Edwards, Minister of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources of the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia.

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

**The Speaker:** I would also like to bring to the attention of members the presence in the gallery of the Rev. the Hon. Frederick Nile and the Hon. Elaine Nile, members of the Legislative Council of New South Wales.

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

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

(1415)

[Translation]

**CHILE'S ACCESSION TO NAFTA**

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of International Trade stated that, if Chile wanted to join NAFTA this would not

require reopening the agreement and only technical changes would be necessary to admit a fourth country to NAFTA.

My question is directed to the Prime Minister. Would he confirm his minister's statement to the effect that Chile's admission to NAFTA would not require opening the agreement but merely some technical changes?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, according to the agreement, Chile or other countries can join NAFTA if they accept the terms negotiated by Canada, Mexico and the United States. The consent of Mexico, Canada and the United States is required if another country wishes to join. Provided Chile does not request major changes, the agreement provides that other countries may join, subject to the approval of participating members of NAFTA.

I know Chile is anxious to join NAFTA, and Canada is very supportive of Chile's bid at this time. In fact, this government has always maintained it did not want an exclusively bilateral agreement with the United States. We feel it is very useful to have an agreement that includes Mexico and other countries, since this would counterbalance the enormous power of the United States.

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, what I understood from the Prime Minister's reply is that if Chile meets the criteria for membership, reopening the agreement will not be necessary.

I want to ask the Prime Minister whether we can assume from what he said that the same scenario and the same reasoning will prevail in the case of a sovereign Quebec?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, that depends on whether the parties to NAFTA agree unconditionally. Personally, I think I am answering a purely hypothetical question. I know Quebec will not become independent. Since Quebec is already part of NAFTA, why get out and then get back in, when you are already in?

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the question is not hypothetical, since the treaty exists and the parties felt the need to negotiate clause 2204, a clause of accession that opens membership to all those who wish to join.

I want to ask the Prime Minister whether he would agree that Canada alone does not have the power to prevent Quebec from joining NAFTA and that the only thing Canada can do is get out if Quebec becomes a member.

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** No, Mr. Speaker. It is clear that Canada is a member of NAFTA and that Quebec is already part of NAFTA. If Quebec wants to get out of NAFTA, that is up to Quebec. However, if Quebec wants to get back in, the consent of all members is required, as in the case of Chile or any other country. A member may propose new conditions for membership, in which case NAFTA would have to be amended.

*Oral Questions*

I do not know the status of current negotiations with Chile, but if Chile does not request changes to NAFTA, there will be no problem. If it requests changes to NAFTA, this will require the consent of Canada, Mexico and the United States. So it is certainly much better to be part of the agreement now, than to have to go and negotiate if you want to become a member.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's answers do little more than give Quebecers cause for fear or doubt. The Prime Minister has already cast doubt on the rapid inclusion of a sovereign Quebec in NAFTA.

My question is very simple and as follows. Given that trade between Canada and Quebec is 153 times that between Canada and Chile, will the Prime Minister undertake to work hard to have Quebec included in NAFTA quickly, following sovereignty?

(1420)

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Quebec is a member of NAFTA. Everyday I work to ensure that Quebec benefits from NAFTA. So why ask me to work harder than I am at the moment?

However, if we are talking hypothetically, I am not sure the rest of Canada will want to retain the privileges farmers currently enjoy. If consumers in Ontario can get milk, butter and cheese more cheaply from the United States, if Quebec leaves, and since dairy production is not a question of French or English, but simply of providing dairy products, they will want to take advantage of the better price. So the best way to protect products from Quebec within the Canadian market is to remain Canadian.

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

**Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice):** Remaining Canadian means being a member of NAFTA. However, those who want to leap into the void may do so. But Quebecers know they are very happy in Canada and they want to stay here. This is clear, and I am convinced of it. I am all the more convinced because the Leader of the Opposition does not even have the courage to tell Quebecers the truth he told the Americans: "I am a separatist".

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, speaking of having the courage to tell the truth, the Prime Minister is in no position to tell anyone anything.

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

**Mr. Gauthier:** We know that Quebec is a member of NAFTA, just like Prince Edward Island. Given that trade between Canada and Quebec is 153 times greater than it is between Canada and Chile—since we are talking figures here, it should be clear—and given that 250,000 workers in Ontario owe their living to the trade relations between Ontario and Quebec, my question is as

follows. In the light of the stakes, will the Prime Minister tell us—yes or no—as the Prime Minister of the rest of Canada, after sovereignty, whether he will assume his responsibilities and see that Quebec's entry into NAFTA is facilitated?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am sitting pretty now. The Bloc Québécois, the official opposition, wants me to remain Prime Minister of Canada to defend the interests of Quebec. That is quite something.

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

**Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice):** Mr. Speaker, the best way for Quebecers to ensure I remain Prime Minister of Canada is to remain Canadians.

\* \* \*

[English]

**GOVERNMENT POLICIES**

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, while Her Majesty's temporary opposition focuses on breaking up the country, our job here is to focus on issues essential to maintaining and advancing this country.

One of those issues is correcting deficiencies in the federal administration. The Minister of Canadian Heritage is lost in a cloud of conflict of interest. The defence minister is in the dark on Bosnia and Somalia. The minister of human resources has bungled social reform. The health minister has only band-aid solutions to health care. The minister of Indian affairs is sleep walking to a crisis in B.C. and the minister of public works is mired in patronage in Atlantic Canada.

Will the Prime Minister shuffle the chairs on the deck of the *Titanic* and relieve any or all of these ministers of their responsibilities over the summer?

(1425)

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** If the leader of the Reform Party really wants to become the leader of the second party, he should talk about something else because that issue is not producing a desirable effect. He is 10 points behind the Tories in the Gallup poll today.

I would give a little advice to the leader of third party. He should do what he intended to do just as he has done today. He scored more when he tried to create a better atmosphere in the House today when he agreed to proceed with the bill on DNA. That is the type of opposition that will increase the stature of the leader of the third party, then he would stop dropping in the polls. The rest of the time he chooses to repeat the same thing and he does not score with it. He should find a new tune.

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I would remind the captain of the *Titanic* it is a short step from being on top of the mountain to being over the hill.

Let me turn to the fiscal administration of the government. The Prime Minister has been strangely silent on the fact that Canadian exports fell in April for the third month, that wholesale trade has dropped sharply, that employment levels have been flat since November, that retail sales are stagnant and that housing starts are at their lowest point since 1982. It is quite apparent there was a gross deficiency in the fiscal planning of the government and that the finance minister did not go far enough fast enough in his budget. The chickens are coming home to roost.

My supplementary question is: Will the Prime Minister now direct the finance minister to present this House with a mid-course correction and have it ready when we reconvene this fall?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, you are very generous with the nature of the supplementary questions today.

The leader of the third party forgot to say that the OECD report published this week said the economic performance of Canada will be the best of all countries in the OECD ratings. The Minister of Finance had a very good budget which was extremely well received. We are on target. Our target to reduce the deficit to 3 per cent of GDP will be met next year as we predicted. Investment will carry on. Interest rates are going down at this moment, which is significant. A two point lower interest rate will help to stimulate the economy.

I have a lot of confidence in the Minister of Finance. He is doing a very good job.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister will not fix the cabinet nor will he fix the budget. So let us turn to the government's administration of the democratic process of this House.

Yesterday the Prime Minister was confronted with the broken red book promise on free votes. In reply the Prime Minister protested that he let government MPs vote on certain amendments earlier in the week. The Prime Minister said he let them vote. The MP's right to vote in this House is not some privilege granted to him by the executive. It is a right that comes from the people and MPs have the right to exercise their vote without threats of punishment or discipline.

Will the Prime Minister end this session on a positive and democratic note by turning to the backbenchers in his own party and assuring them of their right to vote their constituents' wishes without fear of threats or punishment from the Prime Minister or the whip?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the leader of the third party has a very broad shopping list today. He is trying to recuperate. Sometimes it is good to climb a mountain but do not try to do it backward. He has gone from 20 to 10 and is dropping. That is not the way to get to the top.

(1430)

When I talk about the democracy in this party I do not have to add anything. The leader of that party has thrown critics out of different positions, three of them. He has done it. Now he is telling me that I am too tough.

When the question was raised in the House of Commons yesterday, Liberal members reacted very positively. We have an agenda as a government. We are respecting the agenda of the government and we will carry on. When it is time for an election, I will have my red book with me and I will be able to show all the progress we have made and all the commitments we have fulfilled.

I remember the Reform Party telling everybody that political parties should not accept any money from the government. Everyone took the refunds from the Chief Electoral Officer after the last election, contrary to the sanctimonious speech of the leader of the third party, which will remain the third party.

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

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**EMPLOYMENT CENTRES**

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

Ignoring the real needs of the unemployed, who account for roughly 11 per cent of Quebec's workforce after five months without any job creation worth mentioning, instead of thinking about expanding the vocational guidance and counselling services currently provided to a mere 10 per cent of those who lose their jobs, the government is preparing to reduce from over a 100 to just 28 the number of Canada employment centres in Quebec.

How can the Prime Minister explain that the first thing the government does after limiting access to UI and hitting Quebec UI recipients with \$725 million in cuts this year alone, is cut back the services provided to the unemployed?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to point out that no decision has been made concerning the CEC network in Quebec or anywhere else in Canada.

We are looking for a way to provide increased levels of service to our worker clients in the Province of Quebec, and I hope we can count on the hon. members' co-operation so that Quebecers can be provided with more efficient and relevant services. This afternoon, we will be meeting with Bloc members

*Oral Questions*

to look at the services available and see what could be done to better meet the needs expressed.

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, after making numerous inquiries about the proposed reorganization, asking the human resources development committee for information and being assured that our caucus would be informed, we learned this morning that all CEC employees have already been told which ones will be closed, undergo changes or remain open. As for the Bloc, only this afternoon will it be informed.

How can the minister justify waiting so long to inform us, unless it was to prevent us from doing our job as the official opposition?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to provide a small word of advice to the hon. member not to get too excited, because no decisions have been taken. The decisions will be taken in order to improve the service. We have made the offer to her caucus to consult with them, which we will be doing this afternoon, to develop the best information.

I can guarantee this hon. member and all members of the House that the reorganization and modernization of the service centres will provide better service, particularly in the smaller cities and rural areas of Canada. I can make that guarantee to the member.

\* \* \*

(1435)

### ECONOMY

**Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, as much as the Prime Minister wants to say the economy of Canada is good, it is not.

In 1993 the government inherited promising economic growth in the country. What has happened? Instead of nurturing the recovery that was there the government continued on an old pattern of spend and tax Canadians. The only growth policy the government could come up with was to devalue the dollar, resulting in an unbalanced recovery that has been entirely reliant on exports to the United States.

My question is for the Minister of Finance. Now that the U.S. economy is slowing and exports are dropping, what will he do to avert a recession, other than devaluing the currency?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member's statement does not coincide with the facts.

At the time we took office unemployment was at 11.5 per cent. It is now at 9.5 per cent. At the time we took office there were 433,000 fewer Canadians working than are working today. At the time we took office growth was anemic. The fact is that we have just come off one of the best years we have seen in a decade. In fact the OECD stated only yesterday that again this year Canada would lead all the G-7 nations.

The fact is that we have had a very good record, which is due to the policies of the government. We intend to continue those policies.

**Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance can say what he wants. There was some good growth in 1994, but today it is down to 0.7 per cent, which is a multiple drop. The Minister of Finance should admit that.

What we need at this time is an economic statement from the government indicating that the government has a plan to eliminate the deficit. Can we count on the Minister of Finance to present an economic statement this fall so we can go to the people of Canada and say this is how the government will get rid of the deficit and bring in a balanced budget before the end of this Parliament?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have made it very clear that it is our intention to eliminate the deficit. We have also made it very clear that it is our intention to put the country back into good economic shape. That means putting Canadians to work, it means preserving our social programs, and it means giving the country hope.

It is not the intention on this side of the House to bring in the kinds of scorch and burn policies the Reform Party would advocate. It is not the intention of this party to destroy the Canadian economy and the hopes of so many young. It is the intention of this party to do what Canadians want, and that is to make Canada live up to its potential. That means that we will take on anybody in the world.

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

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### DIRECT SATELLITE BROADCASTING

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

Following the public hearings regarding the draft orders in council on satellite television, Liberal MPs abdicated their responsibilities as parliamentarians by giving a blank cheque to the federal government. Unless the minister follows up on the Bloc's recommendations, the government will now go ahead

*Oral Questions*

with these made-to-measure orders for Power DirecTv, in which the Prime Minister's son-in-law has an interest.

Several witnesses heard during the public hearings strongly opposed the draft orders in council, because they will eventually make us lose control over the Canadian broadcasting system. Does the minister realize that, after the recording, publishing, video and film industries, he is about to hand over to Americans the last cultural stronghold still controlled by Canadians?

(1440)

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, after reading the communique released by the Bloc Québécois this afternoon, I think that the party should be called the "blague québécoise", the Quebec joke. We held all kind of consultations, including public ones, and we received the report of a committee of experts, as well as several submissions, including some from groups such as the Consumers' Association of Canada, Friends of Canadian Broadcasting and the Conference of the Arts. Those groups urged us to accept the proposals made by the committee of experts. I should also mention the majority report tabled by the committee, as well as the report of the Senate, where the government does not have a majority. We are told that we did the appropriate thing.

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Senate said that these orders were unconstitutional, but that the government could go ahead with them. This is some reference!

Will the Minister of Canadian Heritage admit—assuming he can answer before it is too late, since things could change between now and this fall—that if he goes ahead with his draft orders in council, he will not only undermine the CRTC's integrity and independence, but will also postpone Canada's access to direct satellite broadcasting and allow Power DirecTv, which is an American company, to maintain and expand its illegal market in Canada?

[English]

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think what all Canadians need to understand is how vital this part of the information highway infrastructure is going to be to Canadians. It is for that reason that we have been very concerned and very careful about ensuring that we see the creation of a framework within which we would have a competitive and open system.

The hon. member, who makes quite bizarre allegations on this issue, is trapped in her own rhetoric. The very groups that say the most about supporting Canadian culture have supported the approach the panel of experts recommended on this case.

What is clear to all Canadians is that we favour a system in which there will be licensing, competition, better choice and lower prices for consumers. The Bloc Québécois favours monopoly. It is as simple as that.

**TRANSPORT**

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport is determined to squander a billion dollars of the Canadian taxpayers' money.

Settlement of the unconstitutional cancellation of the Pearson contract will cost taxpayers between \$400 million and \$500 million. Even if the government manages to get Bill C-22 through the Senate somehow, constitutional experts have said it will be thrown out of court. On top of this, the minister is determined to pay additional money to Hughes for a contract that will provide less than contracted for and that is behind schedule.

Why does the minister not cancel the Hughes contract instead of the Pearson contract and save the Canadian taxpayers \$1 billion in the process?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, one of the things I have tried to avoid doing in answering some of the questions from the hon. critic for transportation for the third party is to take courses in dealing with split personalities to try to cope with them.

Mr. Speaker, if you listened to that question you would understand that on the one hand he is suggesting that we are going to lose \$400 million to \$500 million as a result of the cancellation of the Pearson contract.

We are on the record as saying that we will compensate for reasonable out of pocket expenses, not one cent more, regardless of who thinks, including the hon. member, that we should be taking care of people who have not driven a nail or laid an ounce of concrete at Pearson by giving them up to half a billion dollars.

With respect to Hughes, we have gone to the Auditor General of Canada. We are negotiating with Hughes. We recognize that there was mismanagement in that contract, both on the side of the government as well as by Hughes. We recognize that. We have admitted that publicly. Now we will do with Hughes what we are attempting to do with Pearson, which is to protect the taxpayers of Canada, whether he likes it or not.

(1445)

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Transport is to protect the Canadian taxpayer by paying more for less, no wonder we are in trouble.

Instead of doing the right thing, the government is trying to manipulate testimony going to the Senate. Members of the Canadian Bar Association were to speak very critically of Bill C-22 during the Senate hearings. The Minister of Justice called them to his office and told them to back off. The implication of penalty is obvious.

*Oral Questions*

My question is for the Prime Minister. Did the Minister of Justice do this on his own? Was he directed to do so by the Prime Minister's office?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as a member I hope in good standing of the Canadian Bar Association, I would want to explain to my hon. colleague that people have come before the Senate committee to discuss the issue of Pearson. Although I may disagree with them on some issues, we recognize the credibility of the group that came before the Senate to make its position known with respect to the constitutionality of Bill C-22.

It is highly irregular, if not totally improper, for the hon. member to come before the House and to suggest that members of the Canadian bar have been coerced by the government or anybody else. The hon. member should be aware that there are conflicting opinions on this, but certainly nobody has tried to manipulate the Canadian Bar Association. Had we done that, we would not have got the kind of testimony we got in the first instance with respect to the constitutionality of Bill C-22.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN**

**Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

If the use of somatotropin is authorized in Canada, consumers will demand that the milk produced using this hormone be labelled to distinguish it from unadulterated milk. Our children have the right to drink real milk with no hormones.

Will the Prime Minister acknowledge that if Health Canada authorizes the sale of somatotropin, either of two things will happen: citizens will either be confronted with a done deed and will have no choice but to consume the milk produced with the synthetic hormone, or they will have to pay more for the milk they are used to drinking in order to fund the cost of keeping two separate distribution networks for milk?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the minister explained yesterday that no decision has been made on the issue, that the moratorium is voluntary, and that, on July 1, the Department of Health will not be in a position to authorize the sale of this hormone to Canadian consumers.

The hon. member apparently made the suggestion that we should inform consumers if the use of the hormone is going to be allowed. But this is a purely hypothetical question, because the

government has not made any decision yet regarding whether it will be authorized, if it ever is at all.

**Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I will certainly excuse the Prime Minister for not being up to date on the issue. But, in fact, if Health Canada gives its approval, agriculture will need two years to set up a system. That is why the agriculture committee, in addition to the health committee, this morning, demanded an indeterminate ban on this substance.

Given that this is the last question we will be able to ask on the issue, I am going to ask the Prime Minister a genuine question, a simple question. Why must our children drink anything other than real milk, with no artificial hormones added?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the answer is that, in Canada, at the current moment, the milk children are drinking has no artificial hormones. Artificial hormones are banned in Canada, and that is the current situation. If there is any change in the situation, we will inform the House and we will take appropriate measures. But, at this time, all of these questions are purely hypothetical because the hormones in question are not authorized for use in Canada.

The hon. member just said that this was the last time he would be asking a question. I hope that they are not going to devote all their efforts to the referendum and stop doing the work required of an MP. If they do, I hope they will give back their salaries.

\* \* \*

[English]

**SMALL BUSINESSES**

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question concerns the minister of public works. A recent government report shows that a federal program to direct \$1.5 billion a year in federal contracts to small business may not be necessary because this sector already gets its fair share of government business.

Could the minister advise the House on the relevance of the report and what changes the minister plans on implementing?

**Mr. Réginald Bélair (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the government has a strong commitment to small business in the country. The small business report to which the member refers confirms that 32 per cent of government services contracts are given to small businesses.

(1450)

However, over the last few months a consultation process has been initiated with major industries, aboriginal businesses and political groups across the country on the desirability of having a set aside program. Preliminary reports show a clear message that we do not need a set aside program for small businesses as they can compete with larger industries. In contrast, the set aside



*Oral Questions*

program for aboriginal businesses is strongly supported by aboriginal groups and non-aboriginal industries.

The ministers of public works, industry and Indian affairs are monitoring the situation very closely as they are considering to use these procurements to help small aboriginal businesses across Canada.

\* \* \*

**LITERACY**

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday I quoted passages from "Making Scenes Between the Lines" for the minister of human resources. He was rightly shocked by the obscene language in it and wondered where I got my reading material. I hope the minister has now had time to realize that this booklet was funded by the government for use in classrooms across the country.

If the minister has actually had time to read this booklet in the interim, does he not agree that "Making Scenes Between the Lines" has no place in our children's schools?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to look into the allegation made by the hon. member for Beaver River.

The fact is that the whole program was being sponsored by 21 organizations across the country, including the Canadian Bar Association, the John Howard Society and the Salvation Army. Their attempt was to try to provide ways of linking the use of literacy to crime prevention and to provide a way of enabling particularly young people who are at risk with the law to find solutions.

One of the booklets was prepared by the young people themselves, expressing their concerns and their feelings. I want to point out to the hon. member that the booklet has never been distributed to any school. It is for adult use only and distributed by those organizations. I think it is time the hon. member withdrew her allegation.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the executive assistant in the senator's office who funded this said yesterday that it was for adult use only.

On the contrary, James MacLatchie, the chair of the organization, said to press and MPs alike: "This is to go to all schools across the country without respect to grades or age level". There are two different stories coming out there. James MacLatchie should answer those questions.

Whether it is for adults, criminals, dropouts or young people in schools across the country, would the minister agree that this obscene language is not good for anybody to learn to read and

write? Will he obviously cancel it? Will he cut his losses, recommend to the senator responsible for it to cut her losses and cancel the booklet rather than cut their own throats and let it go ahead?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate the hon. member for Beaver River did not consult with her own colleague, the member for Mission—Coquitlam, who attended the press conference at which the booklet and the kit were released.

At that time the member for Mission—Coquitlam congratulated the minister responsible for literacy on the presentation of the document and applauded the efforts to provide protection against crime by the use of literacy.

I would simply like to raise a question with the leader of the Reform Party. Is he going to ask the member for Beaver River to resign after such overt, obvious fumbling of the question she has raised?

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**FRENCH SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS**

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Canadian Heritage. After the news that funding provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council for scientific journals in French had been cut by nearly 50 per cent, while scientific journals—

(1455)

[English]

**The Speaker:** We only have five minutes to go.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Gagnon:** Mr. Speaker, after the news that funding provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council for scientific journals in French had been cut by nearly 50 per cent, while scientific journals in English were not affected, we heard today that the National Museum of Science and Technology will from now on publish its magazine on astronomy in English only.

What explanation does the Minister of Canadian Heritage have for this kind of decision by an agency for which he is responsible?

**Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I had an opportunity to comment on a sports-related case, and I emphasized the importance of maintaining the status of the French language and complying the official languages legislation.

*Oral Questions*

My answer will be the same today. I intend to see that these rules are observed by all federal government agencies.

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Canadian Heritage endorse this offensive remark by a spokesperson for the museum, and I quote: "If we want the public to buy our new magazine, we would have to offer them a high quality product produced by competent people".

**Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I always expect our national museums to have high quality products in both languages.

\* \* \*

[English]

**ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS**

**Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in response to a question on May 8 from the hon. member for Nanaimo—Cowichan about allegations of sexual abuse at the Lac Barrière reserve, the minister of Indian affairs responded that it was a criminal matter and police were investigating. The band states that it is not aware of any police investigation and a recent federal-provincial-band memorandum of understanding is viewed as pre-empting a police investigation.

Does the minister continue to state that there is a police investigation into sexual abuse when the band says there is not?

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I came here today prepared to commend the hon. member and his colleague in the Reform Party who went up to Barrière Lake. I thought that was very broad minded.

I sat here and listened to the statement of the pair. The aboriginal people of Barrière Lake do not have the opportunity to stand in the House and I feel it is incumbent upon me to put forward their side on what happened.

I was handed a letter that was handed to the hon. member who put the question. They welcomed the hon. members up there. They wanted to show them their way of life. The hon. members chose the topics. They asked questions like: "Is the premier of Quebec the minister of aboriginal affairs? How do you become an elder?" They met with the accountant and they refused to listen to him. They wanted to take them to show them their forestry but they refused.

They ended up by saying: "We thought we were dealing with honourable people who wanted to learn about us. We forgot we were dealing with partisan politicians who are more interested in advancing their own political agenda than in hearing the truth. As I was saying at the beginning of this letter, I hoped this meeting would enlighten you. Apparently it didn't".

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame, a real shame.

[English]

**Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the minister was further asked about allegations of misappropriation of \$255,000 in legal fees to a co-president of the aboriginal committee of the Liberal Party, to which the minister responded that it was a criminal matter and up to the sùreté. According to the band, the RCMP has jurisdiction, not the sùreté, and the sùreté has done nothing. The RCMP has done little, if anything, other than a single brief visit with no follow up.

Is this a shell game or does the minister want to get to the bottom of the allegation?

(1500)

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this allows me to clarify my answer on that date.

The investigation by the la Commission de la jeunesse is in relation to the sexual abuse. The member for the Reform Party stood up and basically under the protection of the House defamed a member of the Canadian Bar Association of Ontario. He did not have the guts to go outside and do the same thing. He should do that today. He has already received a letter from that lawyer saying if he does he will be sued for defamation.

\* \* \*

**HUMAN RIGHTS**

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister for International Trade will be aware of the conflict between the Pinochet led army and Chile's democratic government over the arrest of two army officers convicted of murder.

Pinochet's action in Chile reminds us that unless there is a level playing field when it comes to political rights and human rights, free trade is a moral hoax.

Is the government now considering supporting the proposal endorsed by the International Democratic Union, the Liberal International and the Socialist International to create a UN based international court of human rights to bring those who have violated international human rights to justice?

Will the government indicate its intentions to work for a social and human rights clause in NAFTA and in the WTO so we can have a genuine playing field, not just with respect to tariffs but with respect to human rights?

**Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister for International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the terms with regard to the accession of Chile to NAFTA are set forth in the agreement. A country acceding to NAFTA must meet the terms of the agreement.

*Business of the House*

There are other forums in which we pursue the questions of human rights and we shall continue to do so.

\* \* \*

**PAGES**

**The Speaker:** Colleagues, for a year now you have heard me refer to these people as my pages but in truth they are our pages. On behalf of all of the members of the House of Commons to you, our 42 pages, I thank you for helping us perform our duties here this year.

[Translation]

Perhaps the pages will be members of Parliament one day but, in the mean time, they will have made our life easier in this House. Their devotion and their diligence is, of course, a reflection of the rest of Canada's youth. Even as they leave us, I am sure they will take with them the fine memory of their invaluable experience working in the House of Commons.

[English]

As their terms come to an end I know all members of the House who have had dealings with our pages, our pages to whom we pay the highest compliments in all of our conversations, behind the curtains, in the lobbies and here in the House, treat them as if they were one of us; indeed they are.

My pages, our pages, thank you for being with us for one year. You have done a great service to us and to Canada.

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

\* \* \*

(1505)

**PRIVILEGE**

## COMMENTS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

**The Speaker:** I will hear a question of privilege from the hon. member for Mission—Coquitlam. Is this arising from question period today?

**Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, yes it is. During question period today the minister of human resources misrepresented facts to the House of Commons.

It is true the member for Mission—Coquitlam did attend the launch of the literacy and crime prevention program "Between the Lines". That is one I have been working on for six months.

However, after congratulating the government on what I felt was a very good idea, as there is a definite connection between literacy and crime prevention, we received the books which had not been opened by any of us before. As soon as we received the books and read them I released a press release. I would like to

table it for the House in which I question the offensive language in that book.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member has made her point. I would let it sit as that. It is not a point of privilege.

The hon. member has asked if she can table a copy of her communiqué. May she present it?

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Speaker:** The answer is no.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to put this question in the House today. Would the House Leader tell us what is on the upcoming legislative agenda?

[English]

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government I join with the Chair in words of thanks and appreciation to the pages. We appreciate their efforts for us. We wish them well in their future endeavours.

(1510)

[Translation]

We really appreciate the efforts of our pages.

[English]

We will continue today with the business outlined in the projected order of business. During the day, as the hours go on, we will consult with our hon. friends opposite on the details of business for today and tomorrow.

On Monday, September 18, the day the rules say the House would ordinarily meet again, we will likely commence with items already at advanced legislative stages before we deal with second readings or references to committee before second reading.

I take this opportunity to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and all members of the House for the courtesy and co-operation that have been demonstrated more than may appear from time to time in the House in terms of achieving the business of the country and to wish all a very good summer.

[Translation]

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to that of the House Leader in thanking the Chair, first, for its excellent mediation and chairing of the sometimes turbulent and very intense debate on vital issues. It succeeded in maintaining the dignity, calm and democratic principles that must prevail in a legislative assembly. My sincere thanks to our elected Speaker and to you, Mr. Speaker, to all those who work with you and to those who work

*Government Orders*

with the Clerk of the House. I want to thank you for having preserved this institution, which must endure.

I would also like to thank the pages and ask them not to always go by what they have seen here, should they choose a political career, but to keep the best of it. As we well know, there is good and not so good. They should forget the not so good and remember the best.

[*English*]

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, somehow I have an idea we may not be spending too much time here before our summer break, perhaps not tomorrow at least.

I also extend my thanks to the pages. Their decorum and support of the members have certainly been appreciated by all members of the House, definitely by my colleagues in the Reform Party. We wish them an excellent summer and a wonderful future.

I thank those who have sat in the chair, yourself, Mr. Speaker, and your colleagues. I thank the clerks who sit around the table who have helped us and all staff on the Hill for their support. I wish all members a good summer, a bit of a break, and I know they will be continuing their responsibilities even though they leave here.

Certainly we have not accomplished all we thought we would to this point in the 35th Parliament. However, we have made some progress and for that we are thankful. I give my assurance we will come back on September 18 or whenever the government House leader calls the House back to pursue our responsibility as Canada's unofficial opposition.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the NDP caucus I join in congratulating the pages, giving our thanks to them and to all servants of the House including you, Mr. Speaker, and others who have occupied the chair over the course of this Parliament and wish everyone a good summer.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

### ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSIONS

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** It is my duty, pursuant to section 21 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, chapter E-3, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1985, to lay upon the table certified copies of the 1994 reports of electoral boundaries commissions for all the provinces and the Northwest Territories.

Accordingly, these reports stand referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

(1515)

[*English*]

### MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT RETIRING ALLOWANCES ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-85, an act to amend the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act and to provide for the continuation of a certain provision, be read the third time and passed.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I believe mine is the last speech or close to the last speech we will be having on this issue prior to the vote later this afternoon. We will be on the MPs pension plan, the reduction in the pension plan as announced by the Liberal Party in the red book during the last election campaign. As a matter of fact, the bill on which we will be voting in about half an hour will reduce the MP pension plan benefits to an even greater degree than that which was promised in the red book.

I accept the announcement made in the red book. As the critic for government operations in my days in opposition, I contributed to writing some of these portions of the red book as well as many others that pertained to government ethics, lobbyists, contracting procedures, MP benefits and so on. Today the Liberal Party is delivering on yet another promise in the red book.

Some members across the way particularly in the Reform Party say it does not matter that is what we promised. It does not matter that it goes further. What matters to them is that we change what we are doing to suit them and they are not expected to be here for more than one term. That is essentially the crux of their argument. They are saying that MPs do not need pensions. That is their view.

**Mr. Benoit:** We never said that.

**Mr. Boudria:** The hon. member should have participated in the debate to a greater extent. There are quotes in many places where members said they did not need these pensions. I have to disagree with members who made those statements.

We have had a rather sorry spectacle. The Reform Party asked the Prime Minister point blank whether he would exempt them from that plan. The Prime Minister said yes. Then we produced the bill that did just that. The first question Reform members asked in the committee on procedure and House affairs was whether it was not unfair that the plan was designed in such a way to permit people to opt out, which is just what they asked for.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River):** That is a crock.

**Mr. Boudria:** Perhaps the hon. member personally disagreed with the member for Beaver River when she asked that question in committee. He has a right to disagree with her. I want him to know that the member for Beaver River made that statement. All members of the committee know it and the statement is recorded in the committee transcript. I am sorry if the member disagrees with that proposition. He will have to take it up with the member for Beaver River but I invite him to be cautious when he does so because she can certainly rough him up.

That being said, I will turn to the principle of the bill. Essentially the bill has three components. First, it establishes a minimum age of 55 for receiving a pension on future contributions from the date of proclamation of this bill.

The second component is to officially end double dipping. Mr. Speaker, you and I know perfectly well that since this government has come into office, rule or no rule, we have ended double dipping for any new appointment where a person had previously been eligible for an MP pension. That was done and I congratulate the Prime Minister for that.

The third component is to reduce the accrual rate, which goes beyond the commitment made in the red book but was a good idea. It was done by the President of the Treasury Board in the bill before us today.

Canadians and members have various views of the role of an MP. I heard one member say in debate a couple of weeks ago that the House of Commons should be for people who “have made it”. This statement was made by the member for Peace River when he was participating in debate. In other words, people who have accumulated a certain fame, wealth and otherwise have some sort of right to this place superior to that right which the rest of us hold.

(1520)

I do not agree. Had that been the case, although the number of women in this House is insufficient, it would be far less than what it is today. Although the number of people who come from a disadvantaged milieu is probably lower than what it should be, it would be even less than what it is today if only people who have made it, to use the words of the hon. member for Peace River which are in the *Hansard* of this House, were the only ones who had a claim to be here.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about members who come from a more disadvantaged milieu than others. I think that I am entitled to an opinion, coming from such a background myself, as you, Mr. Speaker, and all my colleagues well know.

I have been in this institution for a long while. I began my working life here, not as the assistant to the prime minister, not as the assistant to a minister or to the Leader of the Opposition or to the Speaker of the House, but as a bus boy in the parliamentary restaurant.

At the time, I had not even finished secondary school, which I went on to do later. I went back to school to earn credits, and although I wish I had more education, I did get four years, after starting here as an employee on the bottom rung.

[*English*]

When I ran for election to this place, I had not made it. I do not apologize for that. Constituents elected everyone in this House for all the good reasons they choose to elect members of Parliament. If this House is to be a microcosm of this great country, then people from all backgrounds and milieus have a right to be candidates, not just those who have made it.

Let us go back a little in the history of parliamentary institutions. Some members across the way denigrate the fact that in their view we are a little too close to the traditions of this great place. I do not apologize for that.

I have become in my own way an amateur historian. Our parliamentary institutions date back prior to the Norman invasion of Britain to the witan in the period prior to that. They have evolved all the way in Britain from the invasion and the Magna Carta, the bill of rights and all those other documents, the declaration of rights and so on and in our own country through our Constitution and the precedents in the British House.

I remind the House that in 1829 Daniel Patrick O’Connell was elected to the British House of Commons. His sin, what was wrong with the man, was that he was a Catholic. It was legal and had been for only a few years prior to that for Catholics to vote in Britain but they did not have the right to sit in Parliament. Notwithstanding that, in 1829 the people of Ireland found someone who could do it, who was rich enough, wealthy enough and a Catholic. There were very few of them. He was able to run as a candidate. He defeated a popular cabinet minister to become an MP.

However he was not allowed to sit. He was made to run again in 1830 in order to be reconfirmed. Daniel Patrick O’Connell then took his seat in the U.K. House of Commons but nobody else could do the same. Why? Because there was no salary for members of Parliament. Only the rich, those who had made it, could become members of Parliament and the Catholics and other disadvantaged people could not.

Salaries of members of Parliament should not be such that we get rich. We do not in this House. We should never go back to an era where only people who have made it have a right to claim

*Government Orders*

that they can sit in this House. All Canadians have the right to be represented.

(1525)

If this Parliament is going to be the microcosm of this country, as I claim it should be and has a right to be, then all of us have a right to be candidates. Whether that person is a well known lawyer or a professor of law, as I see colleagues across the way, whether that person comes from a different ethnic background, whether that person is a medical doctor, or whether that person is the busboy in the parliamentary restaurant, it is all the same. We have the right to be represented in the Parliament of this country.

In the next few minutes I want to talk about the salaries, benefits and pensions members get. After the Reform Party speeches, how many Canadians would know that since 1952 there has not been one year where the premiums to the pension plan were less than the payout? Every single year the premiums by MPs and the matching contributions were in excess of the payout from the plan.

People imagine a huge deficit in that plan. They do not know that every single year it has had a surplus, not thanks to the Reform Party or their friend they are in bed with, Mr. David Somerville of the National Citizens Coalition. They do not know that. Why do they not know that? Because that does not sell ads in the newspapers. That does not buy ties with little pigs on them for the member for Beaver River and the others who have made a mockery of this institution by doing some of the things they have been doing.

[*Translation*]

And then these people come to this House complaining about our integrity. They have talked about the new approach to politics. Give me a break. We could comment on the actions of some of these parliamentarians, particularly the Reformers.

[*English*]

Now we hear that MPs are all millionaires when they retire. Hogwash. Since when does someone take pension benefits based on a lifetime, total them up all at once and pretend that everyone is rich? If that were the way, the silly argument could be made by extension that everyone who qualifies for the old age pension is a millionaire. What kind of nonsense is that?

**Mrs. Chamberlain:** Rubbish.

**Mr. Boudria:** It is rubbish as the hon. member so eloquently just said.

A study was done by the Library of Parliament on my own pension benefits. I revealed it in committee and I will now do so on the floor of the House of Commons.

I have been a member since 1984 and I have paid premiums every month to the pension plan. Those premiums as of last

January, when the study was done by Finn Poschmann of the research branch of the Library of Parliament, were evaluated with accumulated interest at the GIC rate, the rate offered in probably the most, pardon the expression, conservative investment vehicle anyone could use. If we calculated what I have invested in that personally, I have invested \$136,988 in all these years.

Imagine what the member for Windsor West has invested after being an MP for 30 years, or the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, the member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke and other veterans of this place. They will never see even a fraction of the interest on the money they have invested in those plans unless they live to be about 150 years old. How many times is that said to the people of Canada?

In any case I have invested almost \$137,000. Based on a matching employer-employee contribution that is used in any kind of plan that would mean that right now I would have \$274,000 invested. The interest alone on that right now would bring in about \$27,000 a year. What would I get if I retired today as an MP? I would get \$30,000 a year. What about these millions of dollars they say I would get? The difference is \$3,000 a year based on the most conservative investment vehicle we could possibly find.

(1530)

Imagine how much better off I would be if I had done rather well at investing. That plan is not to make the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell rich or the member for Windsor West rich or any other members who are already here and have served many terms. That is not the idea.

The idea is the following:

[*Translation*]

In my case, I was able, at a certain point, to leave my job and run for office. Now I have been elected, and nothing is going to change me, because I am here already.

[*English*]

To use the words of the member across, maybe now I have made it. However, that is not the point. The point is that others in all groups in society can run for office. Perhaps a 29-year old sole support mother who has a good job would like to run for office. She can do so and not threaten her family and their future by wanting to serve her country.

None of this is going to change me. I am already here and I have been here for a long time.

**An hon. member:** You won't be here for long.

**Mr. Boudria:** I do not know whether I will be re-elected. That is for the good people to decide. At least I had this great opportunity. One of the reasons why I had that opportunity is because that security was there.

*Government Orders*

What is wrong with other people wanting to run in 1998 or 2002 and the elections after that if they are able to do so? Not everyone when they get here has previously made it. Not everyone was rich before they came here or had this huge business empire to go back to. Yes, there are some of those and there is nothing wrong with that, but there is another reality out there. Parliament is the place where everyone in Canada has a right to expect that one of them, if they are elected, can afford to sit in this great institution.

The former Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Diefenbaker, once said—perhaps it is be unusual for me to end my remarks by quoting a Conservative Prime Minister but I will anyway—that there was no greater honour for a Canadian than to represent his or her fellow colleagues in the highest court in the land, the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, that is an honour that was given to me, to you and to all of us. What I want is for all Canadians to at least be able to aspire some day to represent their fellow constituents in the highest court in the land, the Parliament of Canada.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ):** Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell on his excellent remarks, on sharing his personal experience of parliamentary life, from his early days in a former life to his election to this Parliament, and to the provincial legislature in Queen's Park before that.

I would like to ask the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell what he would reply to the Reform Party's claim that all the bill before us is designed to do is sweeten even more the members' retirement package.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Bellechasse for his question. While I am at it, perhaps I could take this opportunity to thank him for his work at the procedure and House affairs committee. I think he did a very fine job and I wish to thank him for that.

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

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, we all know that this bill will have the effect of reducing members' benefits. It is true that there used to be no minimum pensionable age.

(1535)

It is true that some former members are receiving benefits although they had not reached pensionable age when they left. It is also true that others, while having contributed to this plan much longer than they would have in a regular plan, are still not receiving any benefits. I gave the example of the hon. member for Windsor West who would probably be eligible for a bonus if

he left now. Those are facts, but not the kind of facts that some Reform Party members raise on a regular basis in this House.

Members' benefits are reduced through the institution of a minimum pensionable age and also for members who took a federal position upon retiring from politics. In their case, double dipping would be prohibited; they would not be allowed to receive money from both sources at once. Third, pension accrual rates will also be reduced because of the decrease in contribution rates and ensuing decrease in benefits at retirement.

I realize that the time is up. To conclude, because this is probably the last chance I have to do so before the summer recess, I wish to thank, in my capacity as government whip, the Chair, our staff, the table officers, the pages and especially my two colleagues the opposition whips, the hon. member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie and the hon. member for Calgary West.

In spite of our differences, we have worked very closely. I could even say that I look forward to the fall when I can work again with my colleagues, the whips of the other parties, in this House.

[*English*]

**Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell talk about how he had only given a fair share to the pension plan and he expected to get a fair amount back.

I wonder if he could respond to a question. We had a financial expert come to our caucus to talk about what we should do since we were opting out of the plan. His first piece of advice to the Reform Party as a professional financial adviser was: "Don't opt out of this pension, it is the best pension plan in Canada".

Would that change the member's mind about his comments that this is a very fair pension plan?

**Mr. Boudria:** I never said it was a very bare pension plan. I used the amount that I have have contributed versus the payout and put before the House the difference between the two. If the hon. member wants to qualify that or anything else as being bare, they are his words and not mine.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to make a few short comments on this bill, since the debate is coming to an end.

All the more so since, as a Bloc Québécois candidate during the general election leading up to the 35th Parliament, I did not come here with the idea that I would accumulate any pension. Nevertheless, this issue concerns us all.

If Canadians have shown some interest in the matter, it is probably after finding out that some young parliamentarians could, after two terms, start collecting very generous pensions.

*Government Orders*

Given the longer life expectancy, some of these pensions could total 3 to 3.5 million dollars.

(1540)

This is what really concerns people. I did not hear my constituents say that the pensions were too generous. What concerns them is the fact that a member of Parliament can start collecting his or her pension as soon as he or she leaves office. During the election campaign, I pledged to fight in this House to ensure that MPs pensions would only be collected at a normal age, that is the age where the majority of Canadians working in the private or public sector, can legitimately retire.

The bill before us deals specifically with this issue, which is an issue on which we pledged to take a stand. The hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell clearly showed that, for the last 43 years, the MPs retirement plan has not only been self-financing, but has accumulated a profit. It is not a costly plan for the state. Indeed, it is a plan which is self-financing and which even generates profits.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I am quite aware that there are some strongly held views on both sides of this debate, notwithstanding the person who has the floor.

If others want to continue the debate elsewhere, that is fine. However I hope we can conclude this debate in the parliamentary fashion we have conducted business in this Chamber on the vast majority of occasions.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Langlois:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for bringing this House to order with your usual blend of firmness and tact. As I was saying, the main concern of the constituents I have the privilege to represent was the pensionable age. That is settled in this bill. What we usually refer to as double dipping has also been abolished, at least in the case of federal institutions, and that is a good thing.

I must say I agree with those who feel that with an annual salary of \$64,400, parliamentarians are certainly not overpaid. Although we represent as many as 100,000 to 150,000 people, we meet daily with people in various sectors who earn twice or three times our salary. Not that I expect to be paid that much. Besides, our salaries are now frozen. The last Parliament decided to put a freeze on members' salaries. We have no desire to broach a subject that as we saw in the course of this debate, tends to elicit the most outrageous verbal attacks.

The remuneration of parliamentarians will probably remain a contentious issue. It may be advisable to provide for an independent review mechanism. Of course, parliamentarians who think they are being paid too much for what they do can always send part of their salary back to the crown. But ultimately, it will be

up to our constituents to decide whether the members they elected to the 35th Parliament gave value for money. Theirs is the ultimate verdict.

Members who were elected and want to make a career in politics have to go before the voters in every election and prove they did the job they were paid to do as parliamentarians. Voters may also ask: Did I get my money's worth? Did my MP really deserve to be paid \$64,400? Their judgment may be negative or positive. So there are several criteria we can refer to. We ourselves might feel guilty about getting a salary of \$64,400. Or we might not feel guilty, but our constituents may show us the door.

(1545)

That said, I think there has been a great song and dance with this debate and with others about certain parliamentary benefits and our having it soft on our arrival in Ottawa. I would not say we have it soft. I would say, rather, that we did not come here for the salary. We came, obviously, to serve our fellow citizens as best we could, and they will evaluate our performance one day or another. We are accountable to them alone.

I take this opportunity to point out, Mr. Speaker, and you are no doubt aware of this yourself, that our work as members of Parliament is made so much easier by the clerks, by the pages and by all those, who, often anonymously, almost invisibly, make our work or our life less difficult, given that we arrive at dawn and leave late in the evening for a few hours' rest.

People are always working to put things back in order for our return, without our even noticing. The journals are printed and Hansard is there when it is ready. If we need something, pages are ready to find the documentation we need, the people at the Parliamentary Library find us what we need to do our job and our legislative advisers prepare our amendments.

Today we have thanked the pages and the clerks. I would like to take the opportunity to thank as well those who, often behind the scene, work so efficiently that our often heavy workload seems a little less so.

That being said, when it comes time to vote shortly, having obtained the guarantees we sought and insisted on in the last general election, I will be pleased to vote in favour of the bill currently before the House.

[*English*]

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it has been a very interesting experience listening to the speeches this afternoon. The hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell talked about how he got his education. We got a history lesson from him and we learned a lot about hyperbole. I never realized that by hon. members not receiving their pensions democracy would collapse.



*Government Orders*

I am amazed by the argument that the Reform Party is objecting to the Liberal plan simply because it does not like it. I would like to back up our comments with a number of letters from our constituents.

For example, let me quote from a letter from Mrs. Marjorie Hernstedt of Williams Lake, who wrote:

Chrétien promised to reform the outrageous pension plan. I am a pensioner and this past July, the government couldn't afford to give us our two-dollar raise. I live on the pensioners' pension and Canada pension with very careful budgeting. The whole outlook is grossly unfair and I urge you, Mr. Mayfield, to demand Parliament bring MPs' pensions into line with what is available in the private sector.

How can any of us justify a pension like the one in Bill C-85 when there are people like Mrs. Hernstedt who are barely making ends meet on their own pensions?

Is it not ironic while MPs are getting their pensions that Mrs. Hernstedt and others like her are being told that the government cannot afford a \$2 raise in pension benefits. The irony is just sickening.

Also Mr. Don Ford of Quesnel feels that politicians have to be willing to make sacrifices and play a part in cutting government expenditures. He said:

The pensions of members of Parliament should be based on their contributions as a percentage of their salary, to the point of their retirement at age 65, a percentage in line with the average Canadian middle income worker, and that they be eligible to start receiving the earned pension after reaching the age of 65 years, and not when they are defeated in an election.

(1550)

We are not simply speaking on our own behalf; we are representing our constituents. Mr. Ford touched on a theme heard over and over again in the House: the MP pension plan has to be brought into line with what is seen in the private sector.

I should also like to mention what some of the media people are saying. Barbara Yaffe of the *Vancouver Sun* had the following to say about the MP pension plan:

British Columbians are not amused. The corpulent cats who remain in the plan in future will get nearly four tax dollars for every one dollar they put in, while the MPs with guts and principles get zip. Those who opt out deserve real credit. The weasels who stay in deserve our enmity.

Those are very strong words: corpulent cats and weasels. These are the kinds of words that come from Canadians when asked what they think of politicians who opt into the pension plan.

An article by Bob Cox of *Canadian Press* stated the following:

A proposed leaner pension plan for MPs is still four to seven times more generous than what other Canadians can earn, says an expert on politicians' pensions.

Though an improvement on the even richer existing plan, the Liberal proposal would still be worth \$60,000 before taxes—close to an MP's \$64,000 salary—The Canadian Taxpayers Federation agreed, putting 242 smiling, pink pigs on the vast

Parliament Hill lawn to represent MPs who have indicated they would stay in the new pension plan.

Canadians, not just Reform MPs, do not trust their members of Parliament to handle their own compensation. It is conflict of interest. It is like appointing a mouse to guard the cheese. The time has come to really reform the system.

One proposal that has received strong interest in Cariboo-Chilcotin was to appoint a volunteer committee to examine the pension plan of 10 companies at random on the Toronto Stock Exchange. Their pension plans would be averaged and the result would be the basis for the new MP pension plan. The plan would be reviewed occasionally and altered as needed, preferably by some neutral person like the auditor general. Others have put forward similar ideas.

If we as politicians are to regain the trust of Canadian people, we have to start right at the beginning with the MP pension plan. The best way to handle the issue is to have the electorate decide the compensation with the politicians out of the room. Anything less than this is an abuse of power on our part. It is conflict of interest and a betrayal of the trust Canadians place in their members of Parliament.

In conclusion, at a time when the Canadian pension plan is on the verge of bankruptcy, when over one million Canadians are out of work and many more are barely making ends meet, we are being asked to approve a pension that would turn average MPs into the comfortably well off in only six years.

As a member of Parliament I cannot support the package, especially when there are so many Canadians without any pension at all. Therefore I will be voting against Bill C-85 at third reading and I will be opting out of the pension plan if it passes.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Pursuant to order made Thursday, June 8, 1995, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 78 it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the third reading stage of the bill now before the House.

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.

*Government Orders*

*And more than five members having risen:*

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

(1610)

*And the bells having rung:*

**The Speaker:** Colleagues, we are approaching the end of the year and we have certain traditions and conventions in the House.

Earlier in the session I mentioned a few times the use of props in the House. I call on all hon. members to respect the traditions of the House. If any hon. members are even considering using what I would call props, especially when a vote is being taken, I would ask you please to reconsider so that it will preserve the decorum of the House.

I ask that with all respect, knowing full well that all hon. members have very strong opinions. Once again in the name of the House, I would ask you to refrain from using any props. I make that appeal to all hon. members.

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

*(Division No. 329)***YEAS**

## Members

Alcock	Allmand
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bhaduria	Blondin—Andrew
Bodnar	Bouchard
Boudria	Brien
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélisle
Calder	Campbell
Caron	Catterall
Cauchon	Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Cowling	Crête
Daviault	Deshaies
De Villers	Dingwall
Discepola	Dromisky
Dubé	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	English
Fillion	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Galloway	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gerrard	Godfrey
Godin	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Guay
Guimond	Harb
Harper (Churchill)	Harvard
Hickey	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Irwin	Jackson
Jacob	Jordan
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lalonde

Landry	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Lincoln
Loney	Loubier
MacDonald	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	Nault
Nunez	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Paradis	Parrish
Paré	Patry
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Proud	Reed
Rideout	Ringuette—Maltais
Robillard	Rocheleau
Rock	Rompkey
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Sheridan
Simmons	Skoke
Speller	St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Torsney	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Venne	Verran
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
Young —181	

**NAYS**

## Members

Ablonczy	Althouse
Benoit	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Cummins	Duncan
Epp	Gilmour
Gouk	Grey (Beaver River)
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Hayes
Hermanson	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoeppner
Jennings	Johnston
Manning	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Penson
Ramsay	Ringma
Silye	Solberg
Stinson	Strahl
Taylor	Wayne
White (Fraser Valley West)	Williams—42

*Business of the House*

## PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)  
Bélanger  
Collenette  
Crawford  
Debien  
Lefebvre  
Mercier  
Regan  
Tobin

Bertrand  
Canuel  
Collins  
Dalphond-Guiral  
Gaffney  
MacAulay  
Picard (Drummond)  
St-Laurent  
de Savoye

(1620)

*During the taking of the vote:*

**The Speaker:** As I mentioned before the vote, I would appeal to all hon. members to please not wear or use props.

I appeal to the hon. member for Calgary Southwest to consider taking off the prop which is on his lapel before the vote continues.

**Mr. Manning:** Mr. Speaker, if I could ask you, on what basis do you regard this as a prop?

**The Speaker:** I regard it as a prop and I would respectfully ask the hon. member for Calgary Southwest if he would consider taking it off.

**Mr. Manning:** Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to remove this prop. I would only ask that members showed the same concern for ethics with respect to the issue that is shown—

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

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

**The Speaker:** I thank the hon. member for Calgary Southwest for what I consider to be his very generous action. I ask all hon. members if they would please follow the lead of the hon. member for Calgary Southwest. I would appreciate it very much.

(1625)

I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed.)

\* \* \*

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think you would find consent that the House now proceed to deal with Bill C-91 at third reading, subject to an amendment which I am about to propose. I believe agreement has been reached between all parties in the House that there would be three five-minute speeches on third reading of this bill, followed by a bell not exceeding five minutes, following which there would be a vote on third reading.

I think if you could seek that consent I would then propose the amendment to the House, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** I am going to proceed to that request and ask for unanimous consent. Before I do that I am going to read a message from the Senate and then we are going to go to orders of the day, and then I will take that under consideration. That is how I will deal with it.

\* \* \*

(1630)

**MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE**

**The Speaker:** I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed Bill C-70, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Income Tax Application Rules and related acts, without amendment; and Bill S-7, an act to accelerate the use of alternative fuels for motor vehicles, without amendment.

\* \* \*

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

BILL C-91

**The Speaker:** The House has heard the terms proposed by the parliamentary secretary.

Is it the pleasure of the House to proceed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on the third reading of the bill, I move:

That Bill C-91 be amended:

By deleting line 25 in section 31 and renumbering (b), (c) and (d) as (a), (b) and (c) and by adding as section 32 the following:

The Bank shall not grant a loan, investment or guarantee to a director or officer of the corporation.

By renumbering existing section 32 as section 32.1 and by deleting line 14 in section 32(3) and renumbering (b),(c) and (d) as (a), (b) and (c).

I seek the unanimous consent of the House for that amendment to be made to the bill.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

*Government Orders*

Motion agreed to.

**The Speaker:** Colleagues, before I leave the Chair this may be the last sitting day. I do not say that it is. As usual, your Speaker is hosting a small reception for all parliamentarians and our pages in Room 216. I cordially invite all of you to join me there when the time permits.

\* \* \*

### BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT BANK OF CANADA ACT

**Hon. Herb Gray (for Minister of Industry )** moved that Bill C-91, an act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank under the name Business Development Bank of Canada, as amended, be read the third time and passed.

(1635)

**Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, the industry critic for the Bloc Québécois, and the hon. member for Edmonton Southwest who is the industry critic for the Reform Party that the government appreciates the co-operation on this bill. If we were not able to get this bill through today, it would have had an adverse impact not just on the bank as we know it but also on meeting the objectives of helping small and medium sized business over the next three or four months as we adjourn this House of Commons.

As we have debated over the last couple of days, the new Business Development Bank of Canada has been given a new mandate. This new mandate allows the capital of the bank to increase substantially to close to \$18 billion. It also means that the bank can be a real force in this country in a complementary way in supporting other financial institutions.

We also have to acknowledge that the bank is not just there to help in making loans to small business. It is also there as a counselling assistance bank. Very few Canadians realize that one of the unique features of the Business Development Bank of Canada is that it has one of the most sophisticated counselling assistance programs in any financial institution right across Canada.

We have given an undertaking that by allowing this bill to proceed quickly today with swift passage, that we on this side of the House will not accelerate the activity of the bank in the province of Quebec before the referendum unless the Bloc changes its mind and wants the bank to be much more aggressive in its lending activities and its presence. That option is there for the Bloc to decide whether or not it wants more activity by the bank before the referendum or if it would like us to wait until after. That decision is with the Bloc and we will honour that commitment.

On behalf of all government members and of course all of our members on the industry committee we have worked as a team in designing this bill and putting it through the House of Commons. Without the opposition's co-operation we could not have

had such swift passage. This is an example where all of us are working together to get this economy going.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise and speak about this bill at third reading, in slightly peculiar circumstances. I would like to state right now that it is only in the interest of Quebecers that we are going along with the government today.

What we would have preferred was for the Federal Business Development Bank to continue as it was before, with a mandate to simply stimulate economic development. We do not want to fundamentally change the rules of the game and create a new small business bank in Canada, as this bill proposes.

There is a fallacy in its very title, because the title does not match its contents, the scope of the bill. The first thing, of course, is the name change: from the Federal Business Development Bank to the Business Development Bank of Canada. That is a little pretentious, a little too pretentious, presumptuous. This was not reflected anywhere in the committee's discussions and debates. In addition, changing the name will be a frivolous waste of time and money.

More serious still, it would change the Federal Business Development Bank's mandate which, up to now, was well appreciated by Quebecers. It would go from being the economic development bank that it was, the last resort bank for a specific clientele, for a very specific market, to a bank which offers complementary financing. We are fundamentally changing what defined it, what gave it its character as a last resort bank.

(1640)

The bank's role will be changed. There will be changes in the culture of a bank whose primary mandate was to promote the creation and expansion of small business, the culture of economic development. The changes will be subtle, as the new Business Development Bank of Canada seeks financing from the private sector and—this is of major concern to the Bloc Québécois—will have to be profit-oriented, considering the rates of interest it will have to pay private investors, who will now be invited to invest in the bank. This will bring about a thorough change in the philosophy of the Business Development Bank of Canada, a bank that in our opinion is set to become a commercial bank with a culture that will be more concerned about making profits than just breaking even, as was formerly the case.

Furthermore, and this is probably the most negative development from our point of view, this bill ushers in an unprecedented offensive by the federal government in the sector of regional development, a sector where Quebec has excellent resources and a reputation for its expertise. The federal government, without consulting with Quebec or the other provinces, has the gall to indicate in the bill that it will deal directly with provincial agencies, which are creatures of the provinces, including in Quebec, although Quebec has legislation that regulates relations between provincial agencies—creatures of the Government of Quebec—and the federal government. This is supposed to be done through the Government of Quebec, and now the federal

*Government Orders*

government comes barging in, tracking mud all over the floor as it were. We deplore this attitude and we condemn it.

Well, let us go on to something else. The bill is full of terms that can be interpreted in a number of ways because they are so vague that bank directors, and especially political leaders, can use them any way they like.

When they are referring to programs, when the qualifier entrepreneurship is used, no definition is given of an entrepreneurship program or indeed of entrepreneurship itself, which opens the door to every possible intrusion by the federal government in the area of regional development, which in Quebec, at least, is considered to be the prerogative and responsibility of the Government of Quebec.

Finally, we seem to be looking at one of the centrepieces of post-referendum Canada which is being put together here in Ottawa, in a very low-key way, and which will make Canada a centralized country, a unitary country, something Pierre Elliott Trudeau never quite managed to do, but now it is being done very subtly, without debate, without any speeches and without anyone being brave enough to come out and say so. It is being done little by little, and the concept that prevails throughout is that Quebec is a province like the others and that for these people, Quebec as a nation does not exist.

[English]

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear at the outset that our party opposes the bill in principle. We feel that it does not make a whole lot of sense for the government to be establishing another crown corporation to compete with the private financial sector at the very time we are desperately trying to get CN, another crown corporation, into the private sector.

To those Canadians watching, I would like to put the magnitude of the new Federal Business Development Bank into context. The lending authority of the bank will go to \$18 billion. The combined total of all of the outstanding loans of all of the chartered banks in Canada is less than double that. It is something like \$26 billion. We have created one huge entity in the financial marketplace.

This is a government bill and we knew it was going to pass. I want to tell the House that the industry committee worked very hard to make the bill better. That was the purpose of our amendments.

(1645)

I think we should also recognize the fact that members of the Department of Industry were most co-operative, very helpful, and worked very hard to put this legislation through. As well,

Mr. François Beaudoin and members of the bank have worked very hard.

I do not wish to cast any aspersions whatsoever on the role of the Federal Business Development Bank as a complementary lender and as a mentor to incubating entrepreneurship in Canada. That is where the bank should restrict its activities. In our view, there is a necessity of having that kind of mentoring in our country. They do great work through the CASE program.

We feel that we should not be getting ourselves involved in the private sector. We did great work in the Small Businesses Loans Act working with the banks. This summer the industry committee will be working once again with the banks to keep their feet to the fire, to make sure they are lending money to small business. If the banks do their job, the crown does not have to do it. In my view, and in the view of many people on this side of the House, the correct approach would be to keep the bank's feet to the fire, not exposing more taxpayers' money to small business or any business. The business of business is business. We should not as taxpayers be throwing money at businesses.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to say through you to the House and to people of the Federal Business Development Bank that they do have the support of the House. It is a democratic institution. It is going to be continued, and we expect them to be a complementary lender, not a competitive lender.

**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:*

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

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

*(Division No. 330)*

## YEAS

## Members

Alcock	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellemare	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Bhaduria
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Chan	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Cowling	DeVillers
Dingwall	Discepola
Dromisky	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
English	Flis
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gerrard
Godfrey	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harper (Churchill)	Harvard
Hickey	Hopkins
Hubbard	Irwin
Jackson	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lee
Lincoln	Loney
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Massé	McCormick
McKinnon	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien	O'Reilly
Paradis	Patry
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Reed
Ringuette—Maltais	Rock
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan	Simmons
Skoke	Speller
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Thalheimer
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Walker
Wappel	Whelan
Young —121	

## NAYS

## Members

Ablonczy	Asselin
Bachand	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron

*Government Orders*

Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Blaikie
Bouchard	Brien
Bélisle	Caron
Crête	Cummins
Daviault	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Duncan	Epp
Fillion	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)	Gilmour
Godin	Grey (Beaver River)
Guay	Guimond
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Hayes
Hermanson	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoeppner
Jacob	Jennings
Johnston	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Ménard
Nunez	Paré
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Ringma	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Silye
Solberg	Stinson
Strahl	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)—69	

## PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Bélanger	Canuel
Collenette	Collins
Crawford	Dalphond—Guiral
Debien	Gaffney
Lefebvre	MacAulay
Mercier	Picard (Drummond)
Regan	St-Laurent
Tobin	de Savoye

(1700)

*[Translation]*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed.)

\* \* \*

*[English]*

## CRIMINAL CODE

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-72, an act to amend the Criminal Code (self-induced intoxication), (with amendments) from the committee.

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.)** moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

**The Speaker:** When shall the bill be read a third time? Now?

*Government Orders*

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Rock** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise today to defend Bill C-72, which has widespread support among Canadians and, I believe, the support of all members for quick passage in the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, Canadians hold the strong moral view that people who commit violent acts against others while voluntarily drunk should be held criminally responsible for their actions.

As members of this House are aware, last September the Supreme Court of Canada, in a case called Daviault, held that according to the common law, intoxication, even if self-induced, may be a defence to a charge of violence against another if the intoxication is so extreme that the accused was in a condition akin to automatism or insanity. As a result, the Supreme Court of Canada directed a new trial in the Daviault case in order to permit the trial court to canvas questions of fact relating to that potential ground of defence.

In the Daviault judgment the Supreme Court of Canada, in the exercise of its proper function, established the common law principles that apply in such cases. Today the House of Commons has the opportunity, in the exercise of its constitutional function, to establish a legislated rule; in short, to codify the principles that we believe should be paramount, starting with the principle of accountability for one's own conduct. As we consider this issue today, I suggest that we, as parliamentarians, must examine the question not just as an issue involving the common law but as a matter involving common sense.

The principle of accountability in the criminal justice system has been reflected in every measure this government has introduced while implementing its safe homes, safe streets agenda. During the session of Parliament that ends this week, the government has delivered on that agenda.

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

**Mr. Rock:** Bill C-37, which will receive royal assent later today, toughens the response to violent youth crime, doubling the maximum sentence for first degree murder, introducing important changes to the transfer provisions involving the trial of 16 and 17-year-olds in adult court when facing charges involving serious crimes of violence.

Bill C-41, passed by this House last week, codifies the principles and the purposes of sentencing, encouraging uniformity and predictability in criminal sentences, broadening the rights of victims in the criminal justice process and increasing their rights to restitution.

Bill C-42, passed earlier this year and proclaimed in force in mid-February, modernizes the criminal justice system in dozens of ways, simplifying criminal procedure and making protection ordered by the courts more readily accessible to women who are victims of the violence that is caused by the men with whom they live.

(1710)

Bill C-68 cracks down on the use of guns in crime, providing for the longest mandatory minimum penitentiary terms in the Criminal Code for those who choose to use firearms in the commission of any one of ten serious offences. As passed by the House Commons, Bill C-68 also provides for mandatory minimum jail terms for those prosecuted on indictment for the possession of stolen or smuggled firearms and provides the police with valuable new tools in their continuing efforts to enhance community safety.

Bill C-104, which will be considered by the House later this afternoon, provides by amendment to the Criminal Code for the taking of bodily samples for DNA testing, providing an important tool for police and prosecutors in the investigation and prosecution of serious crime.

The creation of a national crime prevention council puts crime prevention on the national agenda for the first time, uniting community action with government policy so that Canadians, instead of wringing their hands worrying about safety in their communities, can roll up their sleeves and do something positive and constructive to increase the safety of their homes and of their streets.

With Bill C-72, the government has responded quickly and effectively to deal with an issue of grave public concern.

[*Translation*]

The aim of this bill is to amend the Criminal Code so that intoxication may never be used as a defence against general intent violent crimes such as sexual assault and assault. The bill therefore establishes a new standard of care.

A person in a state of self-induced intoxication that renders them unaware of, or incapable of, consciously controlling their behaviour, who causes injury to another person, is criminally accountable. This person departs from the standard of reasonable care generally recognized in Canadian society and cannot claim extreme intoxication as a defence.

[*English*]

The government believes that the approach taken in Bill C-72 is fundamentally fair, both to the victims of violence and to those accused of crime. It is fair to the accused because we will set out in clear language in the Criminal Code the minimum standard of civilized conduct Canadians are entitled to expect from each other in the context of voluntary intoxication.

*Government Orders*

Henceforth, let no one suggest that they were unaware of the standards by which their conduct in such cases is to be judged.

The bill is fair to victims of violence because it ensures accountability for the aggressor. It fosters protection for the security of the person. It introduces concepts of deterrence and punishment to cases of violence involving self-induced intoxication.

This bill reflects Parliament's grave concern about intoxicated violence and particularly its disproportionate effect upon women and children in Canada. It is not without significance, I suggest, that the Daviault case involved allegations of violence by a man against a woman. Almost all of the cases that followed the Daviault judgment also involved allegations of violence by men against women.

In both the preamble and the operative sections of Bill C-72 we acknowledge the need to deal with violence by men against women and we provide an important means to meet that need. Bill C-72 is a way in which this government is delivering on its commitment to deal squarely with violence by men against women.

[Translation]

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the speaker and the members of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for taking time to examine in depth the complex issues underlying this bill.

[English]

The evidence heard by the committee is valuable not only as an indication of the widespread support for the bill, but it is also an important record of Parliament's reasons for legislating in this area. To guide those who are called upon to apply the bill or to defend or adjudicate upon its constitutional validity, the committee heard from practising and academic lawyers, from women's groups, from experts on the psychiatric, pharmacological, and behavioural effects of intoxication.

(1715)

Of key interest in my view was the uncontradicted testimony that there is absolutely no scientific evidence that alcohol acting alone can medically produce a state of automatism or a state akin to automatism.

To be sure, there were some witnesses who expressed concern about some elements of the bill in relation to the charter of rights and freedoms, but most witnesses strongly endorsed the legislation as constitutional and as an appropriate response to a serious legal and social problem.

The bill comes before the House today with two amendments, both of which I commend to my colleagues. First, the fourth paragraph of the preamble has been strengthened to reflect the scientific evidence that the committee heard. Instead of referring, as it did at first reading, to scientific evidence that many intoxicants, including alcohol, may not cause a person to act

involuntarily, the revised bill refers to scientific evidence that most intoxicants, including alcohol, by themselves will not cause a person to act involuntarily.

The second amendment involves the term "basic intent" as it appeared in clause 1. Section 33.11 has been changed to general intent. The phrase "general intent" is an expression better known to the law and lawyers and makes the scope and intent of the bill crystal clear.

I suggest that Bill C-72 meets the test that Parliament must apply to all proposed legislation in the realm of the criminal law. It reflects our shared values and our notions of accountability while respecting the rights of those who may be charged with criminal offences.

I suggest that the bill is sound, fair and a workable recognition of those important public and constitutional principles of which I have spoken. I ask for the support of every member of the House for its speedy passage.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we have passed these past few days two controversial and divisive bills. The most eclectic views were put forward, and the emotional intensity of the debate on bills C-68 and C-41 was reflected by some members' virulent outbursts.

Unlike these bills, Bill C-72 is not intended to cause controversy and debate, but rather to bring them to a close. The Supreme Court decision in the Daviault affair has outraged the general public. Henri Daviault was charged with sexual assault on a hemiplegic woman while intoxicated.

He was acquitted by the trial judge who was not absolutely certain that Daviault was sufficiently aware of what he was doing to form a criminal intent, that is to say the intent to sexually assault.

The Quebec Appeal Court quashed this decision two years ago and convicted Daviault. But on September 30, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that pleading intoxication could be admissible in some specific cases and ordered a retrial.

Reactions to the decision rendered by the highest court of the land were quick to follow. While a plea based on the Daviault decision was expected to be used only very exceptionally, the interpretation given to this decision by lower courts led to three acquittals within two months.

All these cases involved women who had allegedly been assaulted, sexually or otherwise. In the Blair case, in Alberta, an alcoholic was charged with assaulting his wife. He was acquitted on the basis of the Daviault decision. In the Compton case, in Prince Edward Island, the accused, who only vaguely remembered what happened at a social gathering because he was drinking, was acquitted of charges of sexual assault. The judge said that he could not make a ruling and that he was not



*Government Orders*

convinced that the Crown had established the criminal intent required to convict the accused.

Closer to home, in the district of Hull, in the Thériault case, a Court of Quebec judge acquitted a man charged with assaulting and threatening his spouse on the grounds that he was too high on cocaine to realize what he was doing.

(1720)

Three cases of women who were victims of assault and all three resulted in acquittals. This is more than the public could take. Canadians have had enough of the aberrant decisions made by our judicial system. Following the Supreme Court decision, the Minister of Justice decided to take action. In fact, the general outcry provoked by the Daviault case and the subsequent decisions made by lower courts was such that the minister had to respond immediately. This is of course a political decision; it is only a short term solution, before the Criminal Code undergoes a comprehensive review. This is what we call a piecemeal approach.

The problem with this approach is that it inevitably results in a legislative mosaic which lacks cohesion. Although the justice minister has done some pretty good patchwork, it is still incomplete and inadequate. We wonder whatever happened to the judicial and legislative powers. Simple logic tells us that Parliament should legislate and then let the courts interpret the intent of the legislation. However, this is not the case. The courts, and particularly the Supreme Court, seem to be telling Parliament how to legislate. The world has gone crazy.

It is up to the Minister of Justice to initiate reforms. The Supreme Court should not have to lead him by the hand. It is not up to the highest court in the country to take the initiative, the minister should do it. Enough of stopgap measures. Let us get on with it. The Daviault case was not the only opportunity used by the Supreme Court to send a message to the Minister of Justice.

Indeed, in the McIntosh decision, brought down on February 23, the court gave a rather surprising interpretation of the notion of self-defence. The judges concluded that an aggressor responsible for a dispute could avail himself of the principle of self-defence in a murder case. Chief Justice Lamer made a very telling comment when he wrote, and I quote: "It is clear that legislative action is required to clarify the Criminal Code's self-defence regime". He added: "It is, in my opinion, anomalous that an accused who commits the most serious act has the broadest defence. Parliament, after all, has the right to legislate illogically".

The message is rather clear. Yet, it remains unanswered. With all due respect, the judges of the Supreme Court were not elected by the people and it is not their duty to indicate the direction the criminal law should take. Jurisprudence has an important role to

play in the development of the law, but it is not a substitute for the decisions we as legislators are supposed to make.

As for the bill before us today, the substantive amendments to the Criminal Code proposed in Bill C-72 are preceded by a preamble setting out the circumstances and considerations justifying this new legislative measure. The preamble will appear in the texts as an integral part of the amending legislation, but it will not be included in the Criminal Code. In fact, the preamble is longer than clause 33.1, which will be added to the Code. It is therefore difficult to ignore.

Generally speaking, the preamble gives the background to the bill. Among other things, mention is made of the serious concern with violence in society, the close association between violence and intoxication and the recognized potential effects of alcohol on human behaviour. In this same vein, reference is made to the moral view that people who, while in a state of self-induced intoxication, violate the physical integrity of others are blameworthy and must therefore be held criminally accountable for their conduct, whence the need to incorporate in the law a standard of care, departure from which would entail criminal fault.

(1725)

A minor amendment has been suggested by the justice committee concerning paragraph 4 of the preamble, which points out logically enough that the consumption of intoxicants may not necessarily cause a person to act involuntarily.

It is difficult to argue with virtue. On the other hand, the preamble raises a number of questions and comments. What is meant by saying that violence has a particularly disadvantaging impact on the equal participation of women and children in society. Are we afraid to say what we mean? Why does the preamble emphasize violence against women and children? Why are we still and always compared with children? It has really started to bug me that women are being equated with children, when it comes to victimization.

Let me make this clear. I am not saying that children do not deserve special attention. What bothers me is the condescending and paternalistic attitude of the lawmaker. Whenever women need protection of any importance, we protect them as if they were children. It would seem to me that several people still consider us the weaker sex, actually, as weak as a child.

Therefore, society should give us women the same protection, according to the lawmakers, perhaps; that is a male way of thinking. A woman does not need to be taken by the hand. A woman does not need to be told to look twice before crossing the street. A woman is a mature and responsible being. A woman is a mother who raises a child. A woman is not a child.

Stop thinking of us in this way. If, in general, women need special protection, that protection should be different from the protection given to children. And children certainly do not encounter the same obstacles as women do, when they try to take an active role in society. So, why suggest that they are similar? Otherwise, we would have to reclassify all human beings in our society. We would have to start talking about adults, on the one hand, and, on the other, women and children. There was a time

when people used to think this way. It would seem that the lawmaker is now heading back in that direction.

The summary gives an insight into the legislative amendments contained in Bill C-72. However, this litany of excuses has no other purpose than to eventually refer the issue to the Supreme Court, for an opinion on the approach taken in the amendments made in Bill C-72.

The Minister of Justice is consistent as he again considers the option of a referral asking the Supreme Court to examine the amendments to the Criminal Code in Bill C-72, as soon as the legislation is passed by Parliament but before the legislation comes into force.

He would seek a non-binding advisory opinion from the Supreme Court, as if Parliament needed the seal of approval of the courts! And if the Supreme Court felt that the provisions were unconstitutional, we would have to go through the whole process again. We would be back to square one, and the time spent in the House and in committee would have been wasted.

If the Minister of Justice is so sure that his bill would pass the test of a constitutional challenge, why bother seeking the approval of the Supreme Court?

Immediate implementation of these amendments is both necessary and crucial. As long as we keep postponing the coming into force of this legislation, the number of these sad and sordid cases will continue to increase. Courts across the country are waiting for the Minister of Justice to act. This time they are seeking an opinion from the Supreme Court.

Aside from the preamble, the bill is very brief. Just one clause. Bill C-72 proposes to add a new section 33.1 to the Criminal Code, which consists of three subsections. The first one removes the defence of self-induced intoxication, the second subsection defines the standard of fault and the third specifies the type of offence to which the provision applies.

Section 33.1 of the bill will be added to the general part of the Criminal Code under the heading *Self-induced intoxication*. However, the section in question provides no definition of this term and does not list specific circumstances to which the section does not apply. It seems to me that the Minister of Justice, who wants to correct a judicial decision, is still leaving a lot of room for interpretation. The connection between the preamble and subsection three of the article seems somewhat ambiguous.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** It being 5.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business. Before we do, however, I would ask the hon. member for Saint-Hubert if she could tell the House how long she will need to conclude her remarks. Perhaps we could then agree to delay Private Members' Business, or perhaps we should ask for unanimous consent.

### *Routine Proceedings*

Could the hon. member for Saint-Hubert help us out with this information?

**Mrs. Venne:** Mr. Speaker, I would need 8 or 9 minutes more.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Under the circumstances, I would ask, without wanting the hon. member for Saint-Hubert to be bound by her statement, if there is unanimous consent?

[*English*]

Would there be unanimous consent that I not see the clock so the hon. member for St. Hubert could conclude her remarks? Then at approximately 5.40 p.m. we would go into Private Members' Business. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Silye:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe the parliamentary secretary to the House leader has another issue he would like to bring forward. If he does I would like to have that heard now so that we could proceed. We would agree to the request.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** As we say repeatedly from the Chair, it is your House and I am only here to accede to your wishes.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### INDUSTRY—AUTHORIZATION TO TRAVEL

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in light of the comments of the Reform Party whip I would seek the consent of the House for a couple of motions. I move:

That 15 members and 7 staff of the Standing Committee on Industry be authorized to travel to Toronto, Ontario, during the adjournment of the House between August 1 and August 3, 1995, in order to conduct hearings on major banks and their activities.

I seek unanimous consent for that motion and then I will have another one.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

*Government Orders*

[Translation]

**SUBSTITUTIONS**

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Standing Orders, the chief whip of any party can, for the purposes of this trip, make substitutions by giving notice to the clerk of the committee. These substitutions will apply for the duration of the trip and will take effect as soon as they are received by the clerk of the committee.

I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to introduce this motion as well, Mr. Speaker.

(Motion agreed to.)

[English]

**Mr. Milliken:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask for leave to revert to presentation of reports by interparliamentary delegations so that the hon. member for Labrador could present a report to the House.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

**INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS**

**Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1) I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the seventh report of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association which represented Canada at the 1995 spring session of the North Atlantic Assembly.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Before returning to the previous business before the House, I would like to express my thanks to the House for its co-operation.

The hon. member for St. Hubert will conclude her remarks. Upon completion of the remarks we will proceed to the private members' hour. I particularly appreciate the co-operation and the indulgence of the member in whose name the motion stands, the hon. member for Mission—Coquitlam.

---

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

(1735)

[Translation]

**CRIMINAL CODE**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-72, an act to amend the Criminal Code (self-induced intoxication), be read the third time and passed.

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Sint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for allowing me to conclude my comments on Bill C-72 right away.

I was speaking about the preamble and the relationship of the preamble to the third paragraph of the new clause. The preamble provides that it is necessary to legislate a basis of criminal fault in relation to general intent offences involving violence.

However, subclause 33.1(3) of the bill provides that the section applies to offences including violence or threat of violence under the Criminal Code or any other act of Parliament. Does this not mean that the section would also apply to specific intent offences with violence? This however is not the case.

In fact, an individual charged will still be able to claim self-induced intoxication as a defence against such serious charges as murder, theft, robbery, extortion, breaking and entering and torture.

As the preamble to the bill indicates, we clearly recognize the close association between violence and intoxication. The urgency of the situation requires immediate intervention. Every day women are battered by their drunken spouse.

The results of a national survey on assaults against female spouses, in which more than 12,300 women participated, were released in March 1994. As I said previously, this survey establishes beyond the shadow of a doubt the relationship between alcohol and violence. It reveals that alcohol is a prime factor in spousal assaults. The aggressor had been drinking in half of all the reported assaults.

More specifically, the rate of assault on woman living with a man who drinks regularly, that is at least four times a week, was three times higher than for abstinent husbands.

Women whose husbands drink often five drinks or more at one time were six times more exposed to assault than women whose spouse did not drink. In 1993, 55 per cent of the men who killed their partners had consumed alcohol.

That being said, Bill C-72 is only part of the solution when dealing with the violence issue. When sexual assault results in the death of the victim, what was common assault becomes culpable homicide. The offender will be able to use the intoxication defence, whereas he could not have presented such a defence if the victim had not died, since in that case he would have been charged with aggravated sexual assault.

Which leads to the following nonsense. If the aggressor hits his victim hard enough to cause her death, he can plead that he was too intoxicated to know what he was doing. On the other hand, if the victim recovers from her injuries, he will no longer be able to use this defence. Such nonsense ought to be remedied at once. The only way this can be done is by consolidating the

Criminal Code and updating our law so that it reflects what society condones and what it will not tolerate.

Every form of violence should be exterminated like vermin. The Minister of Justice should not wait any longer to complete the reform of the general part of the Criminal Code. The rules of criminal law are archaic and many of its fundamental principles are not included in the general part, as they were developed by the courts.

Precedents shape the law. It is high time for roles to be reversed and for lawmakers to act responsibly. The Barreau du Québec quite rightly expressed serious concerns about Bill C-72.

In its brief to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, it suggests a global approach to penal law. Here is what it said in unequivocal terms. "The Barreau du Québec wishes to emphasize that, far from eliminating the confusion which surrounds the concepts applying to criminal law, the proposed legislation creates even greater confusion. The urgency is of a political nature and is the direct result of the treatment, by the media, of the Daviault case. This certainly confirms the need to look at the issue, but we must do so in the appropriate general context".

(1740)

Other groups showed less tolerance toward Bill C-72. The Criminal Lawyers Association called the legislation "premature". These criminal lawyers feel that the bill violates the charter of rights and freedoms. They deplore the attitude of the Minister of Justice, who is providing a political solution to a legal issue. These criminal lawyers also feel that the premises of the preamble are flawed and are too open to interpretation.

Without necessarily agreeing with these groups, I do see a common denominator, namely the need to reform our criminal law, particularly the Criminal Code. Using a piecemeal approach or merely patching things up only leads to inconsistent legislation and absurd precedents.

We need a comprehensive review, as Superior Court Justice Réjean Paul said:

"It has already been quite a while since the Law Reform Commission of Canada suggested to Parliament that it should undertake major changes regarding substantive law and criminal procedure, so as to be able to deal with contemporary issues. It is necessary to adopt a new Criminal Code, as well as a new Code of procedure. In Canada, we are still using a working tool that dates back to the previous century, was reworked in 1927 and 1952, and patched up several times since to deal with new political, economic or social realities".

### *Private Members' Business*

The chaotic situation prevailing in our criminal law system could not be better summed up. Therefore, I exhort the Minister of Justice to stop grandstanding and to propose an overhaul in September. Criminal law needs a steady hand at the helm, someone capable of keeping on course, not someone who will be dragged along in the wake of the courts.

In closing, I would like to wish all of my colleagues a pleasant end of session; we all know that the last sprint is difficult. I wish you all a good summer and above all, a happy national holiday, Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day, to all Quebecers. May we proudly celebrate the joy that comes with belonging to a people who will soon, very soon, take charge of their own affairs and create a country of their own.

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** It being 5.43 p.m. the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed in today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

### NATIONAL GRANDPARENTS DAY

**Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.)** moved that Bill C-259, an act respecting a national grandparent's day, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

She said: Mr. Speaker, in today's times the family seems to be under constant attack and so it is that those of us who are chosen to represent Canadians and make decisions for Canadians must also protect the Canadian way of life.

The family is the basic unit for all society, yet it seems to have its adversaries, those who seem intent on belittling the importance of family in today's world. I am sorry to hear from those who do not respect the family for it is our heritage. It is mankind's heritage and mankind must protect it if the world is to remain strong.

From strong families we have strong communities. From strong communities we have strong provinces or states, and from strong provinces and states we have strong countries. One unit builds upon the other.

Why is it so important to remain respectful of the family unit? When we are born, each of us learns from our parents. We are taught who we are and learn the values of living within a family, of treating each other with love and respect.

Our future behaviour, one of being responsible, carrying one's weight and respecting others and our way of life begins in a family setting. Later, as we continue to grow and get an education, our relationships with others and our treatment of others reflect our early family teachings. We are what we are taught. We are what we experience.

If we are part of the working world and go into business, our business reflects our attitudes. If we take a position in the workforce our treatment of others and our ability to work with

*Private Members' Business*

others forms our reputations, that which we become known by or judged by and hopefully loved by.

The most common reference to the life of mankind is a tree. If the roots are strong and well fed, so grows the tree. If families teach strong values, good citizenship, respect for others, children as they grow will carry out this practice in their every day lives. As we know, acorns never fall far from the tree. So it goes that our basic teachers who become grandparents are of great value to our society.

If a country is to remain strong, its people must be strong, for a country reflects the values of its people. In Canada we have many cultures and we are made aware of this when we travel or walk through our large cities, whether we are in a market square or a restaurant or a school. If we look closer when we meet our fellow Canadians I know we will see the attitude within each of these cultures toward their families.

We can learn from each other. Whether we watch our aboriginal peoples or new cultures that come to Canada from other countries, they clearly show respect for their elders in each of our many family groupings in Canada.

It appears to me to be the underlying theme in most cases, the elders in each of our families, the grandparents and the great grandparents, those who are wise in the ways of the world. The best way to be wise is through life experience and through hardships.

Let us look at who our grandparents and our great grandparents are today. First, I want to point out that this group in Canadian society is the very one who gave us many of the plans we have today, such as the basic UIC program, workmen's compensation, old age security and the health care plan. These citizens have paid their way in society. Now we should support the intent of my Bill C-259 and help them by recognizing the second Sunday in September as grandparent's day, the same as we have a father's day and a mother's day.

At this time, in this House, it would be a very special thing to do. At the end of debate in this session on Private Members' Business, we should finish the session by recognizing our grandparents in this way.

Grandparents and all seniors today are very active. Many are still in the workforce. Many are in volunteer organizations. I want to take a moment to point out that right now in Ontario we have grandparents who are in the volunteer organization Many Hands. As a volunteer one does not get paid for one's services. There are many grandparents in this program called "School Volunteers Add Life to Their Years".

These are the types of things this group of grandparents and seniors do in our communities throughout Ontario: volunteer activities and general classroom assistance. These volunteers carry out various tasks such as assisting with learning activities, oral reading, creating displays, helping young children with their clothing. They might also form part of the class grandpar-

ents which is the intergenerational program in which a senior becomes a grandparent to one classroom. They might take on remedial education. Volunteers are needed to assist students with reading, language and math skills.

They might also do special education. Volunteers work with developmentally challenged students, either one to one or within an integrated classroom. They might be in mentoring where they are working one on one with a student to provide friendly support, increase motivation, encourage attendance and help prevent dropouts. They might work with languages.

Volunteers with fluency in languages could assist in French immersion programs or in English as a second language, RESL programs. Grandparents might work in the electives. Students benefit from hands on learning when volunteers introduce and demonstrate their skills in art, drama, music, computers and more. They might be resource speakers. How often in my classroom did I have seniors speaking to students about various skills they have. Volunteers speak on topics of interest to the class which include careers, travel, hobbies and special projects. They might be part of school clubs. School clubs and science fairs all benefit from the involvement of volunteers with specialized experience.

(1750)

Grandparents might coach team sports. Many school teams need help in activities such as coaching, training and managing. Grandparents might be library assistants. A busy library needs volunteers to assist students to locate materials, prepare library cards, repair books, help with circulation tasks and reshelve books or work as an office assistant. The school office frequently needs help in general clerical assistance, filing, copying and telephoning.

I have demonstrated that when it comes to volunteering, our seniors, our grandparents are invaluable. At least in Ontario we already realize what a wonderful resource they are.

I wonder how many of us realize that we have something called seniors games in our provinces. I know Ontario has seniors games because I have in front of me a very beautiful, very large magazine that goes out to 160,000 grandparents throughout the province.

I want to point out that the Ontario senior games have many qualifications within them. One must qualify for various programs to take part in them. Just some of them are: cribbage, contract bridge, carpet bowling, darts, five-pin bowling, golf, horseshoes, lawn bowling, shuffle board, tennis, ten-pin bowling walking, and it goes on.

These activities for grandparents, for seniors are all organized and all paid for by volunteers. I know these seniors have a very good time. I know this because I partake in the seniors program in British Columbia. I competed last year and I will be competing again this fall in the same program.

*Private Members' Business*

All of these seniors give their time but they still enjoy life. I want us to remember that our grandparents are not too old to enjoy life, not too old to take responsibility, not too old to work, as many of them still do.

In the seniors programs we see a demonstration of sport and sports abilities that are second to none. Last year I watched an 87-year-old senior in British Columbia win the badminton finals. A very excellent sports athlete.

I also want to point out, as this book does, that seniors are in volunteer programs here in Ontario. It says: "Volunteers make a difference; \$93.3 million gift to society". That is what the seniors in Ontario have managed to help raise. In 1994 in metro Toronto seniors donated an average of four hours a week to charities and community work which translates into a whopping \$93.3 million. Think about all those volunteer hours that are not paid for, that are given freely.

Seniors have experienced maturity and commitment. They are looking for an opportunity to learn new skills, be challenged, makes friends and have fun. We should take the time to realize that our seniors are very special people.

I would like to point out that in my grandparent's Bill C-232, I stated something very firmly. It was my opinion of the value of grandparents in the home. In this country and in the United States grandparents sometimes raise their grandchildren. In that case they are attending to needs I am going to talk about. In the United States there are over three million grandparents who are raising their grandchildren.

In Canada we have no records on that. The reason we have no record is that we have nothing in legislation yet, even though Bill C-232 did get the unanimous support of the House and I hope it makes it into legislation shortly.

My idea of literacy and crime prevention, which incidentally I have been speaking about for over six months, is something I feel could start with grandparents and with our senior volunteers because literacy begins at birth, it begins in the home. What a wonderful opportunity. Grandparents are there. They drop in. They visit regularly. They look after their grandchildren. It is an opportunity for them to read to them, take time to talk with them, to listen to them, to encourage them in that they are doing.

This literacy program which I have been talking about for six months automatically has a positive result.

(1755)

I believe that positive result would be crime prevention. I have spoken of this in every every group I have spoken to during the last six months, whether in British Columbia, here or in the maritimes.

I strongly support literacy and crime prevention. I strongly support the program as it is outlined by the government, literacy and crime prevention. However, I have to take issue with one booklet which I am holding in my hand. I know my grandparents would agree with me that the language in this booklet is not acceptable for use. I know the grandparents that are in the gallery and the grandparents that are watching at home would agree that perhaps we could take a second at this booklet. We agree 100 per cent with literacy and crime prevention but we know our children have to read good language in books.

I also have a few talking points which relate to Bill C-259, an act respecting national grandparent's day. I want to stress it is important to recognize even in a symbolic way the contribution of our ancestors. They can be recognized, if the House agrees that the second Sunday in September would be a great day to recognize grandparents on grandparent's day.

It is through grandparents and great grandparents, if one is fortunate enough to know them, that the oral tradition of family history is passed on. How many times did we listen to our grandparents telling us stories about their lives?

These traditions that go back to our roots are necessary in times of great change. It is always encouraging to have a touchstone to mark one's activity against and it is important this touchstone never change.

This is what grandparents do for us: for our children they provide a solid base of support and advice. How many times do we in the House remember asking for our grandparent's help when we were younger?

Recognition of grandparent's day is really a recognition of grandchildren and their relationship to the future of the country. I cannot stress that enough. When we talk about grandparents we are reinforcing the rights of our grandchildren. Lifting up the role of grandparents gives recognition to the interests of our grandchildren, it provides a bridge between the age gaps of young and old. When you see seniors working with young children, you realize there really are no age gaps. They converse very well together and they understand each other very well.

We are all aware of the breakdown in the family unit and in family values in this last decade of the 20th century. This is our opportunity at least as parliamentarians to say that we do not want that to happen. We want to support our grandparents.

This breakdown is attributable to many causes: the stress of modern day living, monetary worries and lack of job opportunities. In many cases these stresses have led to the break up of families. In a family breakdown most children who are involved believe they are at least partially to blame for the divorce of their parents. Only grandparents who are not immediately involved can act to console the children of divorce, to reassure them the divorce is not their fault. Grandparents are there in

*Private Members' Business*

good times and in bad to lend a hand. They make the grandchildren whole again.

Those in their later years have contributed greatly to the development of this country. It was they who fought in the last world war, it was they who have attempted to prevent global war since 1945.

We do not as a country spend enough time in reflection on our past. We have been caught up in the struggle to personally succeed, to live our personal success story. Grandparents can contribute a quiet assurance to the development of children that parents because of jobs and other pressures cannot now give.

Bill C-232 dealing with grandparents rights of access to grandchildren during a divorce hearing has been debated on three occasions in the House and sent to the justice committee for study. As I mentioned earlier I would like to see it come back in the House.

It follows from this heightened awareness of the rights of grandparents that one day per year should be set aside to honour them. I hope we can agree with this.

Finally I want to mention an article I happened to run across which contains the words of Pope John Paul. Regardless of our religion or absence of religion, we might all realize this is a world leader to whom we should listen. He is talking of problems of the elderly:

—as the years pass and their strength fails and illness comes to debilitate them further, they are made to feel increasingly conscious of their physical fragility, and, above all, of the burden of life.

The only way to solve this problem is for our seniors to be taken to heart by everybody and accepted as a matter with which the whole of humanity must concern itself, for all humanity is called upon to support our seniors.

The experiences of our elders are a treasure the young married folk who, in the difficulties of early married life, can find in aged parents agreeable counsellors—and confidants, while the children will find in the example and affectionate care of their grandparents something that will compensate for the absences of their parents, which, for various reasons, are so frequent today.

The fact is that modern cultural patterns in which an unbalanced emphasis is often given to economic productivity, efficiency, physical strength and beauty, personal comfort, can have the effect of making the elderly seem burdensome, superfluous and useless, and of putting them on the margins of family and social life—

The elderly often have the charisma to bridge generation gaps before they are made. How many children have found understanding and love in the eyes, words and caresses of the aging. And how many old people have willingly subscribed to the inspired word that the crown of the aged is their children's children?

(1800)

It is my hope today that members who are still in the House at the end of the time set aside to debate my private member's bill will join with me in agreeing that the second Sunday in September would be an excellent day to recognize grandparents.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I remind the House that we can expect an interruption very shortly for royal assent on some bills.

**Ms. Hedy Fry (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of creating a grandparents day for Canada to honour grandparents for their significant contributions to both our individual and collective lives. We have a mother's day, a father's day and a year of the child, yet we have been reluctant to similarly recognize and honour grandparents who have contributed so much to our attitudes and values as citizens.

Grandparents would have been invented if nature had not already seen to create them in the hierarchical structure. Grandparents come in various sizes and shapes, not to mention ages. In fact traditionally one had to be a senior to be a grandparent. Today grandparents may be in their forties or fifties. In fact I have a friend who is a 35-year old grandmother. Even though I am no longer so young, I confess the thought of being a grandparent has begun to enter my fantasy and beckon seductively. Alas my sons have no wish to comply just yet.

My only grandparent who I can remember—all others died before I was born—was my grandmother. She was my mentor and she was my heroine. She taught me early about advocacy, feminism and politics. She had a more profound effect on the path I chose in life than my parents. She taught me to be strong and to be outspoken, to be independent and to tilt at windmills. She taught me more by her example than by dictum. I am the woman I am today mostly because of my grandmother.

Grandparents are not only mentors. They are nurturers. They come to the rescue of their grandchildren. They spoil them. They do things for them they would never have done for their own children, and so it should be. The grandparent is a grandchild's greatest defender and advocate, caretaker, surrogate babysitter, money lender, chauffeur and cookie baker. Grandparents are so important to our society that where nature did not provide them humans have indeed invented them.

In B.C. there is an organization of volunteer grandparents who take the place of grandparents especially in urban settings. This association adopts children the same way as the Big Sister and Big Brother organizations, bringing a new and important relationship into the lives of lonely young children and young people. They become part of the extended family, eventually creating mutually beneficial lifelong bonds.

*Private Members' Business*

(1805)

My own sons, born in a land far away from their own biological grandparents, were deprived of that special relationship with a grandparent, and they recognize that loss even now that they are men.

As late 20th century family trends continue and global travel creates distances between natural families, grandparents will live lonely existences separated from their biological families either by divorce or distance, as too will their grandchildren. For many children, grandparents may be the only stable caregiver they know.

True, the new blended family may create new opportunities for multiple grandparents and that is a plus. But whatever the scenarios, for those of us who remember or still have grandparents, we know that their work is indisputable, their wisdom invaluable, and their experience as story tellers unmatched. They link the past to the future, bringing a sense of continuity, tradition and belonging to this fragmented world of ours.

Grandparents have built and shaped our world of today and with our gratitude and will as parliamentarians we can make them an integral part of the world of tomorrow. I suggest we honour the immeasurable contribution of grandparents to our lives by creating a grandparent's day.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this is my second speech in this House about a bill to declare a national grandparent's day throughout Canada. Like my colleague from Mission—Coquitlam, I also wish to salute the seniors, the grandparents sitting in the public gallery upstairs.

Bill C-259 tabled by my colleague says this:

Whereas it is recognized that grandparents have laid the foundation of our family structure and future well-being;

And Whereas it is desirable to encourage all Canadians, and particularly children and grandchildren, to remember and appreciate their grandparents;

And Whereas the people of Canada wish to honour all grandparents in acknowledgement of their contribution to Canadian society;

The bill proposes that throughout Canada, in each year, the second Sunday in September of each year shall be known as "National Grandparent's Day".

As the official opposition's representative for seniors' organizations, I noticed that my previous comments in support of a very similar bill declaring a national grandparent's day touched many seniors in my riding of Argenteuil—Papineau and across Canada, including the British Columbia seniors' group of which my colleague is a member.

It is essential to recognize the place of grandparents in our society, when we see how many organizations, groups or simply themes are entitled to their own days underlining their existence and importance. Bill C-259 at last gives seniors a prominent place in keeping with the very important role they play in their grandchildren's lives.

However, to help them play this role properly, the government must provide seniors with a minimum level of financial security, thus preserving their autonomy. Our seniors' financial situation shows that we must not reduce the deficit on the backs of the most vulnerable. I refer you once again to the report by the National Advisory Council on Aging, which reveals that seniors do not enjoy high income levels.

As representative for seniors' organizations, I have always sought to ensure that the government does not penalize seniors. Incidentally, I recently participated in the debate on Bill C-54, which specifically affects seniors' pensions either through the Canada pension plan or through old age security. We in the Bloc Québécois proposed a series of amendments aimed at protecting seniors who would otherwise be penalized by Bill C-54. Unfortunately, the government rejected them.

(1810)

I suggested, for instance, that Canada Post should not have access to personal information provided to the government by beneficiaries. I also proposed an amendment that would oblige the minister to remit overpayments due to an administrative error.

Furthermore, the Bloc Québécois presented an amendment that would reinstate the one-year statute of limitation on overpayments by the government on old age security pensions that were not due to fraudulent intent.

The present statute is five years, which means that the government has five years to claim amounts paid in excess. In fact I spoke yesterday in the House on the subject of Bill C-54, to explain the series of amendments proposed by the Bloc Québécois. The bill was passed but the amendments proposed by the Bloc Québécois, the official opposition, were defeated.

I support Bill C-259 because it takes into account the contribution made by grandparents to our society. However, the economic situation of seniors is something we should be mindful of every day of the year, so that they can play their role as grandparents.

We should recognize, even symbolically, the contribution of our seniors. Bill C-259 also gives us a chance to recognize their relationship with their grandchildren. We are, of course, all aware of the breakup of the traditional family.

I also spoke in the House not long ago on the subject of Bill C-232, an Act to amend the Divorce Act. The purpose of this bill is to provide that grandparents will not be required to obtain



*Private Members' Business*

leave of the court to apply for a temporary, permanent or amending order regarding custody of or access to the children.

Divorce always leave a bitter aftertaste, and I see it as my duty to ensure that seniors continue to enjoy the place that is theirs in our society. Personally, I am very concerned about the old age pension reform announced by the government, which will come into force in 1997.

In 1994, the government announced that a document would be produced and tabled. Production was delayed, however, and the government preferred to wait until after the referendum in Quebec. In fact, seniors in Quebec had an opportunity to discuss their future at hearings held by the Commission des aînés sur l'avenir du Québec. In the course of these consultations, we found that seniors' concerns are similar across the country. They are concerned about their social and economic situation.

Practically everywhere, people argued in favour of letting senior citizens use their experience for the benefit of the society they will pass on to their grandchildren. Bill C-259 gives seniors a decisive role and reflects our recognition of the role of seniors in our society.

In concluding, I want to say that the official opposition supports Bill C-59 standing in the name of the hon. member for Mission—Coquitlam. I want to thank the hon. member on behalf of all seniors' organizations and also on behalf of all grandparents, the young and not so young, in this country for drawing attention to their role in our society.

[English]

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to be asked to speak in support of Bill C-259, an act respecting national grandparent's day.

I am sure that my colleague from Mission—Coquitlam asked me to speak on the bill because despite my youthful appearance she knows that I am a grandfather. So today, to my grandson, Marcel I say: "If you are watching the parliamentary channel on TV, Pop says hello". I am a grandparent and I am proud of it. All together my wife and I have four grandchildren. Marcel is five going on 16. We also have Alannah, Carson and Brock who are quite a bit younger.

(1815)

We have a national mother's day and a national father's day. Grandparents are either mothers or fathers and I can see the logic in setting aside a day to recognize the importance of grandparents.

Parents are often so caught up in the task of earning a living, keeping the house organized and keeping the children on the straight and narrow they do not have the energy or the patience to enjoy their children in the same way grandparents do.

My wife Bernice says she has more fun with our grandchildren than she did with our own children. When she was a young mother getting the house tidy usually took priority over reading to our children and other things. Now she spends time with our grandchildren, in particular our grandson Marcel, and she says he claims he loves his grandmother more than pancakes. I can assure members pancakes are my grandson's favourite food.

Grandparents have a big influence on their grandchildren. They provide their grandchildren with deeper roots and a sense of connection with the past. They can teach them different things because they have a different perspective. They can be more tolerant because discipline is not their responsibility any more. They can enjoy their grandchildren for who they really are.

Our grandson Marcel has already learned a few things from watching me in the role of politician. The other day at the dinner table he told a story which his mother knew was a little white lie. She gave him one of her looks and without even skipping a beat our five-year-old grandson said to his mother: "Mom, I would like to rephrase that". He is watching television and he is smooth for a five-year-old.

In today's society grandparents can be of enormous help to their children. With so many families breaking up and with so many families stressed out from making ends meet, an extra pair of loving hands is always welcome.

If we were to have a national grandparents day it would be set aside to honour the role of grandparents and the role they can play. It would recognize the wisdom which grandparents can bring. It would give grandparents a sense of importance and worth. It would be a powerful reminder to those grandparents who are not as involved with their grandchildren as perhaps they could be that the more time they spend with their grandchildren, the longer the memory of their influence will survive.

The House should give serious consideration to the bill. It will be an important signal to the nation of our ongoing commitment to the family. It will strengthen the resolve of those involved in taking their roles more seriously and, most important, it will not cost a dime.

**Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York—Simcoe, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, sometimes I think grandparents are wasted on the young because it is not until later in life when we can look back that we really appreciate what our grandparents have given to us.

I had the great pleasure of knowing three of my grandparents very well. One grandmother, who has been gone from us for almost 40 years, is still revered by her family as a strong, principled woman who worked hard to provide a life for her family in the new country.

My grandfather impressed on me the importance of my responsibility as a citizen, as a new Canadian, ensuring his

children took great care in participating in and supporting the democracy of Canada. I am here today because of him.

My other grandmother provided me with another strong role model, a woman with her own special brand of humour, intelligence and tenacity.

While we discuss a grandparent's day for Canada I would like to introduce the idea of reciprocity. The trend from single to dual earner families has restructured the family as we know it. This has required substantial lifestyle changes within households. The trend has produced uncertainties in role expectations for spouses, their children and grandparents.

Family members or friends provide most of the support for seniors needing care. In return, seniors are active contributors to their families. They provide financial assistance, care for their grandchildren, do housework, they bake and they undertake household repairs. More important, they provide emotional support and continuity for the younger members of their families.

Grandparents donate their time as volunteers, they share their experience—

---

## ROYAL ASSENT

(1820)

[*Translation*]

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Deputy to the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the House went up to the Senate chamber.

(1830)

*And being returned:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I have the honour to inform the House that when the House went up to the Senate Chamber the Deputy Governor General was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, Royal Assent to the following bills:

Bill C-76, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 27, 1995—Chapter 17.

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—Chapter 18.

Bill C-37, an act to amend the Young Offenders Act and the Criminal Code—Chapter 19.

Bill S-7, an act to accelerate the use of alternative fuels for motor vehicles—Chapter 20.

Bill C-70, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Income Tax Application Rules and related Acts—Chapter 21.

## *Private Members' Business*

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

#### GRANDPARENTS DAY ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-259, an act respecting a national grandparent's day, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York—Simcoe, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, grandparents donate their time as volunteers. They share their experiences of life, thereby passing on values to a new generation. Grandparents support a child's development by unconditional love.

Both grandfathers and grandmothers are retiring earlier from the workforce and remaining active and healthy. This affords them the time to emphasize family care and connections. The active participation of grandparents in the lives of their grandchildren helps reduce the stress on their own children who are trying to juggle family and work responsibilities.

We pride ourselves in Canada on being a caring population. We respect and celebrate individual differences. This is our opportunity to honour the role seniors in general and grandparents in particular play in the interdependent relationship enjoyed by different generations. This is the opportunity to do so by declaring a national grandparent's day we can celebrate each year to remind us and Canada's future generations of that interdependence and reciprocity and to honour our elders for their significant contributions.

(1835)

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to address the House on the issue of creating a special day each year known as grandparent's day all across Canada.

From a child's point of view, a grandparent is the person who loves unconditionally. Child development experts will tell you that unconditional love is the kind of love you receive just for being you, and it is critical in the life of a child.

Not too long ago in this House an hon. member referred to his grandson as the most handsome, intelligent, talented, and clever boy in the whole world. The other grandparents in the room may have taken issue with the statement, because we all know that in fact our grandchildren are the best, the finest, the most terrific kids in the whole universe.

Children learn about themselves from many sources. One such source is to see oneself through another's eyes. What they see in a grandparent's eyes is a reflection of their own special uniqueness. From these loving mirrors self-esteem is developed, and from that love come immeasurable benefits for children, young and old.

*Government Orders*

Grandparents are historians and story tellers. They weave tales of days gone by, providing gentle guidance as children learn about family and social values and morality. Kids learn from the stories about their parents that everyone, even those who seem infallible, can in fact make mistakes. They learn that everyone struggles when growing up and they learn that parents are human.

Children also learn about their heritage from their grandparents. Seniors are the keepers of all the treasures of our culture, our spiritual identities, and our social values. In this country, where we welcome people of all cultures, grandparents are often the custodians of a family's original language and heritage. The retention of these original cultures makes Canada rich with variety. Our children and their children gain from a multicultural society where each culture is appreciated for its uniqueness.

I have been talking mostly about younger children and the incredible benefits they enjoy by being close to their grandparents. From the point of view of older children, the relationship, while different, can be equally invaluable. Many of us can remember how we suffered through adolescence, having to balance our desire for independence from our parents with the need to seek counsel and be protected from the hard knocks life can often fling at us. Those of us who could turn to a grandparent enjoyed receiving adult advice without having to jeopardize that all-important independence we felt so ambivalent about.

Children today who do not have grandparents of their own are lucky to be able to adopt surrogates. Several provinces have programs where older people volunteer to take on a grandparenting role. Both the children and the older people win in these relationships.

Grandparents are a source of constant support to grandchildren of any age. They provide respite to tired parents by taking care of the children. They share their energy lovingly with their grandchildren, providing them with a fresh point of view. Grandparents are the connection between the past and the future. They allow us to learn from past mistakes and to plan for the life to come. They are the conduit between what is known and what is as yet unknown.

In families under stress, grandparents can provide the anchor that allows children to escape even briefly the tension at home. By alleviating the anxiety and being solid pillars of calm in a confused world, grandparents help their grandchildren to cope.

The children may not realize it until later in life, but grandparents can provide a stabilizing and powerful influence. They can help children develop their personal identities and a positive image of aging.

The idea of creating a national grandparent's day was first presented to this House a mere few weeks ago by the hon. member for Don Valley North. I know how hard he worked on

that initiative and that he is very pleased that this House has decided to reconsider his initiative through this bill. I urge the government and indeed all members of this House to help celebrate the role of grandparents in Canada by supporting this bill in creating a national grandparents day.

(1840)

**Mrs. Jennings:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank everyone who spoke today; I notice they were all in favour of it.

While I recognize this is not deemed a votable bill, I would like to seek the consent of this House to recognize the second Sunday in September as grandparent's day.

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

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-72, an act to amend the Criminal Code (self-induced intoxication), be read the third time and passed.

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak on Bill C-72 regarding self-induced intoxication.

Like all Canadians, I was shocked when the Supreme Court of Canada ruled in the Daviault case. To remind members present, the Daviault case involved an elderly woman who was sexually assaulted by an intoxicated man. In a six to three decision the court ruled that the man was so intoxicated that he was virtually insane at the time of the crime and was declared innocent of all charges because he did not know what he was doing, I presume.

This country was assured at the time and time and time again by the government that this defence was a rare exception to the rule. Yet in the following weeks at least three criminal charges were overturned, all using the Daviault defence.

Many Reform MPs stood in this House and demanded action on the issue. As the justice minister stood by trying to ease concerns over Daviault mania, individual MPs and the Senate were wrestling with the problem and trying to find solutions to it. Is that not a sad testimony when two private members' bills and a Senate proposal can deal with a justice crisis like this faster than the justice minister?

*Government Orders*

When Bill C-72 finally did make its grand appearance into this House, Reformers were relieved. Finally the minister was dealing head on with this critical issue and stemming the use of the Daviault defence.

Reform promised to work with the minister to get this bill passed as fast as possible. Whatever it would take, we would do it. That was months ago. Now Bill C-72 is just one bill in our list of many to pass and ship off to the other place. Things could have been much different. This bill could have been made a priority, put on a fast track in the process to show Canadians that we as their representatives share their concerns over public safety and justice.

What was the holdup? Why did the Minister of Justice not give this bill the priority it deserved? Why are we only dealing with it now, the last day before the end of this session?

Perhaps a better question is what was more important than closing the Daviault defence? For one, Bill C-41 had a higher priority than ending the drunkenness defence. After all, this was a bill that was being pushed by the special interest groups and had to be passed to prove to these groups that the Liberal Party wants to get tough on crime. As well, the new gun control bill had a higher priority, since it supposedly would prevent crime and according to the justice minister save thousands of lives in the process through the creation of a new gun registry. And let us not forget the changes to the Young Offenders Act.

In other words, before dealing with the drunk defence the Minister of Justice felt he had to clear away Bill C-41, Bill C-68, and the Young Offenders Act changes. The justice minister's actions show just how out of place the Liberals' priorities really are, not only to the members of this House but to the victims of the criminals now off scot free thanks to the Daviault defence.

The Liberals are putting political causes ahead of public concerns in the hope that Canadians will be fooled by this smokescreen.

(1845)

Bill C-41, one of the minister's priorities, is not really about getting tough on hate crime at all. The bill is filled with measures dealing with the so-called alternative sentences giving criminals an easy way out of hard time. Serious concerns raised over section 718 were brushed off as scaremongering. Concerns about true justice were put aside for the sake of criminal rights and lobby groups.

Then there is Bill C-68. Even by the minister's own admission we know the multimillion dollar gun registry this bill will create will not reduce violent crime. Law-abiding owners of legal guns will be forced to register their weapons. Thousands of firearms have been declared illegal on the minister's whim. Meanwhile gun smugglers will continue to flood the underground economy with American firearms.

Are Canadians going to be any safer under Bill C-68? Will criminals have fewer firearms? Come to think of it, will any

criminals be rushing to the nearest police station to meet the registration deadline? The answer on all counts is no.

Of course there are the changes to the Young Offenders Act which still gives young criminals kiddie sentences for adult crimes.

There is a lot of talk but no action. The Minister of Justice is not really interested in justice at all. Time after time he betrays his left wing roots by writing legislation that fails to deter crime and instead treats the criminal like a victim. The bleeding heart socialists would be proud of the minister for his charitable approach to dealing with criminals. However I am not.

Canadians are feeling less safe than ever before. Violent crime surrounds all of us. The tranquillity of our cities is shattered every night by drive-by shootings, senseless beatings, robberies and sexual assaults. Canadians are looking to their political leaders for help and the government is not delivering. The proof of this lies in Bill C-72.

When the Daviault ruling was made, Reform MPs demanded that action be taken to make extreme intoxication a criminal offence. While the minister waffled, Reform put forward not one but two private members' bills putting an end to the defence of drunkenness. Meanwhile one of the senators put forward his own bill on the issue.

With three bills now on the table the justice minister could have picked any one of them, made any necessary amendments and sped it through both Houses. Instead he took his time, wasting precious days and weeks drafting a fourth bill. In all, Canadians have waited five months for the minister to bring forward Bill C-72.

Despite the delays and the indifference on the part of the minister, Reform still promised its co-operation. We would limit debate, cut committee time, even cut the committee process altogether, all to get this bill on the law books.

The minister first put forward his response in February and Canadians have been waiting for action ever since, and waiting, and waiting, and waiting. The delays have not come from Reform. We have promised to do all we can to get this bill passed. The fault lies across the House, specifically with the justice minister. His nearly one-half year delay has put the safety of Canadians at risk while he pursues his personal agenda that have nothing to do with justice.

To close, Canadians have been poorly served by this minister. Canadians are demanding good, effective laws, not laws for special interests, not laws for lobby groups. While pursuing his own agenda this justice minister has left the drunkenness defence issue on the back burner.

Reform supports Bill C-72 and wants it passed. I am relieved this bill will finally undergo third reading and soon at least partially close the drunkenness defence. I only hope that next time the minister will put his own interests aside and work on behalf of the interests of all Canadians instead.

*Government Orders*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

(1850)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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

\* \* \*

**CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-92, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

**Hon. Christine Stewart (for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.)** moved that Bill C-92, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mrs. Stewart (for Mr. Goodale)** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

**Mr. Lyle Vanclief (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, over the last couple of weeks a number of colleagues have spoken on this bill. I would like to add my words in favour of Bill C-92 again today. It is an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act. This bill would change the pooling points for wheat and barley sold through the Canadian Wheat Board to bring greater fairness to that system.

We are living through a time of enormous and almost revolutionary change in western grain transportation. After many long years of debate the federal government has finally moved to put western grain transportation on a commercial footing. The impetus for change came partly from the need to meet international obligations under GATT, partly to ease the federal debt and deficit, but mostly because it was the right thing to do for the economy of western Canada, including the grains and oilseeds sector.

Under the new GATT agreement that was reached in Geneva in December 1993, Canada along with 120 other countries made a commitment to reduce export subsidies. For Canada this meant gradually eliminating export subsidy components of the Western Grain Transportation Act or hampering exports of oilseeds and special crops as early as this year, the 1995-96 crop year.

When the Minister of Finance tabled his budget on February 27, 1995, he announced major changes to modernize the western grain transportation and handling system. This included the cancellation of the WGTA effective August 1, 1995.

Rather than allow the subsidy to wither away as called for under GATT, we decided to take the value of the subsidy over the next seven years, which is \$1.6 billion, and funnel that \$1.6 billion into the prairie economy. Along with that one time \$1.6 billion ex gratia payment the government also announced a \$300 million adjustment fund to assist the prairie agriculture sector in adjusting to the new environment including a change in the Canadian Wheat Board freight pooling system.

Changing the pooling system has long been seen as a prerequisite to making the system fair. Under the present system, grain producers in the western part of the prairies subsidize the movement of grain from the eastern prairies through the St. Lawrence seaway.

I will take a few minutes to explain how it works. When farmers deliver grain to their local elevators they receive an initial payment plus the freight costs for moving the grain to export position. These costs are based on two pooling points at the present time, Thunder Bay and Vancouver. It has been generally recognized by the industry that these pooling points, while historically price equivalent, are no longer appropriate points at which to pool sales revenue. This is due to changes in the global grain market and the transportation system.

(1855)

Very little grain is now exported directly from Thunder Bay. It is usually now transferred from Thunder Bay elevators to terminal elevators in the St. Lawrence. This means the difference between the cost to export grain from eastern Canada and western Canada is greater than it used to be. At the same time, more Canadian grain is exported through the west coast because of the markets that can be reached from there.

Under the current pooling regime, a producer for example in Brandon, Manitoba, being closer to Thunder Bay, would have an estimated \$20.34 per tonne in freight deducted starting as of August 1, 1995. A producer in Calgary, Alberta being closer to Vancouver would have a freight deduction of \$22.19 per tonne.

There are additional costs of about \$20 a tonne for moving grain from Thunder Bay east through the St. Lawrence to an export position somewhere on the St. Lawrence River. These costs are shared equally by all producers through the Canadian Wheat Board's pool accounts. For wheat that is about \$7 per tonne. That is paid by every farmer delivering wheat and barley to the Canadian Wheat Board regardless of where they are on the prairies. It is paid out of the pool account for this purpose.

*Government Orders*

Most Canadian Wheat Board grains produced in the western prairies move to the west coast for export. As a result the current pooling system has meant income has been transferred from the western part of the prairies to the eastern part of the prairies. The proposed amendment recognizes very clearly the locational advantages in the different regions on the prairies that all of those have on the markets for grain produced on the prairies.

This proposal represents a significant improvement over the current pooling system. It reflects the comparative advantage of different regions on the prairies. It reflects it better than the current pooling system. It significantly reduces the income transfer from the western part of the prairies to the eastern part of the prairies starting August 1, 1995. It does that provided that this bill passes before our summer recess which means that it needs to pass this week. We appreciate the co-operation of this House in hopefully seeing that done.

No seaway costs would be pooled after three years or after 1997-98, thus eliminating freight costs related income transfers in the prairies. This will result in grain producers in Manitoba and to a lesser extent in Saskatchewan facing higher transportation costs than before. However, the proposed change to the freight pooling system is being made in response to the requests from the western grains industry itself. Even Manitoba farm groups and the Manitoba government are in agreement with this amendment provided there is compensation. There will be compensation.

Assistance is available to offset a significant portion of the farmers' increased domestic freight costs in the eastern part of the prairies. With the passage of Bill C-92 a fair method of allocating freight costs among prairie producers of wheat and barley that are sold through the Canadian Wheat Board will be in place for the coming crop year and phased in during the next three years.

Again, I would ask all members of the House to support Bill C-92 before this House recesses for the summer for the good of the industry and to follow the directions and the wishes of the grain industry in western Canada.

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C-92 and to express Reform's support for the bill.

The purpose of the bill is to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act to change the pooling points on which initial payments are based from Thunder Bay and Vancouver to determine pooling points across the prairies and to establish a deduction from the initial payment that reflects the relative transportation cost across the prairies.

Through this bill, effective August 1, the federal government plans to change how eastward grain transportation costs are paid. This means that eastern prairie farmers who ship through the St. Lawrence seaway will have to pay the full cost of movement, or very close to the full cost of movement.

(1900)

Originally the government planned to make this change in August 1996 and the minister says he actually had some lobbying on the part of Manitoba groups to make the change a year earlier, in August 1995.

I fully support this move because it will let the market forces take over a lot more substantially, a lot more effectively, in the grain business in western Canada. This change will mean farmers in Manitoba and eastern Saskatchewan will be paying substantially more of the cost of freight out of their pockets while farmers in western Saskatchewan and Alberta will be paying relatively less out of their pockets. The amount of freight paid will be much closer to the actual cost of the freight and therefore the freight pooling will be pretty much removed with this change.

I feel it is important to recognize for Manitoba farmers and eastern Saskatchewan farmers that it will be difficult for them to deal with this change. It is another change on top of the loss of the Crow benefit, the Western Grain Transportation Act subsidy. It is substantial and the two added together will have an incredible effect on their industry.

To help counter that for the next three years there will probably be \$100 million out of the \$300 million transition fund made available to help Manitoba and Saskatchewan farmers deal with the change.

Some positives will result from this change, even from the point of view of Manitoba and eastern Saskatchewan farmers. This move should encourage an expansion of the livestock industry in Manitoba and eastern Saskatchewan.

This kind of diversification is desperately needed in that part of the country as well as across western Canada. This will very quickly lead to a building of the cattle, hog, dairy industry in Manitoba and eastern Saskatchewan that would not have happened otherwise. By less distortion in the marketplace there will be a far better balanced industry in Manitoba and Saskatchewan as the effects of these changes take place. That is a positive and I support the bill. Reform supports the bill.

Our concern is the act amends the Canadian Wheat Board Act but does not nearly go far enough. Reform for some time has been calling for changes to the wheat board, particularly giving control of the wheat board to farmers by allowing farmers to elect a board of directors to replace the presently government appointed commissioners.

*Government Orders*

That cannot happen too soon. It is very important that it does happen quickly. Farmers are starting to become very active and are expressing a lot more concern that the wheat board exists for the pleasure of the federal government and not to serve farmers.

That is what is stated in the wheat board bill and farmers are starting to recognize maybe the wheat board is not working for them quite the way they would like it to and the way they can make sure the board does work more effectively for them is by electing a board of directors.

When I am asked about the chances of farmers getting an elected board of directors to replace the government appointed commissioners soon, looking at the record of the government in the way it treats democracy and the real lack of respect it has shown for democracy over this session, it is not very likely.

I point out a few of the specifics that make me say that. We can start with the pension bill. We have seen with the pension bill which was debated earlier today there are several procedural perversions put in place by the Liberals which really showed the Liberals do not have the respect for democracy they should have.

(1905)

The Liberal led and directed committed refused to hear from members of the public on the substance of the pension bill, the Canadian public, the people paying for the pension program. That is not acceptable; it not democracy as it should be.

The lack of notice from the government of its intention to debate the bill clause by clause after a full day of hearings is not the kind of democratic change that would lead me to believe it is likely to go on and allow democracy into the wheat board.

Despite the fact that witnesses pointed out numerous flaws in the bill, it took the Liberals just 12 short minutes to complete their consideration of this porky pension bill.

Their actions on the pension bill really should not surprise me. It led me to believe it is very unlikely they will allow the democratization of the wheat board. I will go through a list of other specifics that lead me to believe this is very unlikely to happen.

Here is an extended list of the procedural perversions the Liberals have used to show they really do not respect democracy in this place. These are all cases of time allocation or closure invoked in the House: Bill C-18, the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, March 24, 1994; June 21, 1994, Bill C-34, the Yukon First Nations self-government act; Bill C-33, the Yukon First Nations Land Claims Settlement Act; Bill C-32, the Excise Tax Act; Bill C-35, Department of Citizenship and Immigration Act; March 22, 1995, Bill C-77, maintenance of the Railway Operations Act, second reading; Bill C-77 at report stage; April 5, 1995, Bill C-68, the gun control act, second

reading and Reform's reasoned amendments to split the bill; April 26, 1995, Bill C-76, the Budget Implementation Act, second reading; June 5, 1995, Bill C-76 at report stage, and the list goes on, a list that really leads me to doubt the government will ever allow the Canadian Wheat Board to be democratized and allow farmers to take control of their organization.

The most recent procedural perversions are Bill C-41, the sentencing bill, hate crimes, report stage; Bill C-41, third reading; Bill C-68, gun control, report stage; C-68, gun control, third reading, and Bill C-85 today on MPs pensions, first at report stage and again time allocation.

This interference in the normal procedure that should take place in the House, which has rules which govern the amount of debate, is unacceptable.

As we add to the list of procedural perversions, I will mention some other anti-democratic things we have seen happen in the House over the past while.

Let us go back to before the last election, the appointment of several Liberal candidates, rather than going through the democratic nomination process. This is unacceptable.

A few days ago the Prime Minister threatened MPs in his party, saying he would not sign their nomination papers if they vote against government bills, twice was what we heard. In an article from the *Globe and Mail* by Doug Fisher: "Support us or else, MPs warned. Liberal MPs who vote against important government legislation may not be allowed to run for the party in the next election, Prime Minister Jean Chrétien warned Saturday".

Here is a quote from Mr. Chrétien—

(1910)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** According to the rules we recognize one another either by riding name or by portfolio. Notwithstanding reading any quotes, it is to be as if the member were saying the words.

I ask the member's co-operation in recognizing the minister or the Prime Minister by portfolio and not by name.

**Mr. Benoit:** Mr. Speaker, the quote is: "I sign the nomination papers when there is an election. It is my privilege, and dissident MPs know it". That comes from our Prime Minister in another clear demonstration of the lack of respect for democracy. It is intolerable and the Liberal backbenchers will not stand for this much longer. I hope that is the case.

The Prime Minister kicked three members who had the guts to vote with their constituents against the gun control bill off their committees. The chair of the justice committee, who decided correctly the budget implementation bill went completely against what was stated in the red book, had the guts to vote against it and of course was disciplined.

*Government Orders*

I felt it was important to demonstrate from what has happened in the House in terms of anti-democratic actions it is very unlikely the government will ever allow—

**Mrs. Barnes:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to check what bill we are on. I thought we were talking about the wheat board.

I question the relevancy of the comments.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** As stated before, the rules of relevancy are very elastic. Members give themselves a fair amount of range but I ask members to be conscious of that.

**Mr. Benoit:** Mr. Speaker, I can understand the hon. member's wanting to keep this hidden. However, it is directly connected to the point which I am trying to make about the chances of farmers receiving from the government the right to take control of their own organization and to have the wheat board democratized.

I have to talk about the record of the government in that regard when I am evaluating those chances. I can understand members wanting me to keep quiet but I will not keep quiet on this.

Because of this record it is unlikely to happen and I am afraid I cannot give farmers much hope in their taking control of their organization.

This piece of legislation is a move in the right direction. This is the best piece of legislation I have seen from the government in the entire session. It is not a bad piece of legislation. I congratulate the government on it. It will be good for western Canadian farmers in the long run. It will be tough for some farmers now and we recognize that. There is some compensation to help them deal with that.

I congratulate the agriculture minister and the parliamentary secretary for this piece of legislation but we need a lot more and we need to allow farmers to take control of their organization very quickly through an elected board of directors.

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I know there is some haste to bring the debate to a conclusion but this is a matter which is very relevant to my riding in west-central Saskatchewan. I will use a few minutes of the House's time to speak to Bill C-92, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board. It will begin to alter the grain transportation system subsequent to the elimination of the Crow benefit.

The purpose of the legislation is to change the pooling points on which the initial payments are based from Thunder Bay and Vancouver to other points in Canada designated by the governor in council. The new pooling points will reflect the actual transportation costs for each producer, or at least it will come closer to reflecting the actual transportation costs.

(1915)

It should be noted that these changes to the pooling points and the abandonment of the Crow have been in the embryonic stage for a long time. Farmers across the prairies have known for some time that the transportation system would be changing and the Crow subsidy no longer would be in place. In fact, some of the politicians were the last ones to realize this, particularly politicians on the other side of the House.

It is hard to believe that it has actually been 10 years since the Canadian Wheat Board 85 proposal. As we have seen in the past two weeks, the government operates at the speed of a turtle until certain legislation needs to be passed and then the bills are rammed through with a sledgehammer with time allocation and closure.

Fortunately, there is enough support for this bill that the government has not felt it needed to move to censure the members and not allow them to speak to the bill.

The Canadian Wheat Board 85 proposal, seeing the general equivalency of the west coast and St. Lawrence ports in terms of sales returns, recommended the eastern pooling point be changed from Thunder Bay to St. Lawrence. However, under today's market conditions, the demand from Pacific rim far outstrips the demand from the Europeans. Therefore, an extra burden is placed on farmers in Manitoba and eastern Saskatchewan when it comes to paying the shipping costs in moving their grain.

The National Grain Bureau proposal of 1990 is the basis of Bill C-92. This is not, and I want to emphasize this, an initiative of the minister of agriculture. Under the National Grain Bureau proposal, producers would pay the transportation costs based on their proximity to certain markets. For example, a farmer close to the west coast would pay less freight than a farmer farther away if his grain was shipped to the west coast. This would be dependent on him shipping through the Canadian Wheat Board.

The goal is to end the cross subsidization of eastern farmers by western farmers. Under the Crow subsidy, transportation costs being pooled meant that a farmer in Lethbridge, for instance, would pay the same shipping costs to the west coast as a farmer from Brandon. The National Grains Bureau proposal added two catchment areas, Churchill and the United States, to the west and east coast points.

The changes in this legislation are definitely a step in the right direction. I do not think farmers have too many qualms about ending the cross subsidization of farmers. It would not be fair to ask farmers on the western prairies to continue subsidizing eastern farmers based on their location. Conversely, I really do not think that farmers in the east want to be subsidized.



*Government Orders*

There is talk that some of the \$300 million transition fund that will be spent over the next six years will be going to eastern farmers although that has not exactly been clarified. There are some problems with respect to the allocation of these funds. It has yet to be decided the exact specifics of the allocation, but we have heard that approximately \$100 million of the \$300 million may be earmarked for farmers. This would allow farmers to develop new marketing strategies for grains and allow for increased diversification, especially crops such as peas, lentils and beans will be common as farmers shy away from planting cereal crops when prices are falling.

Also, one is likely to see the development of value added in the processing industry. Certainly this is the result that we would like to see. We were trying to focus on the positive developments in the industry and we are encouraged to see farmers responding to market conditions and no longer planting crops based on eschewed or artificial returns for their product.

The Reform Party has expressed some concerns over the implementation of these proposed changes. Although the bill does not specifically set out the catchment areas, it is quite probable that they will be the west coast, the east coast, the United States and Churchill.

The use of the port of Churchill as part of the catchment area may be problematic. In 1994 the port posted a loss of \$6 million. Traffic grew by 11 per cent with 322,000 tonnes being shipped, but this was only two-thirds of the volume Churchill needed to break even on operating expenses.

We need clarification from the government and the minister of agriculture on what they are going to do to solve the Churchill problem.

As I have already stated, the changes to the pooling system are just the first of many changes that should be made to the Canadian Wheat Board. My colleague from Vegreville indicated our concern that the first step be the democratization of the Canadian Wheat Board. The government has not heeded that suggestion and is dealing with some areas which we can support and others which we cannot.

However, there is no doubt that in talking to farmers we have heard their expression of concern regarding its marketing practices.

As outlined by the member for Vegreville on many occasions, the wheat board has a monopoly on the buy side but certainly not on the sell side. Farmers must sell through the board any wheat or barley being sold for export and what is being used for domestic purposes in Canada. Farmers do not have the option to sell wheat directly to points within the United States without going through the board and farmers who do sell across the border do so illegally and are open to criminal charges unless they go through the offices of the Canadian Wheat Board.

(1920 )

All farmers want is an open system that is free from government over-regulation and restrictions. It is clear it is not the bureaucrats that want to improve the system but it is individuals who have to work directly within the system and have a vested economic interest in improvements.

While the Canadian Wheat Board would argue that its advisory committee, which is made up of 11 farmer elected bodies, serves the purpose of providing a link between farmers and the Canadian Wheat Board, I would suggest that it is nothing more than a token gesture. The advisory committee does not have the clout or the power to implement the changes necessary to bring the board into the 21st century. Farmers have the know how to make the wheat board effective. A farmer elected board, not an advisory committee, is needed to serve the interests of farmers.

It is noteworthy that we are also starting to hear rumblings from the provinces regarding the Canadian Wheat Board. First we heard that Alberta's minister of agriculture is interested in having a plebiscite on the dual marketing of grain. Then last week the minister of agriculture for Manitoba, Mr. Harry Enns, suggested that he would not be opposed to a modification in the role of the Canadian Wheat Board if it would improve opportunities for farmers to sell wheat into the United States.

I really believe that the Canadian Wheat Board is agreeable to investigating reforms to make it more effective in the 1990s. The government has no choice but to respond to these concerns. From the first day Reformers arrived in the House we have suggested serious modifications to the board with respect to its marketing of grain. Bill C-92 is more or less tinkering with the Canadian Wheat Board but it is certainly a step in the right direction.

I want to assure the House that Reformers will support Bill C-92. We have said this before and we will say it again. The globalization of world trade markets and the removal of trade barriers and subsidies make it imperative that Canadian farmers, whether they are in the supply managed sector or in grain farming, be prepared for changing conditions. In a small way Bill C-92 is helping farmers make the transition to the realities of the NAFTA and the globalization of marketing around the world.

The Liberal government is often shortsighted, trying to patch flat tires when they should be buying new tires or maybe even designing a new automobile. The future is bright for grain farmers if the government can be in step and be as progressive as the farmers are.

In closing, I would suggest that the Canadian Wheat Board should provide more options for farmers. It should be in touch with the 1990s. The board wants to be and farmers want to be. The only barrier is the minister of agriculture and the Liberal government.

*Government Orders*

**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.

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

\* \* \*

**CRIMINAL CODE**

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.)** moved that Bill C-104, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act (forensic DNA analysis) be read the second time and referred to a committee of the whole.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to speak to Bill C-104, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act, to provide by legislation a system for governing the collection and the use of DNA evidence in Canada's criminal justice system.

May I also at the outset record my gratitude to all members of all parties in the House whose collaboration and agreement will make it possible for us today to consider and approve this bill, allowing quick and effective action on an important measure to improve Canada's system of justice.

DNA evidence is not new to Canadian criminal law. Since 1988 forensic DNA analysis has been successfully introduced in more than 100 trials. In a significant number of other cases, it has also been instrumental in obtaining pleas of guilt. There have been cases, some of them very spectacular, in which DNA forensic analysis has exonerated innocent people. In total, it has been used in more than 1,000 cases in this country alone.

(1925)

[*Translation*]

Notwithstanding the importance and the use of this kind of evidence, the Criminal Code does not specifically authorize us to take samples of bodily substances from a suspect for the purposes of genetic analysis. Several courts, including the Supreme Court of Canada in the recently issued Borden decision, have pointed out that no law in Canada specifically permits us to take blood samples in order to carry out genetic analyses for medical and legal purposes.

[*English*]

DNA typing is a powerful investigative tool that can help to identify with greater certainty those who have committed seri-

ous crimes. The presentation of this bill represents another step forward in the government's safe homes and safe streets agenda.

This initiative is one of a number of measures we have introduced to enhance community safety to preserve the peaceful character of our society.

Allow me to briefly outline what this bill will provide for. Although, as I have mentioned, DNA evidence has been used in Canadian courts for some time, there has been no clear legislative framework to regulate its use. This bill will clarify the circumstances in which the court would be permitted to issue a warrant authorizing the collection of a sample for DNA testing. It will clarify the procedures under which the suspects could be compelled to provide samples of bodily substances for DNA analysis. It will regulate the manner in which those samples can be taken, the uses to which they may be put and the manner in which they should be disposed of after their use.

[*Translation*]

The legislation we tabled today names three bodily substances which can be sampled: first, hair; second, cells from the surface mucus of the mouth; third, a small quantity of blood, extracted by needle.

[*English*]

In examining what the bill will accomplish, it is important to be clear regarding the present state of the law in Canada. What we are proposing is not in any sense revolutionary nor is it an ill-prepared step into uncharted territory.

Section 487.1 of the Criminal Code, a general warrant provision, currently allows for this type of procedure to take place. DNA samples are used in the courtrooms in this country on a regular basis. As I have previously said, they have figured in more than 1,000 cases.

The difficulty has been in the absence of an expressed authority in the criminal law to remove any doubt about the legitimacy of the practice, leaving room for challenge, leaving uncertainty in the law about the circumstances in which samples can be taken and the manner in which they can be put to use as proof.

The changes in Bill C-104 will provide that legislative clarity. They will bring Canada into line with the practice which is in place at present in many other nations. Forensic DNA typing is conducted in countries throughout the world, including the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Australia, New Zealand and Sweden.

The purpose of the bill is to remove doubt as to the procedure in Canada, to institute a mechanism for its even application throughout the country, to enhance the criminal justice system by establishing a greater degree of certainty in the process.

*Government Orders*

(1930)

That being said, may I also suggest to the House that we have been careful in drafting the legislation to abide by principles requiring respect for human dignity and privacy. While the government recognizes the importance of DNA typing as an investigative tool, we also acknowledge that privacy concerns and rights guaranteed by the charter require that adequate safeguards be put in place.

As will be seen from a review of Bill C-104, it contains express safeguards to protect privacy and to protect rights. In the first instance, a sample can only be taken for DNA testing pursuant to a warrant.

Second, that warrant can only be issued by a provincial court judge; not a justice of the peace but a judge.

Third, the judge may only grant the warrant if satisfied from evidence on oath that there are reasonable grounds to believe the person to be tested was a party to the offence, and if satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to believe that analysis of bodily substances will provide probative evidence confirming or disproving that person's involvement in the commission of the offence.

I point out as well that a warrant can only be obtained to take a sample in the investigation of specific offences that are designated in Bill C-104. Once the warrant has issued, a sample so taken and tested can give rise to results that can only be used in that investigation or prosecution. Furthermore, even after the judge is satisfied that the tests I have described have been met, the judge must also be satisfied that it is in keeping with the interests of justice to give the warrant to take the sample, having regard to the circumstances of the case including the offender and the offence.

The act also provides that the sample is to be destroyed if the person is found innocent. It provides that after the warrant is obtained and before the sample is taken the peace officer executing the warrant must explain to the person the purpose for taking a sample and the uses to which it can be put. There is an express provision that the warrant must be executed in such a fashion that is reasonable in the circumstances to ensure the privacy of the person is respected. Nevertheless the person cannot be detained for a period longer than is reasonable to obtain the bodily substance, and the bill makes that clear.

May I also point out that the bill is introduced only after protracted consultation. In September of last year the Department of Justice issued a consultation paper identifying the issues and seeking comment. We heard from scores of respondents, including the Canadian Bar Association, criminal lawyers' associations, the privacy commissioner and others.

Support for such a measure was almost unanimous. We have taken from the submissions which we gleaned during the consultation many of the suggested safeguards and incorporated them into the bill as I have described.

*[Translation]*

As I said, the bill also provides for the disposal of both the bodily substances taken under warrant and of the genetic testing results in cases where, for example, the results show that the person in question did not leave any substances at the scene of the crime or in cases where the person is acquitted.

*[English]*

I hope it is evident that the government has gone to great lengths to ensure that the procedures provided for are not only constitutional but are in accordance with basic principles of due process and fairness.

*[Translation]*

I agree with those who recommend that the provisions contained in this bill and their repercussions should be studied later to determine if the legislation meets its desired ends.

Therefore, we intend to ask the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs to study these changes at the very latest one year after they are implemented. At the same time, we will ask the committee to examine any future amendments which should be made to the overall system of DNA typing.

(1935)

*[English]*

In closing, let me express my belief that we are taking today an important step in the enhancement of the criminal justice system. I believe we are improving that system by giving the police an important tool that will help them carry out their duties, by providing for greater certainty in the rules that govern the investigation and prosecution of crime, by improving the effectiveness of the criminal justice system, and by ensuring fairness for those who would be involved in such a regime.

I commend the bill to my colleagues in the House and I ask them for their support.

*[Translation]*

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the question of the admissibility as evidence of DNA tests is not new. It has been a subject of legal debate for quite a while. Sometimes it comes up in public affairs, but it has burst forth in a very special way in terms of public concern because of the drama faced by the family of Michael Manning last year in Pointe-Claire.

The fact that this House is today considering with exceptional speed, it must be said, and with unanimity rarely seen in connection with a subject of debate here is due to the seriousness of what happened to Mr. Manning's family. We will remember that, last year in Pointe-Claire, Mr. Manning and his son discovered Tara, their daughter and sister, aged 15, raped and dead in her bed. There followed a criminal investigation and a police investigation, with the father and son under suspicion, because of the question as to how such a crime could have happened in a private home, at night. The only way the father

*Government Orders*

and son could free themselves of suspicion was to voluntarily undergo DNA testing.

DNA is what gives all of us a unique and lasting print of our identity. It is practically impossible to confuse one print with another. Because Mr. Manning and his son were able to use the test, they established their innocence. However, biological substances were found on the girl's body that were not hers. An investigation in another matter revealed that an individual involved in a similar assault on another victim had left the substances on young Tara. Following a long legal saga—which, it appears, is not over yet—the crown has been unable, or in any case, has found it extremely difficult in its prosecution to use the biological substance to prove the individual in question committed the crime. This person will soon be released in connection with the other crime, unless found guilty in the one involving Tara.

Why are we debating this in the House today? It is not in order to bring Tara Manning back to life. The sacrifice of the family has been made. However, Mr. and Mrs. Manning, the parents, along with the entire family have made a huge effort nationwide. They have toured Canada far and wide with petitions in order to convince the justice system to come up with the means to arrest criminals in the future. While Tara Manning paid for this flaw in the Criminal Code, others will be spared, because we will now be able to equip police investigators and the justice system with the means to provide the vital evidence.

It is, of course, a complex question, one which, yet again, puts the requirements of public safety and the need to preserve individual privacy in the balance. What could be more private than one's genetic inheritance, which is a part of oneself and of one's being? The question is very serious and very important, of course. I think we have to acknowledge the wisdom of the minister, who, in this case, wanted to divide up the bill and the matters involved to enable us to deal as quickly as possible, before the summer, in Bill C-104, simply with the admissibility as evidence of this type of test, leaving for later and more detailed consideration the issue of data banks that would be set up with this type of sample collecting.

(1940)

We know that some important issues will be raised when this bill comes before the House. We will have to look at this very seriously, because although it is true that it is entirely appropriate, as the House will decide unanimously today, to let the courts use these samples as evidence, and especially to oblige a person suspected of a crime to submit to compulsory testing, the fact remains that this information should not be used to constitute huge data banks whose information could be used indiscriminately.

We know that this information has many uses, that these gene prints contain a tremendous amount of data and can be used in a lot of different ways, some of which are excessive, and we will therefore need a very strict regulatory framework.

We will need more detailed studies when the time comes to consider the issue of data banks which, according to the minister, will be the subject of another bill that will not be rushed through the House as is the case today.

Why should we allow this kind of testing? Because there is a gap, I would even say a disparity between where we are from the technological point of view, especially in the biological sciences, and the resources available to the Crown and the judicial system when evidence must be established.

The gap has become very obvious now that biology has made such tremendous progress. Scientists are now completing the entire genetic chain, an operation that seemed impossible a few years ago, and that now, thanks to computers, is perfectly feasible. We have made giant strides. We are on the verge of new and exciting discoveries.

All the major diseases affecting humankind today, AIDS and the rest, will probably be demystified and the key to these diseases will be determined as biological sciences progress. In this particular instance science has given us some very important techniques that are even more reliable than fingerprints and will help the police avoid judicial errors.

This is not just about convicting people who should be convicted and keeping them from escaping justice when they commit a crime and we cannot prove it, there is also the advantage that with this kind of testing we will be able to avoid judicial errors. It is a fact that major judicial errors have been made but could be reversed after the fact, when it became possible to use this kind of evidence in criminal proceedings.

I think we all felt some initial reluctance. Of course we understand the legitimate concerns of the Manning family, and we try to imagine the horrific situation facing this family as a result of this atrocity. Just think how we would feel if it happened to us.

But beyond that, as legislators, we have a duty to ensure that we do not go too far, that we do not make ill considered decisions and that our good intentions do not lead us to discriminate against other people and, above all, that we do not create an imbalance with respect to the burden of proof and change the dynamics of our criminal law. Therefore, I am convinced that we all hesitated, momentarily.

I discussed this issue frankly with Mr. Manning when I met with him in my office, and I think that he is a reasonable person and that he understood that it was important to put safeguards in the bill to prevent abuses. I think that there are some in the bill now.

*Government Orders*

I believe that the bill is crafted wisely and carefully and that it imposes criteria, for example, that justices of the peace cannot issue warrants. First, a preliminary warrant has to be issued, and in addition to that, justices of the peace cannot issue warrants, it has to be at least a provincial court judge who issues the warrant. And decisions will have to be made case by case. The judge will have to weigh the pros and the cons in each case. In addition, for a warrant to be issued, the case must pass three tests: one, it must be demonstrated that an offence in particular was committed; two, it must be demonstrated that the person from whom the mandatory samples are to be taken took part in the crime committed, therefore preventing the possibility of someone being framed; and three, it must be demonstrated that the samples can be linked to a substance found at the scene of the crime and is evidence necessary for the investigation and will further the investigation.

(1945)

All that having been said, I think that all of the major precautions have been taken, that the act is quite simple and that it covers the main points. However, the official opposition felt that it would be prudent to incorporate in the legislation a mandatory review after one year, because we cannot predict exactly what the courts will do and how they will administer it. Is there a risk that it will be abused and that the courts will go too far?

There is no reason to doubt our judicial system, which is one of the world's finest, I must say, compared to what goes on in some other countries. Even in very democratic countries, the justice system often gets quite out of hand. But we are fortunate enough to have a wonderful judicial system and excellent judges in Canada. I think that the appointment system has given good results. The way our investigations are carried out and the almost complete lack of instances of judicial corruption for many years now in our country should make us proud of this system.

I think that we can be fully confident that this legislation will be administered properly. But, the minister was right to adopt one of the Bloc Québécois' proposals, which was to add the mandatory review to the legislation. In one year, therefore, when Parliament examines the second part of the issue, a bill concerning data banks in particular, it could review how the courts, crown attorneys and police investigators handled this new tool for obtaining evidence.

And I can say that we are going to vote in favour of the bill before us. We are proud to vote for it, to contribute to this judicial and legislative progress. We are confident that the courts will administer this bill and use their new powers in a balanced way which will take equally into consideration the rights of individuals and the need to ensure the public's safety.

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

*[English]*

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to say at the outset of the debate on Bill C-104 that the Reform Party, as the other opposition party, supports this legislation.

I am sure the justice minister must be extremely pleased to be going out on this kind of note after the vehement objections he has been facing on some of the other legislation he has introduced.

We support this bill. We applaud the government for bringing it in. We believe that this type of legislation should be a priority for this government. In fact, if we have one criticism it would be to ask why it took 18 months to bring in such a sensible piece of legislation to facilitate the proper workings of our justice system and assist in the protection of citizens.

As the House knows, the member for Wild Rose from our caucus has been pressing the justice minister to present this bill as quickly as possible. We are pleased and we thank the justice minister for responding to those requests.

The bill has been described both by the justice minister and by the Leader of the Opposition very well as to its technical details. I do not intend to repeat those. However, one important thing to remember and perhaps the key important thing to remember is that DNA testing is a virtually certain way of establishing not only guilt where proper samples are available at the scene of a crime but also innocence. This is a real protection for our citizens.

There was a recent case in Ontario, as most members will recall, where there was a miscarriage of justice on circumstantial evidence, but when DNA testing was able to be carried out the accused person was exonerated and found to be innocent.

My understanding is that in 25 per cent of cases DNA testing proves innocence. This is a test to make our justice system fairer to protect innocent people who are wrongfully accused of crimes.

The other comment I have is with respect to the proposal of the Bloc that the legislation be reviewed after one year. I think that is a very sensible thing to do; that is, to revisit legislation like this and see what weaknesses may be disclosed once the procedure is operating.

(1950)

I would raise a question on timing. Given the fact that the bill will have to receive royal assent, be proclaimed, and put into operation across the country, will a year be enough time to allow the bill to operate to disclose the weaknesses? However, we certainly would support a thorough review after the bill has been operating for a reasonable period of time.

*Government Orders*

The purpose of the bill then is to amend both the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act so that both acts dealing with criminal offences will be dealt with in this legislation. That will allow the courts to authorize the obtaining of proper samples so that DNA testing can be done and to use it in ensuring that proper justice is carried out.

We have examined the legislation the minister has brought before the House. We are satisfied that it is good legislation, that it is well drafted. As the speaker before me pointed out, there are good protections for the rights of citizens in the use of this procedure.

The Reform Party supports this legislation and thanks the justice minister for coming forward quickly with it. We will be supporting it completely. We hope its implementation will in fact help Canadian citizens.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, O.J. Simpson, Guy Paul Morin and the alleged murderer of Tara Manning all have something in common: their fate hangs on a tiny sample of DNA.

In each case, this microscopic amount of organic substance did or will determine whether the accused is guilty or innocent. In one case, Guy Paul Morin was finally acquitted of a crime for which he had already served ten years in prison and been tried twice. In the well-known Simpson case, which is closer to a circus than a criminal trial, the public prosecutors are trying to nab O.J. Simpson by linking several DNA samples.

Closer to us, the fate of Tara Manning's alleged murderer will be determined by the match between a DNA sample taken from the accused's saliva with a cotton swab and a sperm sample collected from the murdered girl.

Deoxyribonucleic acid, or DNA for short, is found in the nucleus of every cell in the body—in hair, in blood, and in every other bodily fluid. DNA contains a person's entire genetic code and varies from one human being to another. In fact, it is specific to each individual. It is like fingerprints but much more precise.

Collecting DNA samples can be compared to fingerprinting suspects. They had to submit to it.

The Tara Manning tragedy commanded public attention because of both the aggressor's cruelty and the circumstances surrounding the murder. Since the case is still before the Quebec court responsible for youth, it would be inappropriate to discuss it here, if only to say that the admissibility of the DNA sample as evidence is being questioned, because the warrant to collect this sample was obtained under the current provisions in the Criminal Code. Since the accused did not consent to the collection of the sample, a warrant was required.

There is an urgent need to end this uncertainty by adding a new chapter to the Criminal Code so that the evidence gathered can be used against the authors of these awful crimes. That is why the Bloc Québécois has demanded these changes.

Already in the U.S., genetic sampling has been used in over 24,000 criminal trials. While DNA testing is already used in Canada, the existing legislation is deficient, and often criminals are set free for lack of sufficient evidence against them.

(1955)

We have before us today a long-awaited bill designed to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act to allow a provincial court judge to issue a warrant authorizing a police officer to obtain samples of bodily substances for forensic DNA analysis from a person who is reasonably believed to have been a party to a violent crime.

Violent crimes include sexual offences and robbery. Bill C-104 contains provisions regulating the use that can be made of the bodily substances seized and the results of the DNA analysis.

DNA can be destroyed under certain circumstances only. Nowhere in this DNA bill does it say that the substances seized shall be destroyed in the case of a guilty plea or verdict.

Finally, young persons will be treated as adults, although they will be afforded some special protection, such as the right to have the samples taken in the presence of counsel, a parent or another appropriate adult.

Right off the bat, Bill C-104 corrects a major deficiency in criminal law. The police and the Crown are having a hard time obtaining samples of bodily substances from suspects at present.

At present, they have to ask suspects to provide voluntarily the required samples. At present, a peace officer can ask for a warrant under the Criminal Code, but the applicable provision remains vague and was not designed for taking DNA samples. It is all too likely that murderers would be acquitted for lack of provisions dealing specifically with the seizure of samples for DNA testing.

However, it should be pointed out that the bill does not provide for the destruction of seized samples in the event that a guilty verdict is returned. This means that these samples will be kept for some unknown future use.

A procedure that makes obtaining samples for DNA printing is a great thing. But the minister should know that, by supporting Bill C-104 as it stands, we are not giving him a blank cheque to store genetic information and use them for any undisclosed purpose.

The Bloc Québécois will keep an eye on the justice minister. If it looks like he is going off on a "big brother" tangent, he can kiss his data base goodbye because we will not hesitate to expose him. To conclude, the Minister of Justice tabled Bill C-104 today in response not only to demands from the Bloc

*Government Orders*

Quebecois, but also and mainly to the representations made by Michael Manning, Tara Manning's father.

We support the principle of this bill, but we cannot help but think that the justice minister is walking a tight rope without a net. He has legislated in dribs and drabs, taking a piecemeal, case-by-case approach. Let us hope that this will not become a habit.

The minister himself said that his department had been working on this case since September 1994. Yet, he waited until today to act. Let us hope that he will be quicker to act next time and will initiate discussions instead of being forced to react after the fact.

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this legislation builds a bridge between science and human justice. These two fields are now joined and intertwined to improve life in our modern society.

(2000)

Bill C-104 seeks to promote justice as we perceive it from an early age. Justice is aimed at punishing those who are guilty of an offence. It also seeks to protect the innocent and the victim.

The use of DNA evidence is relatively new in the criminal justice system. In Canada, it was first introduced in the fall of 1988. As we can see today, DNA evidence is still not regulated in Canada. From a legislative standpoint, Canada lags behind other countries such as England, Australia, the United States and New Zealand.

Today, the government is trying to make up some of that ground. I applaud this initiative, but I regret the way in which we are expediting matters. A few months ago, the Minister of Justice announced that his department was working on a bill to deal with this issue. One wonders why it took so long to table this legislation, considering that it was known as early as last September that there were legal problems regarding the admissibility of DNA test results.

Indeed, in its September 1994 decision in *R. v. Borden*, the Supreme Court of Canada dealt with the admissibility as evidence of these results. Mr. Justice Iacobucci wrote that there was no legislative provision authorizing the collection of a blood sample in a case of sexual assault, and that the defendant's consent was required to make such a procedure legally valid. This implies that, if an accused refuses to give his consent, the collection of that blood sample is illegal and could therefore be ruled inadmissible as evidence by the court.

This could be the case in the trial for the murder of Tara Manning, a teenager killed in her house, during the night, in May 1994, since the suspect refused to give his consent. Consequently, police officers obtained a search warrant under section 487.01 of the Criminal Code. However, this section

specifically prohibits the issuance of a warrant when the physical integrity of a person could be affected. This is a problem, since the courts have made several rulings to the effect that the collection of hair, saliva or blood violates the physical integrity of a person.

We can see why quick action was needed. It resulted in Bill C-104 being tabled in this House today.

There are several reasons justifying this legislation on DNA evidence. The fact that such tests violate one's physical integrity must be weighed against the need to preserve justice. In other words, are we as a community ready to allow the physical integrity of some suspected criminals to be violated to a certain extent, in an attempt to establish the degree of guilt and to eventually impose a sentence? If so, what degree of violation are we willing to tolerate?

At the same time, we can ask how much importance we give the harm suffered by the victim and the accused's right to physical integrity. In addition, in a society subject to the rule of law, we must protect all citizens against unreasonable seizures. This principle is recognized and accepted in both Canada and Quebec. We simply do not want to live in a police state where any officer could demand that anyone undergo tests against his or her will and for no valid reason.

We must also determine in what specific cases these tests may be ordered. We must decide whether or not we should allow bodily substances to be seized in minor criminal cases or if this procedure should be reserved for crimes that are considered serious. Finally, the legislation must spell out all the conditions to be met and all enforcement mechanisms.

It goes without saying that a seizure warrant can only be issued when there are valid reasons to believe that a person has committed a crime. It is also obvious that, to protect individual privacy, tests must not be carried out publicly and the chain of custody must be well established and protected.

Finally, let us keep in mind that, because of the very nature of DNA, these tests can help identify those responsible for certain crimes in which the direct evidence is rather flimsy, thus allowing us to punish the guilty, clear the innocent and avoid subsequent offences against new victims.

Those are some of the reasons why Parliament must look at DNA testing. Let us now examine our reaction to the bill before us.

(2005)

I would like to start by saying that I support the underlying principle of the bill which provides for a warrant to be issued to obtain samples of bodily substances when there is reason to believe that a person has committed a serious crime.

*Government Orders*

For more than 18 months now, I have had the honour of being my party's critic for the status of women. As such, I have had the opportunity to fully understand the importance and impact of violence in our society, and the need to take all necessary steps to stem this phenomenon.

I know that others have said it before me; I am only their spokesperson in this House. Society must pursue a zero tolerance policy on violence. This policy must be implemented through referral to the courts and sanctions. If a bill can make possible the identification and punishment of offenders guilty of serious crimes against persons, if a bill can provide for their confinement, preventing them from reoffending, at least for a while, then it must be passed.

I have one important reservation, however; the minister must undertake to bring forward a complementary bill in the fall to deal with the use of data gathered pursuant to the warrants. Misuse of such data must be avoided at all costs.

Finally, since it is a brand new piece of legislation, at the Bloc's request, I will urge the minister to undertake a review of the bill and its implementation one year after its coming into force. If changes appear to be necessary, the Bloc will have a serious look at them.

Women welcome any measure aimed at protecting them against physical and sexual violence. The same is true of people in general. Ten thousand signatures were collected in favour of this bill. And, as the director of the Montreal Women's Centre, Doris Makhoul, said: "Taking blood samples for DNA testing will not endanger the health of the accused".

Therefore, we support this bill while hoping that the Bloc's reservations will be heard by the minister and dealt with.

[English]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.)

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 100, I do now leave the chair for the House to go into committee of the whole.

(House in committee on Bill C-104, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act (forensic DNA analysis))

**The Chairman:** Shall clause 1 carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Clause 1 agreed to.)

On clause 2:

**The Chairman:** Shall clause 2 carry?

[Translation]

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Chairman, we have just passed clause 1 which, I believe, covers sections 487.03, 487.04 and the rest, did we not?

**The Chairman:** That is right.

(2010)

**Mrs. Venne:** Still, I would like to know on what basis the Minister of Justice made his list at section 487.04, even if clause 1 has already been passed, but so rapidly that you did not hear me ask to be recognized. This is the section in which offences warranting DNA testing are listed.

I would just like to know the basis for this list. You can be assured that we will vote for the bill and that I have no intention of prolonging the debate unduly, especially since the minister acceded to our request and eliminated the need for the amendment we were going to put forward. I just wanted some clarification.

[English]

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Chairman, what we did literally in assembling the list was review the Criminal Code to examine the offences to determine which of them were of sufficient seriousness either as crimes of personal violence such as murder and sexual assault or other crimes that might on the face look to be property crimes such as break and enter which could be for the purpose of committing a crime of personal violence.

We focused on those crimes in respect of which punishment was provided by the code of roughly five years or longer. We did not limit it to either indictable or summary conviction. Some of the offences here are hybrid. We focused on offences that are of the degree of gravity both in their potential for personal injury and death or in relation to the manner in which they are punished in the code so as to justify this investigative technique.

May I point out as well that in respect of these designated offences it will be necessary that there was a bodily sample left at the scene so that the sample to be taken from the person subject to the warrant can be tested for comparison with the sample at the scene.

Second, the mere fact that it is a designated offence is not sufficient. The applicant for the warrant will also have to satisfy the provincial court judge that it is in the interest of the administration of justice for the warrant to issue, including all the circumstances relating to the offender and the offence.

The fact that the designated offence is involved is not sufficient in itself, although we have selected offences which as I said are in relation to personal injury or death or of such a gravity that such a tool or investigation should be available.



*Government Orders*

[Translation]

**Mrs. Venne:** Mr. Speaker, I would like another clarification about section 487.08.

It is stated that DNA analysis will be conducted in the course of an investigation of the designated offence. I thought it would be for identification purposes. I would like to know how much of a distinction the minister makes between identification and investigation. How far will the investigation go?

**Mr. Rock:** I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I am not sure I caught the hon. member's question. Is she inquiring about the difference between identification and investigation?

**Mrs. Venne:** I will rephrase my question, Mr. Speaker.

We are dealing with the restriction concerning the use of the sample to be collected. My question refers to the provision relating to this restriction. It reads:

487.08(1) No person shall use a bodily substance that is obtained in execution of a warrant except in the course of an investigation—

The word investigation is the one I have trouble with.

—of the designated offence—

Instead of referring to an investigation, why did we not use the word “identification”, since the ADN test is supposed to be used for identification purposes and not for general investigation purposes?

(2015)

[English]

**Mr. Rock:** Mr. Chairman, while it may be true to say that ultimately the results of the DNA sample test will be to identify, nonetheless the process—that is to say taking the sample and putting it to use—occurs in the context of an investigation. It is the greater word encompassing the narrower. The choice of word was to delimit the greater activity.

The purpose of the sample is in connection with an investigation generally, although ultimately it may be for the purpose of identifying the culprit.

I would have thought we were safer with the broader word because we want to refer to the entire transaction, not just the ultimate function. While I take the hon. member's point, I think it might unduly limit the purpose to say just identification.

I will read the section with that in mind. If we were to say that no person shall use a bodily substance obtained in execution of a warrant except in the course of identification of the person who might be responsible, for one thing there might be other phases of the investigation or the prosecution where the sample has a purpose that would be excluded unintentionally. Particularly when the act is enhanced by the subsequent amendments creating a data bank we might also have purposes that are not strictly

identification of a person in a specific offence; it might be broader than that.

I think we are safer to use the broader word, “investigation”. That is certainly what I would recommend.

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.):** Mr. Chairman, I have a quick question for the minister.

There is quite a long list of designated offences. This list may need to be expanded in the future, even by one or two offences. I wonder what the procedure would be if that became necessary.

**Mr. Rock:** Mr. Chairman, it would be necessary to amend this act.

I might say that in the course of preparing the bill we looked at some of the recommendations from the people who responded in the consultation process. Some of them would have had us provide simply that in any indictable offence the warrant should be available on application.

This bill is an innovation in the criminal law to the extent to which it provides an express recognition of DNA sampling. We are very conscious of the charter and privacy considerations. We chose to go with a specific list of the offences that upon a review of the code struck us as most serious for the reasons I recited earlier. The list can be added to; indeed, it could be replaced with reference to just indictable offences. But any of those changes would require statutory amendment.

I have committed tonight in the House to a review in a year. It may be that after we accumulate experience we might want to look at the question of whether the list should be expanded or whether we should take a different approach. I think for now this is a prudent approach. It captures the crimes that are obviously of gravest concern to the public and to the authorities and will provide a very good place from which we can learn more about how we can better serve the public by improving the justice system.

[Translation]

**The Chairman:** Shall clause 2 carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Clause 2 agreed to.)

**The Chairman:** Shall clause 3 carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Clause 3 agreed to.)

**The Chairman:** Shall the title carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Title agreed to.)

**The Chairman:** Shall the bill carry?

*Government Orders*

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chairman:** Shall I adjourn the sitting and report on the bill?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Bill reported.)

(2020)

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.)** moved that the bill be concurred in.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

**The Deputy Speaker:** When will the bill be read the third time? Now, with leave of the House?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*English*]

**Mr. Rock** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** I am sure, colleagues, that in the name of all of us we thank the Manning family for being with us tonight for this very special occasion.

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

**Mr. Rock:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in respect of a response that I gave on June 1, 1995 to a question from the hon. member for Kootenay East dealing with agents supported by the government in criminal matters.

In response I said that there had been a significant decrease in government expenditures on agents. I suggested that spending on agents in 1994 was some 25 per cent less than in 1993. I have since been informed the answer was not accurate, that the calculation was based on a partial year and not a full year.

Although a number of savings have been made, they do not amount to the 25 per cent range. In the fiscal year 1994-95 we expect a reduction in the level of expenditures for the cost of standing agents in criminal law matters but the reduction will not be 25 per cent.

We will furnish particulars of what the savings are when they are known.

\* \* \*

#### GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION ACT (FEDERAL AGENCIES)

**Hon. Allan Rock (for the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.):** moved that Bill C-65, an act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies be read a third time and passed.

**Mr. John English (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate on Bill C-65.

The purpose of the bill is to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies. I have spoken on the bill several times before. I do not intend to repeat what was said at that point but I would like to point out its historic importance.

The purpose of the bill is to end overlap and duplication of federal agencies, simplify government and reduce costs. Under the leadership of the Minister for Public Service Renewal, 350 boards and agencies were reviewed.

Bill C-65 represents the first legislative step in that overview and the result is 22 agencies and 6 departments have been affected. Seven agencies have been wound up and 15 restructured. In all, no less than 150 order in council positions have been eliminated.

A second stage of the review will take place in the fall and will result in the loss of 314 patronage positions. Fifty-one agencies will be eliminated and the savings in total will amount to approximately \$5 million.

All of these factors are important: the elimination of overlap and duplication, simplification of government and the reduction of cost. What is important with this bill is for the first time in 40 years so-called patronage positions have been eliminated within the federal government. We have accomplished this and we will continue to carry out this review in the future.

I am sure all members of the House will join with me in supporting this important bill which makes a historic approach to simplifying and improving government.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?  
[*Translation*]

**Some hon. members:** Question.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion carried on division.

(Bill read the third time and passed.)

[*English*]

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have made excellent progress today. I thank the hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster, the hon. member for Roberval, the hon. member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie, the hon. member for Calgary Centre and all my colleagues and ministers who have been here today to assist in seeing the proceedings went smoothly.

*Government Orders*

We have now completed the work that had been agreed to be completed before adjournment. Therefore I am pleased to move the following motion.

Before I do I would like also to add my thanks to the pages for their contribution, as some others have done, and wish them well in the years ahead.

I therefore move, with unanimous consent:

That the House shall not sit on June 23, 1995, provided that it shall be deemed to have sat and adjourned on that day for the purposes of Standing Order 28.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

**The Deputy Speaker:** In the name of everyone, I thank the staff members who will be with us next year and in particular the pages who will not, unfortunately, be with us next year. We wish them all the success in all the years ahead. All members feel you have done a wonderful job this year.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** It being 8.30 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday, September 18, 1995.

(The House adjourned at 8.27 p.m.)

---

# CONTENTS

Thursday, June 22, 1995

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### Columbia River Treaty Permanent Engineering Board

Mr. Rideout ..... 14409

### Safety in Transportation

Mr. Milliken ..... 14409

### Committees of the House

#### Public Accounts

Mr. Bélisle ..... 14409

#### Citizenship and Immigration

Mrs. Bakopanos ..... 14409

Mr. Nunez ..... 14410

#### Agriculture and Agri-Food

Mr. Easter ..... 14410

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) ..... 14410

### Customs Act

Bill C-102. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted ..... 14410

Mr. Gray ..... 14410

### Excise Tax Act

Bill C-103. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted ..... 14410

Mr. Gray ..... 14410

### Criminal Code

Bill C-104. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted ..... 14410

Mr. Rock .....	14410
<b>Canada Business Corporations Act</b>	
Bill C-345. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted .....	14410
Mr. Szabo .....	14410
<b>Bell Canada Act</b>	
Bill C-346. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted .....	14411
Mr. Mitchell .....	14411
<b>Competition Act</b>	
Bill C-347. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted .....	14411
Mr. McTeague .....	14411
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>Victims of crime</b>	
Mr. Keyes .....	14411
<b>Armenian Genocide</b>	
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral .....	14411
<b>Criminal Code</b>	
Mr. Solberg .....	14411
<b>Definition of family</b>	
Mr. Solberg .....	14411
<b>Canadian unity</b>	
Mr. Solberg .....	14411
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	
Mrs. Ur .....	14412
<b>Canada Post</b>	
Mr. Blaikie .....	14412
<b>Divorce Act</b>	
Mr. Blaikie .....	14412

<b>Railways</b>	
Mr. Blaikie .....	14412
<b>Canada Employment Centres</b>	
Mr. Crête .....	14412
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	
Mr. Wells .....	14412
<b>Assisted suicide</b>	
Mr. Wells .....	14412
<b>Rights of the unborn</b>	
Mr. Wells .....	14412
<b>Divorce Act</b>	
Mr. Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury) .....	14412
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	
Mr. Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury) .....	14412
<b>Voice Mail</b>	
Mr. Dumas .....	14412
<b>Customs</b>	
Mr. Wappel .....	14413
<b>CRTC</b>	
Mr. Wappel .....	14413
<b>Criminal Code</b>	
Mr. Wappel .....	14413
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	
Mrs. Hayes .....	14413
<b>National Unity</b>	
Mr. Duhamel .....	14413
<b>Violence in Society</b>	
Mr. Duhamel .....	14413

<b>Recombinant Bovine Somatotropin</b>	
Mr. Marchand .....	14413
<b>Canadian Forces Base Calgary</b>	
Mrs. Ablonczy .....	14413
<b>Northern Quebec</b>	
Mr. Asselin .....	14413
<b>La Malbaie Employment Centre</b>	
Mr. Asselin .....	14414
<b>Alcohol</b>	
Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) .....	14414
<b>Criminal Code</b>	
Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) .....	14414
<b>Canadian Human Rights Act</b>	
Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) .....	14414
<b>Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide</b>	
Mr. Boudria .....	14414
<b>Assisted Suicide</b>	
Mr. Duncan .....	14414
<b>Rights of the Unborn</b>	
Mr. Duncan .....	14414
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	
Mr. Duncan .....	14414
<b>Witness relocation and protection program</b>	
Mr. Duncan .....	14414
<b>Curragh Resources bankruptcy</b>	
Ms. McLaughlin .....	14414
<b>Forestry</b>	
Ms. McLaughlin .....	14414

<b>Bovine Somatotropin</b>	
Ms. McLaughlin .....	14415
<b>Criminal Code</b>	
Ms. McLaughlin .....	14415
<b>Income Tax Act</b>	
Mr. Szabo .....	14415
<b>Former Yugoslavia</b>	
Mr. Milliken .....	14415
<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
Mr. Milliken .....	14415
<b>Questions Passed as Orders for Return</b>	
Mr. Milliken .....	14416
<b>Government Responses to Petitions</b>	
Mr. Milliken .....	14416
<b>Ways and Means Motions</b>	
Mr. Milliken .....	14416
(Motions Nos. 9, 10, 19, 22, 24 and 26 withdrawn.) .....	14416

## **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

### **Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act**

Bill C-85. Motion for third reading .....	14416
Mr. Gagliano .....	14416
Mr. Duhamel .....	14417
Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe) .....	14419
Mr. Harper (Calgary West) .....	14421
Mr. Szabo .....	14427
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	14430
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) .....	14431
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	14432
Mr. Silye .....	14432



Mr. Szabo .....	14434
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) .....	14434
Mr. Discepola .....	14435
Mr. Hart .....	14437
Mr. Mills (Red Deer) .....	14438
Mr. White (Fraser Valley West) .....	14439
Mr. Eggleton .....	14440
Mr. Gilmour .....	14442
Mr. Reed .....	14443
Mr. Eggleton .....	14444
Mr. Hart .....	14444
Mr. Milliken .....	14446

## **STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

### **Peacekeeping**

Mr. Verran .....	14446
------------------	-------

### **Quebec Sovereignty**

Mr. Plamondon .....	14446
---------------------	-------

### **Canadian Wheat Board**

Mr. Hoepfner .....	14447
--------------------	-------

### **Antique Cars**

Mr. Grose .....	14447
-----------------	-------

### **Veselka Ukrainian Culture and Heritage Church**

Mr. Kirkby .....	14447
------------------	-------

### **Quebec Regions**

Mr. Deshaies .....	14447
--------------------	-------

### **Lac Barrière Band**

Mr. Ringma .....	14447
------------------	-------

### **House of Commons Security Services**

Mr. Blaikie .....	14448
-------------------	-------

<b>National Unity</b>	
Mrs. Terrana .....	14448
<b>Quebec Referendum</b>	
Mr. Patry .....	14448
<b>United Nations</b>	
Mr. English .....	14448
<b>Fête nationale du Québec</b>	
Mr. Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry) .....	14449
<b>Pensions</b>	
Miss Grey .....	14449
<b>Dairy Industry</b>	
Mr. Calder .....	14449
<b>Village of Oka</b>	
Mr. Dumas .....	14449
<b>Canada Post</b>	
Mr. Epp .....	14450
<b>Presence in Gallery</b>	
The Speaker .....	14450

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

<b>Chile's Accession to NAFTA</b>	
Mr. Bouchard .....	14450
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	14450
Mr. Bouchard .....	14450
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	14450
Mr. Bouchard .....	14450
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	14450
Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) .....	14451

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	14451
Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) .....	14451
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	14451
<b>Government Policies</b>	
Mr. Manning .....	14451
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	14451
Mr. Manning .....	14452
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	14452
Mr. Manning .....	14452
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	14452
<b>Employment Centres</b>	
Mrs. Lalonde .....	14452
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	14452
Mrs. Lalonde .....	14453
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	14453
<b>Economy</b>	
Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge) .....	14453
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	14453
Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge) .....	14453
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	14453
<b>Direct Satellite Broadcasting</b>	
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	14453
Mr. Manley .....	14454
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	14454
Mr. Manley .....	14454
<b>Transport</b>	
Mr. Gouk .....	14454
Mr. Young .....	14454
Mr. Gouk .....	14454
Mr. Young .....	14455
<b>Bovine Somatotropin</b>	
Mr. Daviault .....	14455

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	14455
Mr. Daviault .....	14455
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	14455
<b>Small Businesses</b>	
Mr. O’Reilly .....	14455
Mr. Bélair .....	14455
<b>Literacy</b>	
Miss Grey .....	14456
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	14456
Miss Grey .....	14456
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	14456
<b>French Scientific Journals</b>	
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	14456
Mr. Dupuy .....	14456
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	14457
Mr. Dupuy .....	14457
<b>Aboriginal Affairs</b>	
Mr. Duncan .....	14457
Mr. Irwin .....	14457
Mr. Duncan .....	14457
Mr. Irwin .....	14457
<b>Human Rights</b>	
Mr. Blaikie .....	14457
Mr. MacLaren .....	14457
<b>Pages</b>	
The Speaker .....	14458
<b>Privilege</b>	
<b>Comments During Question Period</b>	
Mrs. Jennings .....	14458
<b>Business of the House</b>	
Mr. Bellehumeur .....	14458

Mr. Gray .....	14458
Mr. Bouchard .....	14458
Mr. Hermanson .....	14459
Mr. Blaikie .....	14459

## **ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

### **Electoral Boundaries Commissions**

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger) .....	14459
---------------------------------------	-------

## **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

### **Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act**

Bill C-85. Consideration resumed of motion for third reading .....	14459
Mr. Boudria .....	14459
Mr. Langlois .....	14462
Mr. Hill (Macleod) .....	14462
Mr. Langlois .....	14462
Mr. Mayfield .....	14463
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 181; Nays, 42 .....	14465
(Bill read the third time and passed.) .....	14466

### **Business of the House**

Mr. Milliken .....	14466
--------------------	-------

### **Message from the Senate**

The Speaker .....	14466
-------------------	-------

### **Business of the House**

#### **Bill C-91**

Mr. Milliken .....	14466
Motion .....	14466
(Motion agreed to.) .....	14467

### **Business Development Bank of Canada Act**

Bill C-91. Motion for third reading. ....	14467
---	-------

Mr. Gray .....	14467
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) .....	14467
Mr. Rocheleau .....	14467
Mr. McClelland .....	14468
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 121; Nays, 69 .....	14469
(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.) .....	14469

**Criminal Code**

Bill C-72. Motion for concurrence .....	14469
Mr. Rock .....	14469
(Motion agreed to.) .....	14469
Motion for third reading .....	14470
Mrs. Venne .....	14471

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**Committees of the House**

**Industry—authorization to travel**

Mr. Milliken .....	14473
Motion .....	14473
(Motion agreed to.) .....	14473

**Substitutions**

Mr. Milliken .....	14474
(Motion agreed to.) .....	14474

**Interparliamentary Delegations**

Mr. Rompkey .....	14474
-------------------	-------

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Criminal Code**

Bill C-72. Consideration resumed of motion for third reading .....	14474
Mrs. Venne .....	14474

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

**National Grandparents Day**

Bill C-259. Motion for second reading .....	14475
---	-------

Mrs. Jennings .....	14475
Ms. Fry .....	14478
Mr. Dumas .....	14479
Mr. Penson .....	14480
Mrs. Kraft Sloan .....	14480

## ROYAL ASSENT

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger) .....	14481
---------------------------------------	-------

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

### Grandparents Day Act

Bill C-259. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading .....	14481
Mrs. Kraft Sloan .....	14481
Mr. Szabo .....	14481

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Criminal Code

Bill C-72. Consideration resumed of motion for third reading .....	14482
Mr. Mayfield .....	14482
(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.) .....	14484

### Canadian Wheat Board Act

Bill C-92. Report stage (without amendment) .....	14484
Motion for concurrence .....	14484
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) .....	14484
(Motion agreed to.) .....	14484
Motion for third reading .....	14484
Mr. Vanclief .....	14484
Mr. Benoit .....	14485
Mr. Hermanson .....	14487
(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.) .....	14489

### Criminal Code

Bill C-104. Motion for second reading .....	14489
---	-------

Mr. Rock .....	14489
Mr. Bouchard .....	14490
Mrs. Ablonczy .....	14492
Mrs. Venne .....	14493
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	14494
(Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.) .....	14495
Bill C-104. Consideration in committee of the whole .....	14495
(Clause 1 agreed to.) .....	14495
On clause 2 .....	14495
Mrs. Venne .....	14495
Mr. Rock .....	14495
(Clause 2 agreed to.) .....	14496
(Clause 3 agreed to.) .....	14496
(Title agreed to.) .....	14496
(Bill reported.) .....	14497
Motion for concurrence .....	14497
Mr. Rock .....	14497
(Motion agreed to.) .....	14497
Bill C-104. Motion for third reading .....	14497
(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.) .....	14497

**Government Organization Act (Federal Agencies)**

Bill C-65. Motion for third reading .....	14497
Mr. Rock .....	14497
Mr. English .....	14497
(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.) .....	14497
Mr. Milliken .....	14497
Motion .....	14498
(Motion agreed to.) .....	14498