



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 206 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association concerning the parliamentary visit of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association which took place from February 14 to 20 in Barbados.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

INDUSTRY

Mr. Ian Murray (Lanark—Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 15th report of the Standing Committee on Industry.

Pursuant to its order of reference of Tuesday, November 3, 1998, your committee has considered Bill C-54, an act to support and promote electronic commerce by protecting personal information that is collected, used or disclosed in certain circumstances, by providing for the use of electronic means to communicate or record information or transactions and by amending the Canada Evidence Act, the Statutory Instruments Act and the Statute Revision Act, and is pleased to report the bill to the House with amendments.

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 64th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the selection of votable items in accordance with Standing Order 92. This report is deemed adopted on presentation.

I also have the honour to present the 65th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the associate membership of the Standing Committee on Finance.

If the committee gives its consent, I intend to move concurrence in the 65th report later this day.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ANTIPOVERTY ACT

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-491, Antipoverty Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table an antipoverty bill that proposes to add social condition as a prohibited ground of discrimination. The bill creates a new prohibited ground of discrimination: failure to offer financial services on the basis of inadequate income. It asks the Canadian Human Rights Commis-

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1005)

[*English*]

ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, a number of order in council appointments made recently by the government.

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

* * *

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to the Government Leader in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 15 petitions.

* * *

[*English*]

INTERNATIONAL TREATIES

Mr. Julian Reed (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to table, in both official languages, international treaties that were entered into force for Canada in 1997 and 1996, a list of which is also tabled.

* * *

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34, I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, a report from the Canadian

Routine Proceedings

sion to evaluate annually poverty in Canada and the resources that should be allocated in order to eliminate it.

I look forward to receiving the support of each one of my colleagues in this House, since it is an excellent bill.

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

* * *

• (1010)

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the House gives its consent, I move that the 65th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, presented to the House earlier this day, be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

PETITIONS

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present six petitions to the House on behalf of the good people of Dauphin—Swan River.

The first petition calls on the government to mandate the Canadian Wheat Board to start shipping grain to the port of Churchill and not just toward the east and west coasts as it has done for decades.

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the second petition the petitioners request parliament to affirm the duty of parents to responsibly raise their children according to their own conscience and beliefs and to retain section 43 of Canada's Criminal Code as it is currently worded.

PARENTAL RIGHTS

Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the third petition the good people of Dauphin request the government to support Motion No. M-300 which states that the government should authorize a proclamation to be issued by the governor general under the great seal of Canada amending section 7 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms to recognize the fundamental rights of individuals to pursue family life free from undue interference by the state and to recognize the fundamental rights and responsibilities of parents to direct the upbringing of their

children. The petitioners urge the legislative assemblies of the provinces to do likewise.

MARRIAGE

Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the next petition the good people of Dauphin ask that parliament enact Bill C-225, an act to amend the Marriage (Prohibited Degrees) Act and the Interpretation Act so as to define in statute that a marriage can only be entered into between a single male and a single female.

ABORTION

Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the fifth petition the good people of Dauphin—Swan River believe that the House needs to bring in legislation in accordance with the provisions of the Referendum Act that would require that a binding national referendum be held at the time of the next election to ask voters whether they are in favour of government funding for medically unnecessary abortions.

FIREARMS ACT

Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the last petition the good people of Dauphin request that the government repeal Bill C-68 and allocate those funds to more positive things, such as women's crisis centres, preventing crime on the streets and so forth.

FRESHWATER EXPORTS

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to present a petition pursuant to Standing Order 36 from a number of constituents of Clearwater, British Columbia who point out a number of reasons they are concerned that the provisions of NAFTA will result in the eventual export of Canada's fresh water to the United States and northern Mexico.

IRAQ

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present another petition from citizens of Peterborough and other communities in Ontario and Alberta who are concerned about the people of Iraq. They point out that the people of Iraq have suffered untold hardship and trauma in the wake of the gulf war and the recent mass bombing attacks.

They call upon the Parliament of Canada to strongly appeal to the United Nations, the United States and Britain for the rejection of any further military action against Iraq, and call for a serious attempt at peace negotiations with Iraq and its neighbours.

The petitioners also call for the raising of the embargoes, except for military materials, and they urge that Canada vastly increase its efforts in providing food, medicine and infrastructure reconstruction to Iraq.

Routine Proceedings

CANADA POST CORPORATION

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, I present to the House a petition signed by many of my constituents who are asking that section 13(5) of the Canada Post Corporation Act be repealed so that rural route mail couriers are allowed to have collective bargaining rights in the same manner as private sector workers who deliver mail in rural areas.

MARRIAGE

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, I also submit to the House a petition signed by many of my constituents who are asking parliament to enact Bill C-225, an act to amend the Marriage Act and the Interpretation Act so as to define in statute that a marriage can only be entered into by a single male and a single female.

• (1015)

FINANCIAL SERVICES SECTOR

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present two petitions to the House of Commons today.

The first is signed by people from Humboldt, St. Benedict and Moose Jaw who call upon parliament to reject the recommendation of the MacKay task force report pertaining to the entry of banks into the casualty and property insurance markets. They call upon parliamentarians not to give in to the pressure of Canada's chartered banks on this important matter.

GRAIN TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is from farm families in the Kelvington Nut Mountain area of Saskatchewan. They are calling on the House not to accept major recommendations of the Estey report on grain transportation, including specifically the abolishment of the cap on freight rates, the altering of the role of the Canadian Wheat Board in managing transportation and handling of export grains.

The petitioners also want to ensure that hopper cars remain in the hands of the wheat board or farmers to ensure that producer cars remain affordable and that new rules be established to encourage viable short line railways.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 171, 173, 175, 177 and 194.

[Text]

Question No. 171—**Mr. Ted White:**

What were the total costs incurred by the government since 1995 as a result of the negotiations to return Christine Lamont and David Spencer to Canada, itemized by department and including, but not limited to, administrative and travel costs for ministers and other parties to the negotiations, RCMP expenses associated with the physical return of Ms. Lamont and Mr. Spencer to Canada and transportation costs within Canada?

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): I am informed by Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada and the Ministry of the Solicitor General as follows:

1. The sum of \$1,674 was the cost for translating a 6,200 word document from Portuguese to English relating to the sentence, judgment and appeals, which is required by Correctional Services in order to calculate the sentence and eligibility for conditional release in Canada.

Five other texts were translated prior to 1996. The costs for translation were borne by the secretary of state. The estimated cost for the translation of those five documents is \$10,878.

2. The sum of \$785 was the cost for translation of documents by the embassy in Brasilia. These documents relate to the behaviour of the two Canadians transferred back to Canada.

These documents are not required in order to effect the transfer, but would be used in the assessment of the conditional release terms.

3. There were no trips made relating to the negotiation of the transfer. The Transfer of Offenders Treaty itself was negotiated in 1992 and ratified in 1998.

4. Consular visits are part of the consular mandate and were conducted during regular working hours.

The total costs incurred by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police which related to the return of Christine Lamont and David Spencer to Canada were \$118,078.00. This amount was cost-recovered from Correctional Service Canada.

Question No. 173—**Mr. Randy White:**

For the years 1997 and 1998; (a) how many criminal offences were committed with the use of a firearm; (b) of those offences, how many firearms were recovered by law enforcement authorities; and (c) of those firearms recovered by authorities, how many were registered in the national firearms registry?

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): I am informed by Justice Canada and Statistics Canada as follows: (a) The most recent year in which Canadian crime statistics are available is 1997. Data on criminal offences committed with the use of firearms are reported by police to the Aggregate Uniform Crime Reporting Survey UCR1, and Homicide Survey maintained by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. The CCJS is Canada's official source of crime data.

Routine Proceedings

There are three criminal offences reported in the above-mentioned surveys. These include firearm homicide, firearm robbery and discharge firearm with intent. Other types of criminal offences investigated by the police which may involve the use of a firearm, et cetera, for example attempted murder, assault, sexual assault, abduction, are currently not reported to the CCJS, nor are they available nationally from other sources.

In 1997 there were 193 firearm homicide incidents, 5,478 firearm robbery incidents and 189 discharge firearm with intent incidents, representing a total of at least 5,860 criminal incidents which involved the use of a firearm.

(b) Although individual police agencies may collect this information, data on recovered firearms are not available from a national data source. Compiling such data would require considerable effort and cost. However, the Canadian Firearms Registration System, CFRS, will assist in further developing national data on firearms recovered by law enforcement in the future.

A number of alternative sources may be examined to provide a partial picture. Data from the Provincial Weapons Enforcement Unit, PWEU, of Ontario and from various recovered gun studies are presented below. According to PWEU, there were a total of 7,566 firearms seized by Ontario law enforcement in 1997 and 1998. These data reflect firearms seized from a crime scene or guns that were illegally possessed. According to PWEU, their records do not indicate whether the firearms were in fact used in a crime. Individual municipalities are still reporting data from 1998 and as a result the above figure is an undercount.

As additional information, PWEU provided the types of firearms seized by police during the above period. In 1997, 78% of the firearms seized were rifles/shotguns, 18% were handguns, 2% were machine guns/pistols and the remaining 1% were sawed-off rifles/shotguns.

Recently the Department of Justice Canada, in partnership with police services in Saint John, New Brunswick, Hull, Quebec, Thunder Bay and Windsor, Ontario, and Regina, Saskatchewan commissioned a joint research project to study the number and types of firearms recovered by police. It examined police records and property room files for the year 1995.

The study found that in 1995 these law enforcement agencies recovered 473 firearms in criminal incidents. Overall the study found that 52% of the firearms recovered by police in relation to a criminal incident were non-restricted rifles and shotguns, 21% were handguns, 19% were air guns, 4% were sawed-off rifles/shotguns and the remaining 4% were other firearms. It is important to note that under the Criminal Code air guns that shoot projectiles under the velocity of 152 meters per second are not defined as

firearms. However, due to the number recovered in this and previous studies data on air guns were collected.

Data collected by the national Firearms Smuggling Work Group from 10 different police agencies across Canada revealed that they recovered 4,496 firearms in criminal incidents in 1993. The study also reported that of the 4,496 firearms recovered in criminal incidents, 47% were rifles/shotguns, 21% were handguns, 18% were air guns, 11% were other firearms and the remaining 3% were sawed-off rifle/shotguns.

In the above two studies, recovered firearms served as the unit of analysis, not criminal incidents involving firearms. In these studies the firearms may or may not have been used directly in the commission of a crime. For example, they include firearms recovered by police during a drug raid.

(c) As noted above, data on recovered firearms are not readily available on a national level. Furthermore, if national data were readily available, the registration status of recovered firearms could only be ascertained for restricted firearms "mainly handguns" registered on the Restricted Weapons Registration System, RWRS, maintained by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Once again, the CFRS will assist in developing information on the registration status of all firearms recovered by law enforcement.

Long gun registration statistics for crime will only be available when long gun registry is fully operational, after January 1, 2003.

Question No. 175—Mr. Lee Morrison:

Regarding the Halifax Port Corporation: (a) has the corporation awarded an exclusive, untendered lease on Shed 9A, Richmond Terminals, Halifax, Nova Scotia, to a newly incorporated company, Scotia Terminals Limited; (b) does this company have any other leases or businesses with the corporation; (c) has this facility and its related dock recently had the benefit of a \$5 million capital improvement at the cost of the corporation; (d) in the past five years, how many other untendered leases for multimillion dollar port facilities have been granted and to whom; (e) what is the total annual revenue expected to be generated by the Scotia Terminals Limited lease for each of the next five years; and (f) who are the principals, officers and directors of Scotia Terminals Limited?

Mr. Stan Dromiski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.): (a) The Halifax Port Corporation did enter into a lease agreement with Scotia Terminals Limited for facilities at Pier 9A. The lease commenced December 1, 1998. A tender call for the lease was not issued. In fact, it would be highly unusual for the Halifax Port Corporation to call for tenders to lease facilities. Neither HPC's enabling legislation nor its internal policies require it to call for tenders for leases.

(b) No.

(c) In 1996, the dock, which was constructed over 50 years ago, was declared unsafe and taken out of service. The proposal to lease facilities put forward by Scotia Terminals Limited provided the

Routine Proceedings

necessary support for the decision to carry out the \$5.3 million repair expenditure. The repairs were at the cost of HPC.

(d) In the past five years there have been two other leases of a multimillion dollar port facility. One was to PanCanadian Petroleum Limited at Shed 9B and the other was to Colbalt Refinery Limited at Shed 22. The latter area was subsequently leased to Scotia Terminals Limited. The lease terminated on November 30, 1998 when the operation moved to the Pier 9A facility.

(e) The Halifax Port Corporation deems the amount of revenue to be generated by the lease as commercially sensitive and privileged information.

(f) The officers and directors of Scotia Terminals Limited are:

President: Bernard Prévost
Secretary/Treasurer: Harry Mathers
Comptroller: Cheryl Newcombe

Directors: Harry Mathers
Bernard Prévost

Question No. 177—Ms. Judy Wasylcia-Leis:

What have been the federal government's activities in the area of hepatitis B vaccination, specifically: (a) information learned by Health Protection Branch regulators from the decision by France to suspend the administration of the hepatitis B vaccination; (b) actions taken by Health Canada to assess safety of the vaccination B product and, in particular, to survey for adverse reactions over and above voluntary reporting; (c) information requested and received from international bodies such as the World Health Organization about the safety of the hepatitis B vaccination; (d) reassessment of existing evidence in the new drug submission for the hepatitis B vaccination previously assessed; and (e) evidence that plasma was not involved in any part of the manufacturing of the hepatitis B vaccination?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Hepatitis B is a potentially serious disease, spread by blood and body fluid contact. From 1990 to 1994 the incidence of hepatitis B in Canada was on average about 10.3 per 100,000 per year, with corresponding mortality, morbidity and the potential for long term complications and chronic carriage. The best time to introduce the vaccine into the routine schedule is before children become sexually active. Targeting high risk groups only is an ineffective strategy, which is why the vaccine is being offered for infants or children.

(a) The decision in France was taken in response to pressure exerted by opponents to the vaccine who allege that immunization with the vaccine is associated with the development of some types of neurologic disease. It was not based on scientific evidence.

The French Minister of Health announced on October 1, 1998 that school based vaccination programs would be temporarily suspended, in part due to pressure from opponents to the vaccine. Allegations have been circulating in France, despite a lack of

scientific evidence, linking hepatitis B vaccination and the development of demyelinating diseases such as multiple sclerosis, MS. In contrast, the vaccine is still recommended for routine infant immunization, and for adults in high risk groups. More importantly, vaccination is still recommended and available to adolescents through their family doctor's office. The French minister highlighted that this move was temporary, and it will permit a reassessment of the method of delivery of adolescent immunization in school settings. France embarked on a very large scale hepatitis B immunization effort several years ago, to the point where some 25 million doses have been distributed and over one-third of the population have been vaccinated.

(b) The Laboratory Centre for Disease Control, LCDC, Health Canada and the National Advisory Committee on Immunization, NACI, have continued to review available evidence, including results of postmarked surveillance in Canada, in light of the allegations against hepatitis B vaccine. There is no evidence to suggest any change in the current recommendations for the routine use of hepatitis B vaccine in Canada. There is no credible scientific evidence linking hepatitis B vaccination and MS and chronic fatigue syndrome.

The World Health Organization, WHO, has reaffirmed the safety of hepatitis B vaccine and strongly recommended that all countries already using hepatitis B vaccine continue to do so, and that countries not yet using the vaccine begin as soon as possible. Health Canada's role with regard to the hepatitis B vaccine is multifaceted.

The Therapeutic Products Program, TPP, reviews the vaccine through a process of careful assessment of pre-market clinical trials to ensure it meets required standards of safety and efficacy. In addition, each lot of vaccine is individually cleared by TPP before being allowed on the market.

The National Advisory Committee on Immunization, reporting to the Assistant Deputy Minister, Health Protection Branch, issues guidelines and recommendations on the use of the product. NACI indeed has recommended routine use of the vaccine and continues to do so.

The Division of Immunization, Bureau of Infectious Diseases of the Laboratory Centre for Disease Control is responsible for the postmarked surveillance of vaccines in Canada, including the hepatitis B vaccine. It undertakes both passive and active surveillance of vaccine associated adverse events and supports an external expert advisory committee on vaccine safety. There have been no concerns regarding MS identified in Canada, and an investigation into whether the vaccine causes chronic fatigue syndrome found no evidence of an association.

The monitoring of vaccine safety relies on many interrelated activities in addition to case reporting. Not only do the Laboratory Centre for Disease Control, LCDC, Health Canada and the National

Routine Proceedings

Advisory Committee on Immunization aggregate and assess all reports received to be able to detect any signals of increased, unusual or previously unrecognised adverse events, but in addition Health Canada funds a national program, through the Canadian Pediatric Society, which actively monitors for serious reactions to vaccinations in children and adolescents at 11 pediatric hospitals. The Division of Immunization has also established a committee of medical and vaccine experts to review all the reported serious cases and to further investigated any concerns and take appropriate action as required.

(c) The World Health Organization, WHO, has issued a press release reaffirming the safety and benefit of hepatitis B vaccination. It concluded, after careful review with the assistance of external experts, that available scientific evidence does not demonstrate a causal association between hepatitis B immunization and central nervous system disease, including MS. The Viral Hepatitis Prevention Board, a World Health Organization collaborating centre for the prevention of viral hepatitis, called a technical consultation at the end of September 1998 to review accumulated data. Participants at that meeting were presented with data, including preliminary and still unpublished recent analytic epidemiologic studies conducted in France, the United Kingdom and the United States. Although they acknowledged that the data available to date was limited, none demonstrated a causal association between hepatitis B vaccination and demyelinating disease. They concluded that no evidence was presented at the meeting to indicate a need to change public health policy with respect to hepatitis B vaccination. Routine immunization programs against hepatitis B are in place in 100 countries around the world.

(d) Reassessment of existing evidence has not been considered for the time being in view of the aforementioned notification from WHO. Its statement is based on the conclusion from the international expert meeting at Geneva, on September 28-30, 1998, at which all available information was reviewed in detail—national public health and regulatory authorities, academia, the hospital sector, the pharmaceutical industry and the World Health Organization; experts in public health, epidemiology, immunology, neurology and pharmacology—in response to the decision of the Minister of Health in France to temporarily suspend the school based immunization program.

(e) There two hepatitis B vaccines available in Canada, both of which are recombinant products. This means that they consist of a non infectious subunit derived from the hepatitis B surface antigen harvested and purified from cultures of a strain of yeast. Therefore, no blood products are used at any stage of the manufacturing process. Before the approval of these two vaccines in 1987 and 1990, human plasma was involved in the manufacturing of hepatitis B vaccine. Those “plasma-derived” vaccines have been discontinued with the availability of recombinant products and are no longer in use.

Question No. 194—**Mr. Peter MacKay:**

What financial charges have been made against the budgets of the RCMP and the Department of Justice for the Airbus investigation, and what is the total cost of the investigation as of February 10, 1999?

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): I am informed as follows:

The Department of Justice does not have responsibility for criminal investigations. Department of Justice counsel may provide advice and assistance to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, RCMP, and other police forces with respect to their investigations. Such advice or assistance is provided by the relevant sections of the department and the resources relied upon are those assigned to that particular function. Thus, it is not possible to provide figures on funds spent by the Department of Justice in relation to any particular RCMP investigation unless charges have been laid and the Attorney General of Canada has responsibility for the prosecution. In that instance, it might be possible to provide cost estimates for the prosecution. The budget for providing assistance to the RCMP in various contexts is allocated globally to units such as the International Assistance Group and it is not calculated by reference to individual cases.

It is the position of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police not to disclose the costs at this time as it would be harmful to the ongoing criminal investigation into this matter.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if Questions Nos. 130 and 131 could be made Orders for Return, the returns would be tabled immediately.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 130—**Mr. Gordon Earle:**

What funds, grants, loans and loan guarantees has the federal government issued in the constituency of Halifax West for each of the following time periods: a) October 25, 1993, to October 24, 1994; b) October 25, 1994, to October 24, 1995; c) October 25, 1995, to October 24, 1996; and d) October 25, 1996, to June 1, 1997; and in each case, where applicable: (i) the department or agency responsible; (ii) the program under which the payment was made; (iii) the names of the recipients if they were groups or

organizations; (iv) the monetary value of the payment made; and (v) the percentage of program funding covered by the payment received?

Return tabled.

Question No. 131—**Mr. Gordon Earle:**

What funds, grants, loans and loan guarantees has the federal government issued in the constituency of Halifax West from June 2, 1997, to June 1, 1998, and in each case, where applicable: (a) the department or agency responsible; (b) the program under which the payment was made; (c) the names of the recipients if they were groups or organizations; (d) the monetary value of the payment made; and (e) the percentage of program funding covered by the payment received?

Return tabled.

[English]

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

Mr. Ted White: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I just wonder if the parliamentary secretary could do as well on notices of motions and get P-70 responded to as soon as possible.

The Deputy Speaker: He will not today because they are called only on Wednesdays. I know that the hon. member for North Vancouver will be very patient and will wait until Wednesday when we will hear all about it.

The parliamentary secretary has asked that the remaining questions be allowed to stand. Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, discussions have taken place between the parties and the member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley concerning the taking of the division on P-31 scheduled at the conclusion of Private Members' Business today. I believe you will find consent for the following motion. I move:

That at the conclusion of today's debate on P-31, all questions necessary to dispose of the said motion shall be deemed put, a recorded division deemed requested and deferred until Tuesday, April 20, 1999, at the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. chief government whip have the unanimous consent of the House to propose this motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

Supply

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—REGIONS OF CANADA

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.) moved:

That this House condemns the government for alienating itself from the regions of Canada by failing to identify and address the concerns and issues of those regions, and as a symbolic first step towards taking responsibility for all of the regions of Canada, the government should rename the Liberal committee on Western alienation the "Liberal Alienation Committee".

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

We look forward to this debate today. Reform Party members participating in the debate will be dividing their time.

Mr. Ted White: Mr. Speaker, it is because of the government's ongoing and arrogant disregard for the aspirations and valid concerns of the provinces and regions of this country that we are having to debate this motion today. I would like to read it into the record once again:

That this House condemns the government for alienating itself from the regions of Canada by failing to identify and address the concerns and issues of those regions, and as a symbolic first step towards taking responsibility for all of the regions of Canada, the government should rename the Liberal committee on Western alienation the "Liberal Alienation Committee".

• (1020)

As the debate progresses today, Reform MPs will be speaking one by one about the concerns of Canadians on a region by region basis beginning with the west. We want to try to provide the Prime Minister with information firsthand which is much more detailed and valuable, and perhaps even more relevant than that which will be collected by his partisan task force, a task force which appears to be interested in receiving input only from persons or groups who can be identified as Liberal supporters.

As an example of a meaningful message, I would like the House to consider for a moment a poll of residents in B.C. and Alberta which was completed by Mark Trend Research in late March. The results of the poll provide some important contradictions to the claims made by the Prime Minister that he has been dealing with western concerns.

It is especially interesting to note that barely one in ten of the respondents had even heard of the Prime Minister's task force. That is not surprising in light of the complete failure of the task force to publish an agenda or to even make public the venues for the meetings so that westerners can give their input.

If we take as an example last week's activities of the task force, the chairman of the task force claimed in this House yesterday to

Supply

have met with 60 individuals and organizations in Manitoba. I have a copy of their agenda here. It is quite clear that it was designed to exclude the public who would more than likely have arrived at the meetings with tough messages embarrassing to the task force.

This agenda was obviously put together months ago. It has been carefully constructed and it is entirely a set of meetings behind closed doors with special interest groups and Liberal Party hacks. Mind you, the chairman could be a bit gun shy of public exposure. In light of his experience on a Canada-wide talk show in early February, I would not blame him for wanting to have his meetings behind closed doors.

In two hours of open radio talk show he did not receive a single call of support from anywhere in Canada, in an entire two hour talk show. In fact, it was probably the hottest of public roastings experienced by any MP in a long time. Callers predicted that the task force would be a complete waste of money and that the members would not listen anyway. This prediction appeared to become a self-fulfilling prophecy as the talk show progressed.

The member for Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia made comments like “We have to pursue what we think is in the national interest” and “I hope the passions diminish and westerners accept the legislation”. He was talking about the ill-fated gun control bill, the Liberal gun control disaster. His comments made it quite clear that he had no intention of listening to the input from law-abiding gun owners who are sick of being treated like criminals.

Another comment from the task force chairman on that talk show was in connection with the probably unconstitutional Nisga’a treaty that is being dealt with in B.C. His answer to a request from one of the callers was “You know we don’t believe in referendums”. To say the least, this is a truly insensitive statement from someone who claims to be leading a group which in the Prime Minister’s words has a mandate to travel throughout the west on a fact finding mission. No wonder a caller to the show told the member that he is obviously deaf and needs a hearing aid.

In fact, the Mark Trend poll I mentioned earlier found that 65% of people in B.C. want a referendum on the Nisga’a treaty. That is up from 60% three months ago and up from 48% in August 1998. The more people learn about the agreement, the less they want it. The fact is they do not want two arrogant governments, each elected with less than 38% of the popular vote, ramming down their throats a system of government which is 100% based on race and which is probably unconstitutional.

On the flight to Ottawa from Vancouver this week I sat alongside a B.C. businessman who had lived in South Africa for seven or eight years. He told me, as have so many of my constituents who have lived in South Africa prior to coming to Canada, that the Nisga’a treaty does exactly what South Africa was told by the international community to abandon. It sets up a government based

on race, a system of apartheid and racism and homelands rather than a system of equality of peoples.

Even the Liberal Party of B.C. is against the Nisga’a treaty and has launched a court challenge against the unconstitutional delegation of powers contained in the agreement.

● (1025)

Yet the member for Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia and his so-called task force are choosing to ignore the concerns of the people of B.C. and even what their own provincial counterparts are telling them. Unfortunately, the callers to the radio talk show were correct when they said that the task force would be a flop. They know that the vast majority of government members are simply trained seals who will vote the way they are told to vote by the Prime Minister regardless of the input they have received from the people in the west.

It is a sad commentary on our dysfunctional parliament that men and women who no doubt in their private lives are intelligent, thoughtful and reasonable people have no option but to vote the way they are told by the Prime Minister because otherwise he will not sign their nomination papers. It prevents them from representing their constituents.

In contrast, soon after westerners started the Reform Party, they included in the party constitution a provision which prevents a leader of the party from refusing to sign nomination papers. In the Reform Party it is the executive council, a body elected from the members at large which decides whether or not a leader will sign a candidate’s nomination papers. Reform MPs are guaranteed the freedom to do what has to be done when it needs to be done in terms of voting freely in the House.

This is good because that Mark Trend poll I keep mentioning found that in both Alberta and B.C. more than 87% of the people want parliament reformed to establish free votes as the norm rather than the never. They want their MPs to represent them, not a political master in an office on Parliament Hill. Until the task force comes to grips with that reality, we all know that the callers to CKNW’s radio talk show were absolutely right that the task force is a big waste of money and resources.

Surely it might make the task force members feel all warm and fuzzy inside when they meet with their carefully chosen sympathetic supporters, but as Winnipeg *Sun* copy editor Mark Perry wrote back in January “If Chrétien and his Liberal flunkies really wanted to know what’s on the minds of Western Canadians”—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows he cannot refer to other hon. members by name, even when quoting from a document. I would invite him to comply with the rules in that respect fully.

Supply

Mr. Ted White: Mr. Speaker, I thought you might stop me on that so I will start again. The article states that if the Prime Minister “and his Liberal flunkies really wanted to know what is on the minds of western Canadians, they could start by unplugging their ears and listening to what those folks sitting across from them in the House of Commons have to say. No, not the separatist Bloc Québécois, the Reform Party”.

Mr. Perry then went on to state that they would find out very quickly and pointedly why the west does not elect more Liberals, which is of course the real point of this wasteful junket. Mr. Perry also wrote that the member for Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia should know better than to be part of this sham.

I know that my time is running short already. I am going to read out a typical list of western concerns. It is a list that has only grown since the government was elected in 1993. With respect to a few of the items on the list, the government has engaged in a very expensive and lavish public relations exercise, feigning concern and pretending that they have actually done something about the issues but to all intents and purposes nothing has changed.

One of the items on the list is an overhaul of the Young Offenders Act. That is a real overhaul, not the pathetic piece of fiddling while Rome burns that was recently introduced by the Minister of Justice. They want an end to the wheat board monopoly; a referendum on the Nisga'a template; prompt deportation of the tens of thousands of criminal refugee claimants in Canada and an end to refugee claims at the borders; action on judicial activism and a more transparent and public method for selecting judges; reform of the Senate; an end to the use of closure to limit parliamentary debates; and meaningful tax reductions.

That poll I mentioned asked westerners what they thought would be a meaningful tax reduction. Almost 87% said the tax reductions given by the minister were pitiful and that \$2,500 to \$3,000 per year was meaningful.

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to my hon. friend's comments. I find I agree with most of what he says, which is somewhat frightening, but on this issue I can feel safe.

• (1030)

The member referred to the fact that a number of Liberal backbenchers toured western Canada to seek out why people from that region of Canada were feeling somewhat alienated. Could he share with the House what his constituents felt about this initiative

in terms of having to send out a delegation of eastern backbenchers to find out what they were concerned about?

Mr. Ted White: Mr. Speaker, that is a really good question and I thank the member for it. He is from British Columbia and he is well known as what we call a constituency rep. He cares for his constituents and their opinions.

The Mark Trend poll I mentioned asked a question of whether or not people thought the Liberal task force would actually listen or make any difference. Almost 70% thought it would not make the slightest bit of difference. Therein we have an answer to part of his question. People do not believe it will make any difference. All it will do is meet with its own people, Liberal supporters, and not really listen.

Judging by the telephone calls to the radio talk show I mentioned, many of which were from western Canada, they simply did not believe the member for Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia was listening at all to the concerns. Caller after caller said “You are not listening, are you? Will you please be quiet and listen to what I have to say?” They repeated one after the other the same theme that the member really had not clicked to the need to listen to the constituents.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to say how happy I am to learn, from the remarks by my hon. colleague from North Vancouver, that in his second term as a member of this House he has realized that the west is neglected by the Canadian government.

During the first referendum in Quebec in 1980, we consulted the people to inform them that the Canadian government saw the province of Quebec as a region and that Quebecers were recognized by Ottawa only as taxpayers but that no services were being provided to Quebec.

This is why in 1980 the then Premier of Quebec, René Lévesque, and, in 1995, Mr. Parizeau, told the people “We should be masters in our own house, we should manage our own affairs and stop being considered as a region by the government”.

I am delighted that today the Reform Party member in his speech is beginning to take a view similar to Quebec's position and that he realizes the Canadian government is doing nothing for the west. While it may be doing nothing for the west now, it has not been doing anything for Quebec for a very long time.

That is why one day Quebec will assuredly achieve sovereignty, or independence, and then it will govern itself with its own money, its own taxes and its own powers, and will no longer depend on the Canadian government.

*Supply**[English]*

Mr. Ted White: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the question. I would like him to know that in the 10 years since the Reform Party was formed we have always had a policy that the federal government should remove itself from using its spending powers in areas of provincial jurisdiction. It has been an irritation to the west just as it has been to Quebec that this federal government interferes constantly in areas of provincial jurisdiction.

He may also be aware that there has been quite a strong separatist movement in western Canada that has ebbed and flowed from time to time. It even elected two members in Alberta at one stage. In B.C. the support for western separation was measured as high as 17% to 18% at one point in time.

The irritations he mentioned are certainly not limited to Quebec. They are widespread throughout the country. I hear comments from people in Ontario that they feel this place, Ottawa, interferes constantly in what should be left to the provincial government.

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, since the Liberals are sending this committee to the west I am sure they will be to British Columbia, that place on the other side of the Rockies.

• (1035)

Could the member tell us what the itinerary is, if they are coming to my area, because we would like to give them our own tar and feathers as well. Is it possible that the member could let us know where they will be in British Columbia?

Mr. Ted White: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately we cannot provide the agenda as requested by the member.

The task force did not release its agenda for last week until this week. The meetings had already taken place by the time we knew where they were and there was absolutely no opportunity for public input whatsoever.

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong here. We have a Liberal committee with a sort of agenda and itinerary coming west to find out what alienates them. It was there last week and released the itinerary this week. This is a good example of the way Liberals do things and maybe what alienates the west as well as all other provinces. Three or four senators are being sent on this little trip to the west. I am sure they might get the gist of things.

In my capacity as House leader for the official opposition I also have the role of regional critic for Nova Scotia, a job which I am very proud to undertake. I want to tell the government that there are other areas in the country that are truly alienated. I am sure that is why the Liberals do not have any seats in Nova Scotia. It may be just dawning on them what the problem is. I asked quite a few people in Nova Scotia what exactly was bothering them about

being alienated from the Liberal government and I will give their responses.

However, I want to clarify something for the geniuses across the way that they are bragging about a byelection they won last night in Windsor—St. Clair. The Reform Party did not do well but the NDP just about took them out. I might add that they did lose a considerable number of votes from the last election. Not only that. I would invite members opposite to come to my riding during a byelection any time and then come into the House and brag after it. We will see where they go. The Liberals do not win seats across the country. We are trying to point out today that the Liberals have won seats in two regions of the country. That is where the Liberals primarily have votes.

Other regions of the country are sick and tired of the way the country is governed. Let me give some idea of the things I have heard in Nova Scotia. I am sure some of my colleagues who represent that area will either agree or add more to the list.

Why in the name of heaven are we sending this group of backbenchers and senators to one region of the country when there are all kinds of regions that are hurting and all kinds of regions that are sick and darned tired of what is opposite? I ask them to listen up, all five of them.

Sable Gas is a project the people of Atlantic Canada, Nova Scotia in particular, have been watching for so long as one of the great hopes of the region. One can understand that with the potential it has. It continues to remain on the horizon. The country was promised a November 1999 start-up of the project, and now they are talking about November 2000. Who knows where it will go from there? There are still no clear indications of the benefits when the contract is signed.

We can recall in the House some time ago debating the issue of why the Liberals went to another province and said let us divert that natural gas pipeline north around Nova Scotia. Nova Scotians and people all over Canada asked what they were doing. In fact I stood in the House and asked why they would not allow these people the production and the growth as Alberta did with its natural gas until they introduced the national energy program.

• (1040)

Nova Scotia is an area of great potential. Yet the federal government did nothing but play games in that exercise. It is not even visible in getting this project active today. It kind of walked away from it when it did not serve its own benefit. Do the people of Nova Scotia feel alienated by that? Maybe the government better send some members down there to ask a few questions.

Some of my colleagues and I met with families affected by the Devco situation. There has been no direction from the government. There has been no meaningful assistance and no acceptance of responsibility by the government. Some shake their heads, but that is what is happening. The government says that it is only the west

that is alienated. Give it a break. Get a life. There is more to the country than one small region.

There is no policy on what to do with Devco or what to do for the men and women, particularly the families in Cape Breton that are highly stressed. Where are the Liberals today? How are they dealing with this situation? The frustration is showing more and more with protesters, depression and suicides.

The government goes to Sydney, makes an announcement and walks away. No responsible government does that under any circumstances. Why do the people in Nova Scotia feel alienated? One problem is that the government does not ask why. It just thinks it is a problem in the west because the Reform Party is sitting here.

Let us talk about shipbuilding in Nova Scotia. The Marine Workers Federation had an excellent suggestion. Where was the government when that suggestion was made? Nowhere. It was not even supportive of the issue.

What is the issue? I know a number of people who have worked in the marine industry for 20 or more years. Why not build some ships? There is the capacity in the shipyards in Halifax. The dedication is there. Canada has low costs in terms of the international value of the Canadian dollar. Holland is producing at a higher cost. Why can we not do it here?

The question from the government would be why do we have to build ships anyway. It does not understand that one potential market is the coastal tanker fleet which is 25 to 30-plus years old. It must be renewed by 2004 to meet environmental standards. Many of the necessary tax acts and other incentives are already in place. With a little policy direction there could be half a billion dollars worth of work at approximately \$30 million per vessel. Where is the government promoting that kind of thing?

There is a saying that a government that robs Peter to pay Paul can always depend on the support of Paul. Is it the government's intention to rob Peter to pay Paul and to make sure that the Pauls are always in place rather than look at some initiatives that might help a region? Talk about regional alienation.

I could talk all day about the tar ponds in Sydney. I will be there on Thursday looking at them again. It is one of the biggest open sewers in the world. After \$50 million plus were spent on it nothing has been done. There has been study after study.

The Liberals walked in, threw some bucks at it, walked out and said the problem was solved. It has not been solved. It has been going on for decades and decades. For the last 12 years the government has been throwing money at it in a big way. People are still living in front of a major sewer which is unacceptable anywhere in North America. Except this government accepts it in Sydney. It is incredible.

Supply

We could talk about the gun law. Nova Scotia among other places is appalled at what is going on with the famous gun law the government brought in to prevent murder by gun. What did we recently see in Ottawa? Murders by guns. Has it stopped it? No. Steve Gullon in Nova Scotia can tell us. He cannot live off his business any more. It is dying because of the cost and the exorbitant administration rates.

● (1045)

I only have a minute, unfortunately. I would like to talk about the toll highway in Nova Scotia. I would like to talk about the Port of Halifax, the crime, the issue of offshore ownership of waterfront property and real estate, the inefficiencies of ACOA, high taxes and overburdened health care. I could go on and on.

I would suggest that the government get off the idea that it is only western Canada which is alienated. The whole damned country is alienated.

Therefore, I would like to introduce an amendment to the motion. It is necessary to introduce it because we do not know what the plans of the government are. I move:

That the motion be amended by adding "and immediately make its intentions and full agenda public".

Maybe then we in the west, the people in the east and people throughout this country will understand that there is more to this than just some PR exercise by backbenchers.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on the amendment.

Hon. Andy Mitchell (Secretary of State (Parks), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, considering how few members are on the other side to debate the motion, I am not surprised they could not find a seconder.

The Deputy Speaker: The Secretary of State for Parks knows that it is improper to refer to the presence or absence of members and I would advise him to refrain from such comments. He knows it is contrary to the rules.

Mr. Randy White: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Not only is it improper, but there are only three members on the other side of the House.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Langley—Abbotsford knows that is not a point of order. He is only compounding the difficulties of the Chair. The Chair is trying to ensure orderly debate in the House and I know that the hon. member for Langley—Abbotsford, as House leader for the official opposition, would want to assist in every respect.

Supply

Hon. Andy Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, so as not to make your job more difficult, I will refrain from making such comments.

It is interesting that this particular debate would take place the day after at least some Canadians spoke directly to the role of how the various parties are doing here in parliament.

It was interesting to note in the byelection results in Windsor—St. Clair that a Liberal was returned to the House. It was interesting to note that the Reform Party got a little over 6% of the vote, certainly under 10% of the vote, and actually saw its percentage decline, which is interesting to put in the context of the debate that is taking place today.

My question has to do with the comments of the two initial speakers and their criticism of members of parliament seeking the views of Canadians.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Hon. Andy Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, members opposite are chuckling because they think they are the only ones who know how to do it.

Let us make it clear that what the Reform Party is criticizing is an effort by parliamentarians to understand what Canadians are thinking.

My question to the opposition House leader is, why does the Reform Party not support efforts to talk to Canadians to ask them what their perspective is?

• (1050)

I realize that since it is not the Reform Party doing it Reformers are somewhat embarrassed that they are left flat-footed because they have not gone out and asked their folks what they think, but the Liberals have indeed done that. I want to know why they have not gone out to consult with their constituents. Why they have left it to the Liberals?

Mr. Randy White: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals do not understand that in the last election 62% of Canadians voted against them. How does the member figure that? It would be an awful lot more important if the few Liberals here would understand that what we want to talk about today is not what they are doing but what they are not doing in all regions of the country.

His question was why we would be concerned about the Liberals going to the west asking about what is alienating westerners. If it were truly a practical good exercise with the intention of finding out what alienates westerners, we would be all for it. But the fact is that this is a clandestine exercise by a committee that announces its itinerary a week after it shows up, gets absolutely no press in Winnipeg and talks behind closed doors with people. It is a fact that it is on a search for candidates for the next election. As well it bellyaches about parties opposite meeting behind closed doors. I hardly think this committee is really looking to find out why westerners are alienated. I think it is really there for other

exercises, and it is not doing a very good job at that. I would encourage those committee members to try to be more realistic. If they think westerners cannot see through this they are kidding themselves.

I am sure the other opposition parties are hoping that if the committee is coming to their area it would at least notify them.

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, it is very important that all members of parliament, on a consistent basis, be judicious in their comments relative to other regions. During a previous debate on issues facing Atlantic Canada I was offended as an Atlantic Canadian when I heard a member say that the smallest violin in the world plays for Atlantic Canada. That member was mocking the efforts of Atlantic Canadians to bootstrap themselves into prosperity.

I would like the hon. member to comment on that, given that it was a member of his party, the member for Calgary West.

Mr. Randy White: Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear a bit about this today. There is some shyness and concern from the PCs who are a little concerned about us bringing up regional interests, in particular in their area. We should watch for the kinds of suggestions and improvements they have for their own area. It is unfortunate that they act this way, but that is just the way it is going to be.

What we are talking about is not a matter of party politics. Maybe some day when the PCs grow up they will get to be the official opposition, but it is going to be a long time. I would encourage them to listen to the issues and to respond in kind to the real problems in this country.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel (Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) (Western Economic Diversification), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to the official opposition's motion.

[*English*]

Last night, as I was putting down some thoughts with respect to today's address, I was in a restaurant and a number of people came over and asked what I was doing. I showed them the motion. I asked them what they thought of it. The first person said "I really don't understand it". Another two people said that it seemed rather silly. Another person said "It makes no sense".

• (1055)

Having already heard from these people, I recognized some others, so I went to them. The truth of the matter is that another two said it was a silly motion and another two said that it made no sense that the government should rename the Liberal committee on western alienation to the Liberal alienation committee. Even the most literate could not understand what that meant. Reformers did

not even have the courtesy of having the formal title. They probably could not find it, or perhaps they could not understand it.

There are a lot of issues that could have been raised in debate. We could have talked about building a stronger, more united Canada. We could have talked about increasing Canada's economic performance. We could have talked about Kosovo, the genocide that is occurring there and what it is that we might do to lessen the atrocities. What did they do? They picked a silly motion that does not make any sense to anyone. They are playing politics.

Why would they be doing that? They are a little nervous because they have pockets of support. They say that this could be useful. This might work. Therefore let us get in there, let us be dysfunctional, let us be negative, let us do whatever we can to torpedo it.

Are they waiting to see the report so they can look at it and then perhaps address substantive issues and solutions that will be identified in it? Of course not. That would be logical. That would be a professional approach. Of course they are not going to do that.

I participated for two days on the task force. I met with the mayor and councillors of the city of Winnipeg. It was an excellent meeting. We met with the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce. We met with la Chambre de commerce francophone du Manitoba and it was an excellent meeting. There was a meeting with the Brandon mayor and his council, which was an excellent meeting. I also attended a meeting of reeves and councillors from southeastern Manitoba. Guess what? It was an excellent meeting.

Were they friends of the government? No. They were responsible citizens, identifying issues and making concrete proposals for solutions.

In view of the way in which this has started and in view of this particular motion, perhaps the Reform Party ought to consider renaming itself the silly party of Canada, or perhaps the "we never made sense and will never make sense party of Canada".

I will give an example of the lack of respect they have for their colleagues. This morning "flunkies" was used with respect to government members. They referred to MPs from eastern Canada as lackeys and trained seals, as if they had no role to play on such a task force. They also referred to senators without the least bit of respect, as if they were men and women who had no knowledge of the country, who could not make a contribution. I find that shocking.

An hon. member: Reprehensible.

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel: It is reprehensible.

The good news is that they are not all like that. I will share what one Reform member said. He no doubt recognizes the fallacy of

Supply

the Reform Party's motion this morning. Here is a quote found in two publications which was made by the member for Athabasca.

The federal government has made the provision of information one of the cornerstones of its effort to assist Canadian small and medium-sized enterprises. . .no matter where you live in western Canada, Western Economic Diversification, in partnership with other business service organizations, is your local link to a world of business resources.

That is what the member for Athabasca had to say.

Another MP from the Reform Party, one of the more enlightened ones, who sees more than what they see thank goodness, who responds to materials made available to him so that he can share them with his constituents, said "It will be my pleasure to share this information with my constituency".

The Reform Party has a platform. It would like to remove the economic development agencies, but it has not said what it would replace them with. It has not given an indication of how it would undertake economic development. Absolutely none. This is the party that would reduce equalization payments without having any clue whatsoever of the impact it would have on the provinces that are in fact receiving that kind of assistance.

• (1100)

[*Translation*]

What would they replace this by? They have no idea. They would be prepared to slash and to cut, without understanding what is going on, without analysing the impact this would have on Canadians. I find this absolutely unacceptable.

[*English*]

I want to talk this morning about western economic diversification.

[*Translation*]

I am responsible for this portfolio. I want to further emphasize this agency's presence in western Canada. Before doing this, I want to talk about, or at least briefly mention, the other agencies.

[*English*]

In the Atlantic provinces we have ACOA. While there are similarities to western economic diversification, there are differences and there need to be differences. If we are to listen to the people from those regions, we need programs that respond to their unique needs.

[*Translation*]

In Quebec, there is also the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec. Here again, there are some similarities with other economic development agencies. Of course,

Supply

there are some programs that have been tailored to meet the specific needs of Quebecers.

FedNor, an agency that operates in Northern Ontario, is similar in many respects to the other economic development agencies. Programs are in place to meet the special needs of this region.

[English]

Let us talk about the mandate of western economic diversification. It is to diversify the economies of the western provinces. What does that mean? We all know that traditionally we have made a good living. We have done very well based upon the natural resources that we have had, an abundance of natural resources in a number of sectors.

We also recognize that we are in a different world today. We are in a knowledge based society which requires a knowledge based economy. What does that mean? That means getting more from what we have by applying the knowledge we have in the mining sectors, the forestry sectors, the agricultural sectors and the fishing sectors. That is what it really means.

If people have businesses that are doing well, can they do more with those businesses? Can they create more jobs? If they have an idea for a new business, can they in fact launch that business successfully and create more jobs for western Canadians?

We on this side of the House believe that a strong western Canada, like strong Atlantic provinces, like a strong Quebec, like a strong Ontario, like strong northern territories, is good for Canada. It makes for a stronger nation. That is what we are all about.

Where is western economic diversification in the Government of Canada? It is headquartered in Edmonton, headed by a deputy minister from Edmonton, an outstanding public servant with an outstanding staff for each of the provinces, committed to western Canadians, committed to being advocates for western Canadian issues.

There is a satellite office, by the way, in Calgary, Alberta, because we want to bring the services to the people. We recognize that southern Alberta differs from Edmonton and northern Alberta.

[Translation]

Madam Speaker, I was under the impression that I had 20 minutes. Is that not the case?

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Yes, I am sorry, but 10 minutes is the amount of time allotted.

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel: That is unfortunate, because I was told that I had 20 minutes. Therefore, I had prepared myself accordingly. I thought that as the main speaker for the government, I would have 20 minutes.

[English]

We are in Vancouver. We are in Saskatoon. We have a satellite in Regina. We have an office in Winnipeg. More important, we are in the small places.

[Translation]

Saturday morning, for instance, I was in Saint-Pierre-Joli to announce the opening of a business centre. We are present in small towns and villages like Prud'homme and Bonnyville, not just in large urban centres.

[English]

We have a number of partners. We have four women's enterprise centres.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Unfortunately I must interrupt the secretary of state. The rules of debate state that the first speaker has 20 minutes and the four subsequent speakers, 10 minutes each. We now move on to questions and comments.

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel: I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker. I would like the unanimous consent to continue with my presentation.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The hon. secretary of state is asking for unanimous consent to continue for another 10 minutes. Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

• (1105)

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am curious about the comment of the hon. member opposite that the motion being debated today is a waste of time. I am sure the people where I come from will be very interested in that comment.

It is not just where I come from in the west. I spoke on some serious issues that I was made aware of in Nova Scotia. They were the port of Halifax, the tar ponds, shipbuilding, Devco and Sable Gas. All these issues are facing the federal government and it could do more. I am sure the people down there do not take kindly to the words that it is a waste of time.

We had hoped to get from the government not that it was a waste of time on regional issues but that we could do more and this is what we should do. It is truly unfortunate that it has taken this stance. I hope it can do more.

Would the hon. member do one thing at least? Would he stand here and commit on behalf of the committee he says he is on that it would table in the House today the itinerary, the agenda it has for the rest of Canada?

Supply

People in Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia would like to know where and when these folks will be showing up. He talked about having meetings with chambers of commerce and other organizations. The vast majority of people in those areas do not know those meetings are occurring. Behind closed door meetings, quiet meetings or unannounced meetings do not get adequate public input.

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel: Madam Speaker, I will respond to my colleague's questions. First, I did not say it was a waste of time. I said that—

Mr. Randy White: Yes, you did.

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel: No, I did not. I said people said it was silly. People said it made no sense. My hon. colleague knows that it is nothing but petty politics he is trying to play. He is trying to embarrass the government.

If he had wanted he could have given me an extra 10 minutes to talk about our partners in the women's enterprise centres, to talk about the 90 community futures development corporations we have in western Canada, and to talk about the 81 Canada-Manitoba and other provincial business centres that help businesses.

He could have permitted us to talk about businesses with which we work, businesses to which we provide information and businesses which we assist by finding funding and information on internal markets and export markets.

He could have permitted me to talk about aboriginal peoples and the way in which we are trying to integrate them more fully into Canadian society.

He could have permitted me to talk about the youth programs we have because we recognize that they are important. He could have encouraged me—

Mr. Nelson Riis: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The rules of the House are well known, particularly to my hon. friend who is an experienced member. The first round is 10 minutes with 5 minutes for questions and comments. It seems to me that he is simply bootlegging in parts of his speech that he was hoping to make within 20 minutes.

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel: What is your point?

Mr. Nelson Riis: My point is—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The hon. secretary of state still has two minutes.

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel: Madam Speaker, I would like to know what his point is.

I wanted to point out that western economic diversification, with other government departments, has responded to the needs of western Canadians such as those in rural areas and francophones.

They do not want to hear about that. We have been involved with the fishing communities that were devastated in western Canada and with the people affected by the floods. We have had a number of initiatives in science and technology and invested major dollars in western Canada. Why? Because western Canadians are competitive.

Why is it that hon. members opposite cannot see what the government has done? Why is it that their only ability is to try to identify issues about which they know very little and to try to inflame the passions of western Canadians against other regions of the country? I cannot understand that logic. That is petty politics. That is unacceptable. Frankly I am ashamed of that behaviour.

• (1110)

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Madam Speaker, the member does not admit that there is any problem at all.

Would he at least be prepared to say that in the regions of Canada, in the fishing sector, the mining sector, agriculture and forestry, there are some issues that are yet to be addressed seriously? It is not a perfect world out there in the regions of Canada, particularly those in the resource sectors.

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for the appropriate question. Of course there are issues and I wish we would identify them.

Let us talk about the \$400 million that was given to west coast fisheries. Is that appropriate? Is it working? How is it going?

Let us talk about the \$224.5 million that was given to flood victims in Manitoba. Is that appropriate? Is it working?

Let us talk about the \$56 million that was invested in Synchrotron in Saskatoon. Is that an appropriate investment? Are we for it or against it? Those are the questions we ought to be talking about.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is my turn to speak on this opposition day motion by the Reform Party.

I would like to divide the motion into two parts. The first part of the motion condemns the government's failure to address the concerns of the regions of Canada. In Quebec, our region, this failure is only too clear. Our presence here is vivid proof that Quebecers are deeply dissatisfied with this government and the federal system that governs them.

Supply

The second part of the motion, on what should be done to remedy the situation, is a proposal that the government rename the Liberal committee on western alienation the Liberal alienation committee. Even if this proposal might be considered justified, it seems to me that somewhat better wording could have been found to condemn the government's action and suggest to it possible courses of action.

I shall concentrate on the first part of the motion, condemning the government's failure—I would say historic failure—to address the concerns of many of its citizens, and in our case, Quebecers.

I shall not go over all the constitutional negotiations that have been the subject of dispute and the failure by the federal government to respond to Quebec's demands. There have been many such negotiations, particularly in the past 30 years, and they have one thing in common: regardless of who was negotiating—the federal Liberal or Conservative Party, a Quebec Liberal or Parti Québécois government—the result has always been the same: failure.

It might be tempting to lay this failure at individuals' doorsteps, but that would not hide the fact that there is a profound problem: an inability to live together or find rules that can govern all of us within a single system.

Efforts to this end have always been based on the concept of Quebec as a province. From the federal government's point of view, the provinces must have a certain character. Though the government is reluctant to say that it sees them as all equal, it does have a very strong tendency to say that it has to avoid special treatment for certain provinces. This has prevented agreements being reached that would have led to an asymmetrical model, more particularly for Quebec, giving it a different constitutional status from the other provinces. The Canadian government has always been too frightened of the reaction from other regions of Canada and too frightened as well that the whole thing would become unmanageable, although it is already extremely difficult to manage.

To come down to brass tacks, this is causing a considerable number of day to day problems for ordinary citizens. I am going to indicate some of these. I will not expand on my examples right now, I will return to them, but I am thinking of the millennium scholarships. There are also secretaries of state for various economic development agencies, for example Canada has a regional development agency for Quebec, while Quebec has its own regional development structure.

This gives rise to a sizeable number of concrete problems. It is hard to co-ordinate the work in the field, because the federal government wants to be visible more than it wants to be useful. This causes problems of slowness and inefficiency in the system, when it comes to meeting people's needs.

The primary underlying problem in all these negotiations, in Quebec's case, is that it is difficult to reach an agreement with someone who represents an entity whose existence one refuses to recognize.

• (1115)

When we are told there is no such thing as Quebec culture, as the Prime Minister said, when one refuses to recognize the fact that Quebecers are a people, it is very difficult, when it comes to negotiating with someone who refuses to recognize our very existence, to find a basis for understanding. This in turn creates a number of problems. The basic problem in relations between Quebec and Canada has always been at this level.

Even though people believe we talk too much about it, we do not stress it often enough. When it comes to the Constitution that currently governs Canada and contains the fundamental rules according to which people are living together, it is now shameful to talk about it. Are there many other countries that are ashamed to talk about their constitution, which should be a fundamental principle and something accepted by the citizens as a whole? There is something wrong when a country is ashamed of its constitution. Why is it wrong? Let us not forget what happened during the patriation of the constitution which governs us currently. One player did not sign, and this player is Quebec.

I know a few people will say "Yes, but separatists will never sign anything". They should remember that for nine years there was a federalist government in Quebec. Even the main federalist party, the Quebec Liberal Party, does not intend to sign the Constitution as it stands today.

This does not seem to worry too many people. On the contrary, the federal government is forging ahead with administrative framework agreements, such as the one on social union, to further centralize decision making in Canada. This is along the same line. It could not care less that one of its components, which it sees as a major, beneficial, essential part of Canada, did not sign the Constitution.

Let us go back to specific examples, such as culture. If there is one thing that sets Quebecers apart, it is of course their cultural characteristics. The Government of Quebec is rightly claiming, and in practice now, the ability to represent itself internationally. The Minister of Canadian Heritage and the Prime Minister reacted hysterically to its doing so and to its promoting its unique qualities internationally.

How can these people not understand even such basic things as these? They are, however, the very people who, with meaningless resolutions, would have us believe they recognize the vaguely distinct character of Quebec.

They will not agree to our promoting even the most obvious elements of our distinctiveness. This is a cultural element.

There is also our ability to do things differently. The Government of Quebec has made decisions regarding the education system in order to give students better access to post-secondary education, saying "We must have more graduates, therefore we will lower

fees as much as possible". Our policy on tuition fees is very different from that of Canada. They are much lower.

Outside Quebec, tuition fees are very high, less than in the United States, but still a lot higher than in Quebec. Obviously, that creates a debt problem that is heightened when students have difficulty finding a job.

I understand there is a problem and a need that is greater in Canada than in Quebec. The government creates a scholarships program for students and says "We will help them, we will reward excellence. There has been this whole debate on elitism. Therefore, we will back off a bit. We will go back to the issue of financial need and help students in this way".

So, the government came up with a coast to coast program. Yet, needs are not the same everywhere. If we could have control over that money, our priority might be to provide tools that could benefit all students, because in Quebec the primary issue is not students' indebtedness, as is the case in the other provinces. For example, we might use that money to modernize the technological equipment used in our CEGEPs and universities. In this communications era, this might be a greater priority than scholarships.

However, these choices cannot be made because, with its taxation power, with its huge power to collect revenues, the federal government dictates its decisions, or uses the tax system to do so, thus setting priorities that are not necessarily the same as our own.

Because it is incapable of getting along with the Government of Quebec, the federal government does not even want to come to the negotiation table. Instead, it gave that mandate to a private foundation run by BCE's president, and told him "We are sending you \$2.5 billion. In addition, you will get two year's interest before starting to deal with issues. You will settle them by negotiating with the government".

• (1120)

There is a very big accountability problem there, but they are washing their hands of the whole thing by hiding behind a foundation. That is a problem. In the meantime, our educational system cannot define priorities as quickly as it needs to be able to do.

Quebec held a summit conference on priorities in postsecondary education. But the federal government does not see this as important. One morning, the Prime Minister had a bright idea and told the House that that was the priority because he believes that Canada has a role to play in this.

In the few minutes I have left, I want to look briefly at regional development. It is the same thing. Our RCM in Témiscamingue has

Supply

managed to develop a genuine single window approach. Higher levels of government having had difficulty reaching agreement, we created a single window with one board of directors for the federal, provincial and municipal programs.

Who barged in? The federal government. Having lost its visibility in such a structure, it made us dismantle it. Now, we are going back to two boards, two directors general and, in the long term, two different development visions. Locally, it was a success, but because the federal government had lost its visibility, it decided to make us go back to the earlier system. This is not conducive to economic development. This agency should be called Propaganda Canada, not Economic Development Canada.

The government takes the attitude that Quebecers do not know how good they have it and should be shown. But our presence in the House, and the presence of others who are not satisfied with this system, shows that there are serious problems that the members opposite have historically been unable to resolve.

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ): Madam Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the words of my colleague. I believe he is absolutely right. There are particularities to the west as there are to Quebec, but I believe the Liberal government would be well advised to announce its intentions when it is travelling in the regions, particularly in Quebec.

I have an anecdote to relate in this connection. Over Easter, a minister decided to come to the Charlevoix region, one of the loveliest regions of Quebec. Did he come to the casino, or to visit his relatives? Of course, in order to justify his travel allowance, the minister had to meet the press, or a mayor, or visit an arts centre.

He ought to have given the MP for Charlevoix a call to say "I would like to consult your area of the riding, I would like to meet with local unemployed people in order to see whether the \$27.3 million in cuts in Charlevoix are doing much harm. I would like to meet the people of Charlevoix in order to see whether they are frustrated by our unkept promises made in 1997. I would like to meet the people of Charlevoix to see what effects our transfer payments to the provinces have had on health and education".

I would have liked to have got a group of women together so that they could tell him how the President of Treasury Board is refusing to give public servants pay equity. I would have liked to have got a group of young people together to tell him how the federal government is refusing to withdraw from collective agreements the orphan clause which penalizes very young workers.

But no. When ministers travel to the regions, they do so solely to raise their profile. We have seen that the problem is the same in the west, as the Reform Party pointed out this morning. Quebec is recognized as a region. I believe that Quebec has been calling for that right for some years now. The Bloc Québécois has been doing so in the House of Commons since 1993.

Supply

There is a problem of duplication and overlap, and I would like the hon. member for Témiscamingue to give us some other examples. He has already mentioned the millennium scholarships, to demonstrate that the Government of Quebec is acknowledged by the Canadian government as a region, as a kind of board.

Mr. Pierre Brien: Madam Speaker, I do not have a lot of time left, but we could have talked, for example, about the environment of pulp and paper companies or others that have both the federal and the provincial standards. Sometimes the higher standards are federal and sometimes they are Quebec's. If a criminal offence is involved, the weight is in favour of the federal standard. Conversely, if it is a civil matter, the weight is in favour of the provincial standard. It is a total administrative mess.

However, as regards what my colleague from Charlevoix was saying recently, a well-intentioned individual working for the federal government at home with the Department of Human Resources Development said to the stakeholders "The regional office analyzes that". I knew that by "regional office" she meant Montreal. But the people in my region, when they heard "regional office" understood it was managed in Rouyn-Noranda, because that is where the regional office is.

So at one point I spoke up and said "We will clarify one thing. In Ottawa, when you say 'region', you mean Quebec entirely. If you say Abitibi—Témiscamingue, you are referring to—" I would not even use an adjective for fear of having it used against me. For us, Abitibi—Témiscamingue is our region. We would like the government to think this way.

• (1125)

What sets us apart is the number of mines we have. There were tax incentives, which still exist, but have been cut considerably by the federal government, which led to a lot of exploration. Northern Quebec still has extraordinary potential for mining exploration, but the reduction in the worth of natural resources, particularly metals, and the Bre-X crisis and other incidents, have discouraged exploration.

The fact that the federal government did not restore that program in its original form was very prejudicial to our region. When that flow-through shares program was at its peak, unemployment in the Abitibi—Témiscamingue region was at 7%. However, from the federal government's perspective, a tax measure that applies to just one region of Quebec clearly does not have enough of an impact to justify an extended program.

This is unfortunate because that initiative was specifically targeted to the needs of our region. I could list many more that do not specifically meet regional needs. It is not the economic development agencies, which often do promotional work, that identify these needs. These agencies exist primarily to sell Ottawa

to people in the regions, not to take regional issues and get the federal government to do something about them. There may be exceptions, but this is how it works in my region.

[English]

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Madam Speaker, I must say I always welcome the opportunity to talk about topics such as why those of us who represent the regions sometimes feel alienated from the central part of the country and why there are concerns in the regions of Canada. I say this today with a certain discomfort in light of the events that have surrounded us. We are in a state of war. We are in an offensive operation against a sovereign nation.

The news reports this morning are of Serb infantry troops crossing into Albania and seizing Kamenica, a village in northern Albania. There seems to be an expansion of the war. There are topics we could talk about in terms of welcoming refugees in particular those with family connections here in Canada and the use of spent plutonium on the bullets of weapons from certain countries. We could talk about a whole number of items, but today we are talking about alienation particularly from a western perspective. Therefore my comments will focus obviously on that.

There is a school of history which is called the heartland hinterland school. It is where we try to describe what goes on in our country in terms of recognizing that the heartland of Canada is mainly parts of Ontario and Quebec and the rest is a hinterland and the relationship between the heartland and the hinterland.

It is important when talking about the alienation of regions to recognize that we are talking about western Canada, British Columbia, Yukon, the north, Atlantic Canada. But there is also northern Ontario, the Gaspé and other regions which feel very alienated from the centre, meaning the central triangle in Ontario and Quebec.

There is no question there are serious problems in the regions of Canada. One of the reasons I suspect these concerns and problems go unaddressed in any serious way is the result of simple demographics. There are more MPs in the city of Toronto than in all of British Columbia. That tells a bit of the tale. When we look at representation by population the vast majority of Canadians are focused in central Canada, their representatives are from central Canada. The regions are a long way away in geographic terms. I suspect they are a longer way away psychologically also.

As a representative from western Canada, in particular British Columbia I want to toss out a challenge to my Liberal colleagues across the way. Over the years there have been shared programs between the federal and provincial governments. Recognizing that British Columbia has a little over 12% of the population of Canada, I have yet to determine a single shared program where

Supply

British Columbia gets 12% of the benefits. There is not a single one.

I would like to be contradicted. Therefore I am challenging my Liberal friends opposite to identify for me a single program over the last 20 years where British Columbians have simply received their fair share.

• (1130)

We do not want more than our fair share. We do not want an excess. If we have 12% of the population and highway funds, for example, are being divvied up, we should get 12% of the funds. What do we get? Nothing, absolutely zip.

When we look at the money the federal government collects from gasoline taxes and where it invests that money in highways, is a single cent invested in western Canada? No, not a single cent. Is it any wonder western Canadians feel somewhat alienated?

We could talk about the north, about Yukon. Yukon has been dealt devastating blows by the federal government. It lost its weather station. This is a part of the world where the weather is crucial but the weather station is gone. It is the one part of Canada where the stay in school program has been most successful, but it has been yanked out of the territory.

There have been major cuts in crucial health programs particularly for aboriginal peoples. Then there is the privatization of the airport which has a particular impact in the north. Those of us who travel and use airlines have to pay a certain fee in some airports. In Whitehorse a fee for cargo has to be paid as well. As a result of the fee that is added on in terms of this airport user fee there is a huge extra cost for bread and milk in remote communities.

I could go on and talk about the Devco fiasco in Nova Scotia, the Sable Gas disaster or the shipyards on the east and west coasts that are crying for work. The unions come forward with very complicated, complex and thoughtful programs in terms of how to develop our east and west coast shipbuilding industries and are virtually ignored by the federal government.

To someone from British Columbia one thing symbolizes the frustration we feel. It is fair to say that as we have attempted to diversify away from the resource based industries that are known to have built British Columbia, we have been developing the film industry. We now have the largest film industry in Canada. Yet when we look at the number of dollars the federal government invests in the film industry in British Columbia compared with Ontario and Quebec, it is infinitesimal.

When there is a significant effort to diversify away from the resource based economy, is there any serious help from the federal

government? The answer is no. I am not here to say that there is no help, that there is absolutely nothing, but it is pretty close to that.

The economy of that region of Canada to a large extent is based on the resource sector, on agriculture, mining, forestry and the fishery. Members should come to British Columbia and have a look at the fishery industry. A disaster is unfolding. Granted, the federal government has come up with a few dollars to help out but not very much. Whole sections of the British Columbia coast are absolutely devastated economically because of lack of support for the west coast fishery. I do not even have to talk about the east coast fishery because we know what has happened there.

We could look at agriculture, the struggling sector in all regions of Canada, and see where the federal government is taking us in terms of support. It is relatively abysmal.

Mining has been essentially abandoned. We could consider the importance of mining for the north, for British Columbia, for the northern parts of the prairies, for northern Ontario, and for the regions of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Newfoundland. It is a critical sector that has by and large been bypassed by the federal government.

I know it is not terribly romantic. The romance now is in the high tech sector, the information technology sector and so on. That is where the investments are being made. Not surprisingly those operations are by and large located in central Canada, again to the abandonment of those of us from the regions of Canada.

I want to point out that the issue of water diversion concerns us. Water diversion and the sale of freshwater are probably not huge issues in downtown Toronto or downtown Montreal, although they are probably issues with some people. For those of us who represent the regions of Canada they are major issues.

A little while ago a motion was passed in the House which called for an immediate moratorium that the government should announce on freshwater exports to the United States and northern Mexico eventually. It also called for the government to bring in policy as quickly as possible to safeguard that very crucial resource for the future.

• (1135)

We passed that motion unanimously. That should send a pretty clear signal to the government that the House of Commons, representing every part of Canada, wanted action immediately on the preservation of Canada's freshwater resources.

What did the government do the next day? It went to the United States and asked the Americans what they thought about it and what they suggested it do in terms of our freshwater. From where did that initiative arise? Who suggested that we go to the Americans and ask what they thought about exporting water,

Supply

diverting rivers into the United States, and that sort of thing? That is where we are today.

I challenge my Liberal friends across the way to identify for those of us in the opposition parties a single program where British Columbia gets its fair share, one program where British Columbia which represents 12% of the population of Canada gets 12% of the action. I see the minister from British Columbia is here. I know he will be standing in a moment or two to list those particular programs. I look forward to those comments.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would gladly yield to a Liberal colleague answering my friend's question. None rose to their feet, so I will do my best to fill in.

I know for a fact that there are no programs that give British Columbians their fair share, even though they contribute more than their fair share in terms of revenue to the federal government. The same applies to my home province of Alberta. I think that is why people in the west in particular, but in all regions of the country, find good reasons to feel alienated from the federal government and from central Canada.

My friend touched on the important issue of the government's lack of respect for democracy. We saw that in the water debate and again more recently. On many occasions in this place we have seen the Liberal government whip its majority into place to vote against a particular bill. We must remember that the Liberal Party has 101 seats of the 103 seats in Ontario, or at least most of them. There are only two provinces in the whole country in which it has majorities.

I wonder if one of the big reasons people feel alienated is that they do not see Liberal backbenchers standing up and representing points of view that are held strongly across the rest of the country. Would my friend care to comment on that and on the whole idea of the democratic institution of parliament being fundamentally broken and not working well to reflect the interests of the rest of the country?

Mr. Nelson Riis: Madam Speaker, perhaps I can use an example to respond to my hon. friend. A little while back there was a byelection in Port Moody, British Columbia. The individual elected used to be mayor of the community of Coquitlam. During the election campaign he said he would come down to that town and raise hell. He would speak up for British Columbia. He would be on the floor of the House of Commons and even speak out against the government if he had to. He said that time and time again during the campaign. People listened to him, believed him and elected him. I ask members if they have ever heard this hon. member speak in the House?

An hon. member: Lou who?

Mr. Nelson Riis: I hear somebody saying "Lou who?" To be fair, he may have spoken but the reality is he has sat in the back row

and has not said a single thing on a single issue publicly about British Columbia. That is why British Columbians feel short-changed.

The fact that the Liberals have put together this little travelling road show to go about western Canada unannounced seeking the reasons for grievances is another abuse of this institution. We have representatives from western Canada here that we know the concerns. They could easily be sought out in terms of advice. Instead of using parliament as a tool, they twist the partisan part of this place and send out a group of Liberal backbenchers and Liberal senators. If there is one thing that will alienate western Canadians it is that.

• (1140)

I know from my own riding that the Liberals sent out a certain individual. I will not name the person, but when she arrived in Kamloops I can tell the House the response she received. I can tell the House how people feel about it. They had an elected representative from British Columbia, an elected representative from Kamloops. They wondered why somebody from Ontario was being sent out there to find out their views when their representative could have been asked about them.

She goes out there regularly. I do not know who she talks to but she talks to a few folks. I know what people are saying on the street about these visits. I suspect it is the same as they are saying about the delegation that visits certain parts of western Canada in secret.

That is the reason there is a feeling of alienation. We elect people and then the government ignores the individuals concerned. We elect individuals and they are completely ignored by the government.

I say with reluctance that its arrogance will grow and grow so that in another two years from now it will be almost intolerable. The level of arrogance will be almost intolerable as we move toward the next election. It seems to be a pattern that develops in this place. That arrogance is reflected in the fact that when the government wants to know what is going on in British Columbia it sends out a group of senators and Liberal backbenchers.

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Madam Speaker, normally when I rise to debate an issue in the House I start my debate by saying that I am very proud and very pleased to stand to debate a particular issue. Unfortunately I cannot say that at this time because quite frankly I find that the motion put before us by the Reform Party is basically taking up very valuable time of the House. The motion is totally partisan and quite frankly an opportunity, I suspect, to put forward a face that is kinder and gentler for the Reform Party. Perhaps the Reform Party has too many supply days if it has to go this level to put forward important issues to the House.

Supply

I have spoken in the House on numerous issues from the hepatitis C situation that we found the Liberals ignoring to health care. I have spoken to the budget, which I was very pleased to do. I have spoken with respect to defence issues, very important issues that resonate out there in our country today and are very important to Canadians in general. I cannot put this motion in with the other issues we have debated.

As I say, I am always proud to be a representative of the constituency of Brandon—Souris in the House. I must say that speaking to this motion does not instil a lot of pride in myself. Certainly it should not instil a lot of pride in the people who put forward the motion.

Yesterday in the House a very important debate took place, a debate of great significance to Canadians, the Canadian military and our responsibility with respect to NATO. The Reform Party and the leader of the Reform Party justifiably took offence to the fact that we as members of parliament did not have the opportunity to vote and make our mark or have the ability to come forward and suggest that what the government was doing was right or wrong.

Perhaps the Reform Party would have been much better served if it had put forward that motion today and if the Reform Party leader had some conviction as to whether he wished to have that vote on the floor of the House. Then we would have been much better served than with the motion before us.

I find it a rather perverse irony that the Reform Party would come forward with a motion that actually speaks to alienation. Alienation is synonymous with the Reform Party. To bring it forward now obviously is the Jekyll and Hyde of the Reform Party. It is trying to snow Canadians at this point in time.

Let us make no mistake that Reformers have alienated the rest of Canada. We can see that on their benches. They have alienated Ontario. They have alienated Quebec. It does not take much for me to speak to that with the advertising campaign that they had in the last election, as well as comments that were made by their members just recently with respect to anti-French, Frenchified and anti-francophone.

• (1145)

The members of the Reform Party have alienated eastern Canada, Atlantic Canada. They have done it many times in suggesting that Atlantica should be an amalgam of all the Atlantic provinces. They have alienated Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland.

At any point in time if the Reform members would like to come to me, I can introduce them to my colleagues from Ontario, Quebec and Atlantic Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Newfoundland. The Reform members cannot do the same. I would love for them to introduce me to their colleagues in those other regions of

Canada that they now so passionately speak of as being alienated, not only by the Liberal government, but by other members of this parliament. They do not speak of their own alienation. Let me speak to that briefly and then I will get into the alienation the Liberal government has also allowed in this great country.

What about Atlantic Canada? A member of the Reform Party stood up recently and spoke very eloquently to the fact that there are issues in Atlantic Canada that have to be put on the floor of this House, which the Liberals and the government should be able to deal with immediately. Let me deal with some of those issues.

I quote: "The Leader of the Reform Party of Canada does not like special income assistance programs for fishermen and plant workers. He would wipe out regional development initiatives like the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and he is opposed in principle to the special bailout of Cape Breton coal mines". Not only is that an irony, it is a complete flip-flop from a comment that was made recently by a member of the Reform Party. He talked about Devco and about the Sydney mines. That quote, by the way, was made on July 25, 1996. Those are the chameleon policies of the Reform Party.

I have another quote: "The kind of fiscal shock treatment the leader of the Reform Party favours may eliminate the deficit, but would also abandon thousands of Atlantic Canadians to a cruel fate".

I find it rather ironic that they speak so eloquently on issues of Atlantic Canada on the one hand, but do not tell the truth on the other. They are saying something totally different. I would like to add another quote: "Canada should slash its universal social program and return to a bygone era when families and charities looked after the elderly, the unemployed and the poor, the Reform Party says". That was in the *Chronicle-Herald* on February 22, 1995.

It is absolutely incomprehensible that the Reform members would talk about the alienation of a region when in fact they are the ones who have alienated the majority of the regions in this country. It is the wrong thing to do.

We should be debating something of consequence here in this House, but we are not.

I would like to speak to the motion because perhaps there are some items the government would like to hear about from the Progressive Conservative Party to try to improve upon its record in western Canada. The government has alienated in its own right and its own way, as have we. I take some consequence of 1993 when the Progressive Conservative Party had alienated Canadians. Perhaps we all do it at some point in our political careers. That is why they are not necessarily long careers, but they are valuable and viable careers.

Supply

On January 7, 1999 the Prime Minister announced the creation of what he called the Prime Minister's task force on the four western provinces. I have to admit my first reaction was that it was definitely a political manoeuvre to try to get additional support in the western Canadian provinces.

I have no doubt in my little mind that is what this particular task force is all about. It is to go out and gain some public relations and some media attention. It is to say that the government is listening, that it cares not only about western Canadians but also about eastern Canadians, Atlantic Canadians and the Quebecois who are still very strong Canadians.

The task force is a bit of a make work project for little Liberal backbenchers. However, it is doing it for whatever it feels are the necessary reasons.

In fact, the chairman of the task force is a colleague of mine. He is also the chairman of the agriculture committee on which I sit. I find it rather amusing. The member who is from the Manitoba riding of Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia, and heads the task force is the very same member on the agriculture committee when we were trying to put forward some very well thought out changes to legislation, Bill C-4, which had to deal with the Canadian Wheat Board, who said that Canadian farmers want what we are putting forward and we are not prepared to make any changes.

• (1150)

That is not the way governments are to listen to the people who represent Canadians in those areas. I wish that particular individual had made some of the changes. We would not be in the position we are in now with the alienation of Canadian farmers.

Did the government consult with not only the stakeholders but also the premiers of the provinces of western Canada when it put together the AIDA program? No. It developed a program of its own design and then it went out and forced premiers to come into the program. It is the absolute wrong way to do it. Of course in doing that people are alienated and the government is learning from that.

I wish that Canadians would better recognize this country as being ten provinces and three territories. Perhaps we could all learn from our mistakes. Perhaps by working together as opposed to driving these wedges between the regions of the country we can become a much better country.

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel (Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to commend my colleague for his positive attitude. Let me give a few examples.

He acknowledged that any activity which a political party takes has a political dimension. When I go to Brandon and make an announcement which I have done, obviously it has a political

dimension. When one undertakes an initiative such as the one we are discussing this morning, out of necessity it has some political ramifications. There is no question about that.

I am particularly pleased that my colleague pointed out that if we look at the country today, indeed if we look at the world, there are some questions we could have been discussing today, debating and exchanging information on which could have benefited all Canadians. I am not sure that is going to happen.

Would my colleague agree that an initiative such as the one that has been undertaken, which he has discussed, could have some potentially positive benefits for western Canadians and western Canadian provinces? I indicated that the Government of Canada was fully integrated into western Canada. There are a lot of services which many people do not know about, but I acknowledge the fact that a couple of colleagues have identified how helpful those have been.

Let us strip away the politics. Let us strip away the other dimensions. Is there some potential benefit in having people from not only western Canada but from eastern Canada, MPs as well as senators, meet with groups to talk to them and to try to understand better than they do now what this country is all about? In this case it happens to be western Canada.

Mr. Rick Borotsik: Madam Speaker, I thank the Secretary of State for Western Economic Diversification for his question.

I would suggest that he does not make enough of those announcements in the city of Brandon. Perhaps he could expand on some of those announcements and I would be very happy to be a part of them.

I do not think there is any doubt that it is always to our benefit to listen to Canadians. The Progressive Conservative Party has a task force under way that is listening to those people who are homeless and who are dealing with poverty. We deal with that task force from coast to coast. We would not be able to learn the issues and to better deal with them if we did not listen to the people who are at the root of those issues.

I have no doubt there will be some good that comes from this particular task force. I have no doubt the task force initially was developed and designed to try to elevate the Liberals' profile in an area where their profile is very limited. Will it work for the profile? Probably not. But the members of the committee should well learn something from the people whom they listen to. The people they are talking to certainly know the areas better than the Liberal members do.

As was mentioned once before, I believe by a member from the NDP, I too have some very strong opinions on those issues. I have had the opportunity on occasion to share those opinions with members of the government. Unfortunately they do not implement

those opinions as much as they should. They would do a much better job if they did.

• (1155)

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I really would like to have a good one on one with the member. He spoke about alienation and that the Reform Party has alienated the country, which is absolutely silly. As a matter of fact if it had not been for his party and the degree to which it alienated Canadians, there would be no Reform Party. If the Progressive Conservatives had not created the vacuum, there would be no vacuum to fill. Really, they are experts in alienation.

Today we are trying to bring to parliament the concerns of people across the entire country. I would hope the member would use this occasion to enter the debate by showing us the concerns from his part of the country and from his constituency. In my riding around 60% of the people voted for me. The reason they did is because of the fact that we have promised, and this is true for candidates in our party right across the country, to represent the riding. What is it in the member's riding which causes people to feel alienated from Ottawa? That is the real question we should ask.

Mr. Rick Borotsik: Madam Speaker, needless to say, the people of my riding do not feel alienated because they have elected me to represent them in this House. They did not elect Reformers so I do speak in glowing remarks to the residents of my community who had a very reasonable decision to make and made a reasonable decision in not having Reform represent them.

Mr. Gary Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Madam Speaker, as it has just come up, why are we here today? Why are we debating this motion? We are giving the government members an opportunity to hear the concerns of Canadians from coast to coast to coast. That is what it is about, listening to their concerns.

Why do people want to be heard? What are their frustrations right now? No matter where we go, people consistently tell us over and over again that the Liberals are not doing their job. I listen to dozens of people in this country. In Ontario people are feeling alienated and frustrated and likewise in Nova Scotia. These people are coming up with the same concerns that I hear in British Columbia.

Last week I spoke with dozens and dozens of British Columbians. I asked them if they had something to say to the government what would it be. One response came up over and over again without prompting them. I told them they had an opportunity to say something to the Prime Minister, so what would they like to say? They said there was contempt for parliament and a lack of democracy. That came up in virtually every conversation.

One gentleman said to me that 38% of Canadians gave 100% of the power to one man. He said that every four years we democrati-

Supply

cally go to the polls to elect a dictator. There is no question that far too much power centres around the Prime Minister. They went on to say that there are numerous examples in parliament that the Liberal backbenchers are nothing more than sheep. They might as well send trained robots to Ottawa to do as they are told. We have heard that over and over again. It is a rubber stamp for these guys.

I spoke with Irv Koombes from Burnaby. He expressed alienation that stemmed from the government's fundamental lack of respect for members of parliament and the democratic process. He said that he feels parliament treats British Columbians more like a nuisance and at its worst its attitude borders on contempt. He went on to say how can one help but not feel alienated from a government that treats its own MPs like sheep. That came up over and over again.

There are lots of examples. Members have been kicked out of government for not voting with the government and now sit on their own as independents.

• (1200)

The most recent issue that comes to my mind, an issue respecting crime, concerns the member from Ontario who brought forward a private member's motion dealing with consecutive sentencing. To make a long story short, this private member's bill was sent to committee but the trained sheep were sent to committee to delete the entire bill. It was outrageous and a contempt of parliament. It was absolutely inexcusable. These examples happen over and over again.

Last year the member for Vancouver Quadra suggested to the Prime Minister that the government should consider funding the legal expenses for some of the protesters at the APEC trial. All he was suggesting was a fair process.

Did the Prime Minister consider that suggestion? No. What did he do? He punished the member by removing him as committee chair. At the end of the day, the government came around so the process could be fair, but because the member disagreed with the government and the Prime Minister, out came the heavy club. These are people from the Liberal member's own riding who are telling me this information. This is the level of frustration we have.

The whole country was shocked earlier this year when Justice Shaw struck down the law with respect to possession of child pornography. Seventy Liberal members, MPs and senators from across the country, including those from British Columbia, sent the Prime Minister a letter asking him to immediately bring into parliament legislation that would reinstate the law and make it stronger or use the notwithstanding clause.

The Reform Party put its motion forward to deal with this as expeditiously as possible. When this motion was put forward we

Supply

were not even aware of this letter. The letter came up after the fact. What did the government do? It again brought out the heavy club.

The Liberal members from British Columbia feel frustrated and alienated because they cannot stand up and represent their views. The government has no concern for them at all.

I personally witnessed it as a member of the fisheries committee. In my very first year in parliament our committee went out and did excellent work. When we were sometimes critical of the government, how did it respond? It fired the chairman, the member for Gander—Grand Falls, Newfoundland.

The member for Gander—Grand Falls, right now as we speak, is speaking to the fisheries committee on the seals issue. Does any member know whose time he is speaking on? He is speaking on Reform's allocated time because the government does not provide him with any. The Liberal member for Gander—Grand Falls, a member of parliament for 24 years, is at the fisheries committee speaking on the allocated time of the Reform Party of Canada. He does not have a lot to offer because the government will not provide him with anything. The government punishes him because he is not a trained sheep. This is absolutely disgraceful.

I could speak here all day on the things I have heard from British Columbians. A member from Victoria, a member who works in the minister of fisheries' riding, told me that the government considers British Columbians to be parasites; they literally suck the life out of us and give nothing back. That is what a parasite actually does. It literally sucks all the life out of something and offers nothing in return. That is how this member described the government.

According to the Liberal government, if British Columbians are making too much noise, it throws them a bone once in a while to keep them quiet and slow them down a bit. It thinks of British Columbians as nuisances.

These are the exact comments, word for word, coming from British Columbians that I have spoken to. It is an opportunity for the Liberals to listen.

The government is also aware of this. What did it do? It knows this is out there but is not dealing with it. It created a committee called the western alienation committee. That describes it in itself. When we have to create a committee called the western alienation committee what does that tell us? It tells us that there is no representation.

• (1205)

There are opportunities for the government to act for British Columbians. The federal government could push to renegotiate the softwood lumber accord with the U.S. Two out of every five jobs in British Columbia come directly or indirectly from the forestry industry. It is suffering terribly partly because of the federal

government's policy with the softwood lumber accord. No, it is not taking it to task. It is sitting on its hands and doing nothing.

I heard throughout the province that the forestry communities throughout British Columbia are devastated. Where is the government? How come it is not standing up and fighting for us? Let us be absolutely clear that when it negotiated and agreed on the quotas with the U.S. in the softwood lumber agreement, it was a Liberal member on the committee who negotiated that. Ironically, the quotas for British Columbia went down while the quotas for Ontario went up.

If I had to sum up the issues which are frustrating British Columbia, the first issue would be the contempt of parliament and the lack of accountability and democracy. That issue resonates everywhere we go. They want people to come to Ottawa to represent their views. They do not want Ottawa to tell them what they think.

The second issue is taxes, taxes, taxes and tax fairness for the family. They are outraged that the government could not support a very simple motion. It only confirmed in their minds that the government has its own agenda. It refuses to listen to the people of Canada and, more importantly, the people of British Columbia.

I spoke with a family from Surrey. This woman received an increase of \$1.24 per hour 13 months ago and not one extra dime has shown up on her pay cheque. It was all going into taxes. I hope the government is listening.

Hon. Andy Mitchell (Secretary of State (Parks), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to the hon. member's comments, particularly with respect to the alienation in British Columbia and its concern about the abuse of parliament. I thought I would point out a couple of things and then ask him a question.

Canadians have had three opportunities since the general election to speak in a byelection. We seen how much they have supported the Reform Party in that respect. Not only has it lost all three, but as recently as last night the Reform Party went down in its vote in Windsor—St. Clair. In fact, I think it got a little more than 6% of the vote. That shows how its message is resonating to Canadians.

What I found more important was the comment about the abuse of parliament. I sit here every day and look across at the hon. member who used to be the Reform Party defence critic. He had the audacity to make his own decision about an issue that his leader and the Reform Party did not like. What happened? The Reform Party leader said that he had to be sentenced to sit out of caucus and go into purgatory. That is Reform's new way of discipline.

Several members on the other side are not particularly enamoured with the united alternative initiative of their leader. My goodness, they had the audacity to say it publicly and to have a discussion on how concerned they were about it. What happened?

The whip of their party came out with the big hammer and sent out a letter stating they must cease and desist.

I wish the hon. member would explain to me how those examples are examples of the great new Reform way of not disciplining members, of not ensuring that it has to be the leader's way? Maybe the hon. member would like to explain that to me.

Mr. Gary Lunn: Madam Speaker, I will gladly explain. Our party emphatically believes that we must represent the wishes of our constituents, which we do all the time.

The member has mentioned the member for Okanagan—Coquihalla who at one point in time was the defence critic and then the justice critic. This member resigned his position as a critic on his own. I am not going to go down there. He resigned on his own and I will leave it at that.

• (1210)

Let us talk about the member for York South—Weston who took a principled stance on the GST, on a promise made by this government. Again we are talking about accountability. He was the only individual who voted against the government. It does not matter whether it is hepatitis C or child pornography. Here we had one on taxation. He voted against the government and where does he sit? He sits on this side of the House. The Liberals kicked him out of the party. They would have nothing to do with him because he voted by his conscience and by the people who sent him here.

I have been in Ottawa for two years. People ask me how I like it and what is happening here. The only thing I can tell them is that it is a disgrace to see that there is an absolute dictatorship there. It is controlled by one individual. The people out there are equally frustrated and the Liberals are sent in here like trained sheep to heckle. They will not listen and it is very unfortunate.

We need to change this institution. It is dysfunctional. Both Chambers, the Senate and this one, do not represent the views of Canadians. We need to ensure that all members of parliament have more input. That is what we are talking about. We are talking about true representation and true accountability so that the views of Canadians are actually represented here.

There is no question that there are times when we want to collectively be a force, but that should not cause people to be fired and thrown out of their party into the opposition. It is absolutely outrageous and a contempt of parliament to treat people like that.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to stand before the House today as the regional critic for Alberta, to speak on behalf of Alberta and to explain how I arrived at the questions I will be posing to the House today.

Supply

I got those questions by canvassing 26 ridings in Alberta. I have enough to fill the rest of the afternoon with what they feel has alienated them from the federal government.

First, they are insulted that a task force has to be sent to a province where there are 24 MPs who would be glad to tell the government and the Prime Minister of exactly the sorts of things that alienate the people of the province I live in and represent.

I got involved in politics because I believed the message had to come from the constituents to Ottawa and that all MPs should have the opportunity to express themselves and to be listened to.

Just last night we were here talking about Kosovo. As the foreign affairs critic, I have many points of view that I believe Canadians would like to have expressed here. Of course no one was here to listen. It was a take note debate. The motion had no substance and of course there was no vote at the end of it. That is the sort of blatant abuse that just disgusts people from the province of Alberta.

I have the list that will save the Prime Minister and the member for Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia from having to visit our province. Here are some of the things on the list that have alienated our province.

First, we feel the federal government has become too intrusive in provincial affairs. That is a claim that could come from most provinces, specifically Quebec where a whole party was formed that said it knew it could not make any changes so it was going to separate. What a terrible option. Many people in my province are saying that if the government keeps intruding the way it is, they will not put up with it forever.

The millennium scholarship is an example. The provincial education minister was not even consulted. There have been health care cuts of 40%. The federal government continually wants to blame the provinces for those cuts. On the environment, the endangered species act keeps floating around this place, again without consultation with the people who will make it happen. Farmers, grassroots people, will save endangered species. It will not be those on high in government. People are responsible and do want to have input into legislation.

• (1215)

We could go on. The flag money was mentioned many times in many ridings, the waste of money by Ottawa and of course the Kosovo situation and the vote which I have already alluded to.

The second item that was most often mentioned by the 26 ridings in Alberta was the whole tax situation. The federal government just does not get the message that taxes cost jobs. Taxes cost this country in lost productivity. The incentive to work is destroyed by high taxes. The government just does not get it.

Supply

Of course Alberta has led the way. We have the lowest taxes. We are going to an 11% flat tax in 2002. That is leadership. The federal government could learn a lot about that.

Taxes on petroleum and not on hydro has been brought forward by many petroleum producers. There are taxes on private utility companies like TransAlta while government run utility companies are tax free. That is a penalty against the free enterprise system which Alberta practises.

Then there is Kyoto and what that will mean for our province, as well as the GST promises on which the government reneged. We do not have a sales tax in our province and we do not want to have the GST either.

There is unfair taxation on families. The EI surplus is being taken as a tax. When only 38% of people can actually receive EI, the rest is just tax money. Small business after small business talked about the EI and the CPP. They said "Just be honest about what you are doing", but the federal government is not doing that at this point. It is taxing us to death.

Third, there were many mentions of patronage. The CF-18 bill is not dead yet in Alberta. We still remember that. I often have said that in Alberta there are two things to be mentioned if one wants to get elected. One is to mention the name of Mr. Trudeau and the national energy program. Immediately individuals say "I won't vote Liberal". Then one has to mention the name Mr. Mulroney and GST. That means "I can't vote PC". We have eliminated two parties right away just by saying those words. It becomes pretty easy.

There is blatant patronage everywhere. Candidates who are defeated end up on parole boards and all kinds of other boards simply because they decided that they would be a Liberal candidate. We have example after example. It makes people furious that the Liberals are using taxpayers' money to reward their friends.

The fourth is the judicial system. Albertans are concerned about victims' rights. They are concerned about the soft Liberal approach to justice. They are concerned that when a judge in B.C. said it was okay to have child pornography the government did not slam into that judicial system and say "That's wrong". That is wrong in anyone's books. They cannot understand how any government can agree with child pornography. They just do not understand how anyone who cares about anything could go along with that sort of thing. It infuriates them.

Albertans are fed up with the very fact that the Young Offenders Act is tampered with a bit, but that the real recommendations by the committee are not looked at. The judges are making the laws. The Prime Minister says that it is okay for judges to make laws, that parliament should not have any say in that area.

Albertans find fighting for criminals' rights, whether they be in Brazil or in Texas, distasteful.

The fifth is gun control. I received 13,000 letters in my riding from people who wanted to talk to me about Bill C-68. They are disgusted by it. I asked the justice minister to come to my riding. I said that I would book the Centrium, which holds approximately 10,000 people. I would pay the bill if she would come to explain to me the justification for Bill C-68. She has not said no. She has said she is very busy. But she should come. She is our Alberta justice minister. If she is so certain that the law is good, why will she not appear in front of 10,000 Albertans to justify it? Why will she not do that? What is she afraid of if the law is so good? Again I challenge her to accept the invitation, which she has now had for two months, to come to Red Deer. I will make sure the crowd is there for her.

● (1220)

I also noticed someone in an Edmonton paper reporting that they bought an \$800 dinner. It was donated by the minister. She now has decided not to give the dinner because it was someone opposed to gun control who bought it.

As far as the wheat board is concerned, let farmers have their say.

There should be Senate elections. It is a slap in the face of Albertans because we elected two senators and we want them to be appointed, not some political hacks.

Then we had the Prime Minister's comments about the UN and not being Canadian.

The message is "Wake up". Albertans are entrepreneurial. We are gaining population. We are gaining influence and we will roll over the government if it does not start listening to us.

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel (Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think an error was made by previous speakers, which I am sure was unintentional. The official name of the task force which has been referred to is the Prime Minister's caucus task force on the four western provinces.

My question is very simple. I want to ask my colleague if he personally has ever made any positive comments about the Government of Canada's contributions to western Canadians or to Alberta in particular.

I will give him a couple of examples that I think might be useful.

He may not be aware that there are 14 centres of excellence in Canada and that the University of Alberta is involved in 14 out of 14. I think the University of Calgary is involved in 12 out of 14. That is a pretty good score.

Supply

He may not know that since 1993, 1,790 schools and 72 libraries have been connected in Alberta.

He may not know that the Small Business Loans Act backed 20,957 loans, valued at \$1.4 billion, to Alberta SMEs.

He may not know that the National Research Council, through its IRAP program—and these are people in the field working with industry to try to bring ideas in order to commercialize manufacturing as quickly as possible—provided support to 838 clients for 1,319 projects worth \$26.7 million.

He may not know that the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada has invested since 1993 \$132.6 million.

He may not know that the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council has invested since 1993 over \$24 million.

He may not know as well about the \$40 million partnership that Canada has with the province of Alberta that is going very, very well.

Are these the kinds of things that the hon. member shares with his constituents, with other Albertans and with other western Canadians? Perhaps he could enlighten us.

Mr. Bob Mills: Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the hon. member for his comments, but I think he just proved the very point, the very message that Albertans are sending. We want government out of our lives. We do not want government giving this and handing out that and taxing us more and more so that it can spend our money for us. Leave the money in our pockets. We are entrepreneurial. We are creative. We can take care of it.

The 1960 socialist philosophy of “government will take care of everything” did not work anywhere. If it had the eastern bloc countries would be leading the parade in the world today. But they are not. They are collapsed and in decay because they had too damned much government.

Get the message. Get out of our hair. Let us run our province. We are proud Canadians. We want to be Canadians. The government should not tax the very incentive out of us and then hand it back through all of the programs that have been so kindly mentioned.

• (1225)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ): Mr. Speaker, time has a way of arranging things.

When the Bloc Québécois formed the official opposition, its members were making the same comments that Reformers are now making. We said the same things in 1997.

Reformers are talking about overlap, duplication and federal intrusion in provincial jurisdictions. That is what the Bloc Québécois was condemning, and continues to condemn.

The problem is that the federal government is making increasingly deeper cuts in transfer payments to the provinces, while intruding in areas of provincial jurisdiction such as health and education with the millennium scholarships. When the federal government intrudes in our jurisdictions, this adversely affects regional development.

The Bloc Québécois has been condemning such intrusions since 1993. Could it be that Rodrigue Biron influenced the Reform Party during the united alternative convention? Is the Reform Party motion the result of the convention to establish a new united alternative party?

[*English*]

Mr. Bob Mills: Mr. Speaker, certainly Quebecers and Albertans have a lot in common. The one difference is that we have decided to try to change the system from within. That is the big difference. Quebecers have decided that they cannot do that and have taken another option.

I am saying to the government that it has to start listening to regional concerns. That is the purpose of the supply motion today, to give every province an opportunity to have its grassroots views expressed and recorded, and hopefully the government will respond.

Mr. Joe McGuire (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Waterloo—Wellington.

It is indeed a pleasure to take part in the debate today and to say a few words about a topic affecting not only the regions of the country but Canadians as a whole.

The opposition motion speaks about a government alienated from the various regions of the land. My contribution to the debate will be to offer a concrete example of federal presence in every province, a positive presence that is a force for economic growth, environmental sustainability and prosperity in all parts of the country.

I am talking about the Government of Canada’s nationwide system of scientific research and technology development which represents a significant contribution to the success of Canadian agriculture. This network has a proud history of over 100 years. It has given Canada new crops and scientific advances that have transformed this nation and continue to contribute to our economic growth.

This includes Marquis wheat, canola, the Shepody potato and the new frontier of plant biotechnology, just to name a few. Marquis wheat transformed the Canadian west by giving Canadian farmers

Supply

a variety suited to the harsh winters and short growing seasons of the Canadian prairies.

The impact of canola on Canadian farmers, particularly in the west, cannot be underestimated. It has made a tremendous contribution to the prairie farm economy by providing an alternative to King wheat. Not only has it provided an alternative, but this year, for the first time ever, it has outperformed wheat, as far as grains are concerned, in western Canada. That is the first time in history that has happened.

The Shepody potato is one of 23 potato varieties developed by federal scientists. It alone accounts for 15% of Canadian potato production and is ranked number two among varieties for french fry production. This variety and this particular research is the underpinning of the economy of my province of Prince Edward Island and also contributes greatly to the economies of the provinces of New Brunswick, Manitoba and Alberta, as well as to the economies of many nations around the world to whom we sell our seed potatoes.

Canada's pioneering federal researchers have put Canada in the lead to develop new products and processes that will make Canadian agriculture more productive and environmentally suitable and sustainable.

• (1230)

These are some of the tangible benefits of federal agricultural research. The Government of Canada spends \$350 million a year to conduct this research in all regions of the country for the benefit of all Canadians from coast to coast.

Agriculture and agri-food's 18 research centres have formed the backbone of Canadian agri-food research. There is at least one research centre in every province. These centres represent a system that is both national in scope and regional in focus. These centres also collaborate with their counterparts in the industry, academia and provincial governments to form a powerful research community with links across the country. Each federal centre has a specialized research focus reflecting the industry strengths of the region in which it is located.

Federal researchers and scientists have well earned international reputations for their skill and expertise which they use to help all Canadians regardless of region.

The livestock research in Lethbridge and Lacombe is helping producers in more than just Alberta. Biotechnology research in Saskatoon is helping create jobs well beyond Saskatchewan. Food research in Quebec and Ontario is creating opportunities for growth in every region of this country.

Research efforts and resources are meeting regional needs through the matching investment initiative as well. This is a program that brings government and industry together in joint research projects.

In 1998-99 the Government of Canada and its partners in industry collaborated on over 860 projects with a combined investment of more than \$58 million. Investment through this initiative is projected to reach the level of \$70 million by the year 2000.

Federal research in agriculture also focuses efforts in the vital area of sustainability. Work done by both the research branch and the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Agency aims to improve the environmental performance of agriculture in areas such as integrated pest management, conservation tillage and animal waste treatment.

Federal research is also focusing on ways to use water and fertilizers more effectively. This means improved soil structure, better conservation of water and a reduction of so-called greenhouse gases that are behind global warming.

Federal agricultural research is helping to shape the future of agriculture. In many ways it is helping to ensure that there will be a future for agriculture. That is what makes the research done in federal research centres so important to Canadians whether they are farmers or consumers.

The agri-food industry is responsible for 9% of our gross domestic product and provides jobs for 1.8 million Canadians. These people are found in B.C., on the prairies, in central Canada, in the maritimes and in the north.

Our nationwide network of federal research centres and expertise is the foundation on which this essential industry is built.

The Government of Canada is indeed responding to the needs of Canadians in all regions. One of the ways we are doing it is through our investment in research and technology development.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the speech that was just given and I am somewhat puzzled.

In a province like Alberta the Liberals had very little support in the last election. All of these programs which the Liberals like to crow about really do not deliver that much support.

I recommend to the Liberal members that they listen to Canadians. I guess we are all guilty of this to a degree. I think it is human nature. We tend to see things, read things and interpret them based on our own experience and our own predisposition to what we believe is true. That is one of the foibles of human nature.

If the Liberal members really listened, they would find that people in western Canada, and this is probably true across the country, want fewer programs and less government interference in their lives. We want the government to give us freedom.

Supply

The government does not know how offended people in western Canada and in the prairie provinces are when there is a distant government in Ottawa with an Ontario majority. Ontarians are not subject to the rules of the wheat board act but the government imposes a wheat board on western farmers. It takes away their total freedom and forces them to sell their grain through that one agency when what they want is freedom.

• (1235)

When the government puts a referendum out with two options, neither of which is their first option and then claims that they have listened to the people, that is the stuff of which alienation is made.

I would like to hear the response of the member to that kind of thing, the programs and just not listening to the people.

Mr. Joe McGuire: Mr. Speaker, I think we will recognize that question is a very peculiar one.

The member seems to imply that we should not be spending any money in Alberta because they did not support us electorally as much as he thinks they should have. As a national government we do not do these things for the support we may garner here or there, but for what is good for the whole country as a nation from coast to coast.

If the member is suggesting we should not do anything in Alberta because we only have two or three members there, then that is a very peculiar way to think about how a national government should be running the country. We are as concerned about the problems in Alberta as we are concerned about the problems in the north or in Newfoundland or in my own province of P.E.I.

That is the way a true national government looks at things. This is why the previous speaker from the Conservative Party was saying this party represents alienation itself. They grow fat on alienation. This is why we have this topic here. They should be looking at ways where we can share and co-operate and be partners as the Fathers of Confederation envisioned it many years ago.

Mr. Ken Epp: Mr. Speaker, just as a follow up, it is not that the Reformers feed on alienation. Wrong. Just stop to think. Had the Liberals and the Conservatives before them and the Liberals before them done a decent job for Quebec, had they done a decent job for western Canada, there would be no Bloc party, there would be no Reform Party.

How could we possibly have told the people to vote for us because we are going to do for them something they were already happy with? Why would they switch their allegiance? On the other hand, if we came up with something that they are not happy with, they would most certainly stay with the party that they had been supporting and would not support a new one.

The new party is not a cause of the problem. It is a symptom of the problem. As far as I am concerned, those members are missing the point.

Mr. Joe McGuire: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that the Liberal Party of Canada has been in existence since the beginning of this country and will still be here for many more decades, long after that party is but a figment of somebody's imagination.

Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to enter the debate today on this very important topic. I want to emphasize a federal presence in one of our regions, that being the west.

Frankly, I am a little astounded at any insinuation that the federal government is alienating itself from the regions. It is really all quite silly on the part of the Reform Party but I suppose in that sense it is not surprising.

I wonder if my hon. colleague from the Reform Party who is proposing the motion has had an opportunity recently to look in the phone book. The presence of federal departments and agencies is quite astounding and remarkable. We are in all the places people would expect us to be, for example in the metropolitan centres like Winnipeg and Vancouver, but we are also as a federal government in communities like Bruno, Saskatchewan and Bonnyville, Alberta. All key federal departments have offices throughout western Canada.

It is much more than just that. Using our own department, Western Economic Diversification Canada as a primary example let me highlight how wide reaching this government's efforts are in this area.

First of all, with respect to western Canada business service network, I note that western diversification and its partners have over 100 points of service across western Canada serving urban and rural communities from Lac du Bonnet to the Queen Charlotte Islands. In that sense we are still growing and that is important to note. The headquarters are in Edmonton and there are offices, four of them actually, in Vancouver, Edmonton, Saskatoon and Winnipeg, and satellite offices in Calgary and Regina.

• (1240)

Western diversification plays a unique role in helping the western economy to grow. That is its purpose. It works closely with the people of western Canada. This includes aboriginal peoples, youth, communities and industry leaders throughout that part of Canada.

We advance the interests of the west. We advocate on behalf of businesses in the west. Our government provides integrated services to small business in that area, for example, advice on financing options, help with business planning, exporting, and

Supply

selling to government. All of these are important things and aspects to western Canadians.

We work with financial institutions to provide loans to new economy sectors. Western diversification contributes to loan loss reserves to lever small business loan capital. We also provide up to \$57 million toward a lever for a total of \$439 million in small business loan capital. This represents a leverage ratio of nearly 8:1 which is important to note.

The international trade personnel program and first jobs program match small businesses with recent graduates, all in the effort to help our young people. We provide small businesses with the cash flow to hire young people and provide young people with a first job opportunity. It is also important to note that since 1995 our government has provided over 900 jobs to young people in western Canada.

It is also important to highlight at this point the existence of four women's enterprise centres, one in each of the western provinces. There are five satellite offices. This meets the needs of women in business. It offers financing, counselling and advice. Over the course of time, 17,000 women have trained and 1,600 loans worth over \$10 million in the last four years have been made evident. This supports and shows the difference we make to the lives of western Canadians.

There are also 90-plus community future development corporations across the west. Seven are aboriginal exclusive. This program provides focal points for the delivery of western diversification services outside the major cities covering all non-metropolitan areas in western Canada. I also want to point out that between 1995 and 1998, 8,100 loans worth \$171 million and over 28,000 jobs were created as a result of this. That too underscores our commitment.

There also are four Canada business service centres, one in each of the western provinces, which provide one-stop shopping for business services. Thousands of entrepreneurs have made this their focal point of contact for business services each year. Expansion of services to rural areas are part of this with 97 regional access sites being established.

Over 1,000 volunteers are part of the western Canada business service network. This month in Jasper, Alberta western diversification is participating in the first ever pan-western conference which will bring together international and other partners in this area and volunteers. That too is important to note.

Let me turn now to the role of regional agencies in western Canada. Western diversification and its counterparts represent the interests of all regions in the west. Through regional partners they develop an in-depth understanding of the needs and requirements of their region. They deliver national and regional programs on behalf of the federal government. For example, it administers infrastructure works programs in western Canada and it partners with provinces and municipalities to upgrade transportation and local services.

We have noted over the past while \$747 million in funding with over 5,300 projects and over 35,000 jobs. They are agents of economic development and job creation. All of this says that we are flexible, responsible and accessible in this very important region of Canada.

In the process, there is a focus on client needs and local people responding to local concerns. Our government has also shown the importance of responding to communities in need, for example the Manitoba flood. Total federal funding of \$224 million in assistance was provided for flood relief and flood protection.

The response of western diversification was immediate and creative. Our government put teams of personnel on the road to search out affected small businesses and provide them with start-up money to resume their operations.

• (1245)

I would now like to talk a bit about aboriginal initiatives. As the federal government in this important region we provide integrated services to our aboriginal people. I should note that 63% of Canada's aboriginal population resides in the west. Last week our colleague, the Minister of Industry, announced a \$21 million package to improve business development opportunities for aboriginal peoples with western diversification contributing one-third of that funding.

The aboriginal business development initiative is expected to result in 900 new businesses and 2,000 new jobs, and many of them will in fact be in western Canada.

I should also point out that an aboriginal business services network was built on existing infrastructure and will provide enhanced business services to aboriginal entrepreneurs. This initiative will also see increased access to capital for aboriginal businesses.

We have over the course of time made a \$950,000 contribution to the Aboriginal Business Development Centre in Winnipeg to encourage entrepreneurship among urban aboriginal people. For example, \$5 million recently was set aside to establish the Saskatchewan Indian Federation College, the only native controlled college in Canada.

I also want to point to technology and innovation in this very important region in Canada. First of all let me say that knowledge and innovation is a revolutionizing industry. Even traditional resource industries of the west have become high tech. We are marking a new era of scientific research and technological innovation in Canada as we move into the 21st century, and much of this is in fact taking place in the west.

I want to turn for a minute to the Canada Foundation for Innovation. Through the Canada Foundation for Innovation the federal government is modernizing research infrastructure at uni-

Supply

versities and research hospitals. Two weeks ago, for example, the foundation approved a \$56 million contribution to the Canadian light source project at the University of Saskatchewan. It will become one of the largest scientific projects ever built in Canada. It will enable Canadian scientists to conduct world class research at home. It will enhance the reputation of Saskatoon and the country as a whole, I should point out. It will create an expected 500 jobs and millions of dollars in economic activity.

With respect to connecting Canadians, I want to point out that the government has made connecting Canadians one of its primary goals. The aim is to make Canada the most connected country in the year 2000. We are establishing public Internet sites in rural and remote communities across the west. We have connected 183 community access sites in Saskatchewan alone.

Finally I would point out the National Research Council and the industrial research assistance program, IRAP, need some discussion. Under the National Research Council we have \$31 million in additional investment earmarked for the next three years. An extensive network of IRAP contributors and research institutes across the west is also in place.

All these things provide an overview of what we are doing in western Canada. They are important initiatives.

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.): Madam Speaker, during his speech the member mentioned that the government was responding to the needs of aboriginal peoples in the west. The fact is that the government completely ignored an enormous amount of input that came from aboriginal peoples with regard to the Native Land Management Act, to the point now that the bill has gone to the other place, the Senate, and the Senate has to amend it.

With credit at least to the member for Vancouver Quadra, he admitted there was a problem with the bill. In fact he publicly stated that it was badly flawed, but he failed to follow through at vote time.

How does the member think his constituents feel when their MP speaks out against something and then votes the opposite way in the House? No wonder there is alienation. It is not the least bit surprising.

The member also said it was silly to say that the Liberals did not understand what was happening in the west. I have to ask him why then set up a task force. Why did the Prime Minister do that?

In addition, it seems that basically all the government can do is talk about its western economic diversification program as if it somehow answers all of the frustrations in the west. What a pathetic and pitiful example that is. I doubt that western diversification appears in the top 500 concerns of people out west.

• (1250)

Where is the discussion about criminal refugee problems? Where is the discussion about the Young Offenders Act? Where is the discussion about the lumber quota problems out there?

Let us have some real substance instead of this nonsense about a diversification fund that might help some business somewhere. The businesses in my riding and out west would rather have tax relief and get rid of the western diversification fund.

Mr. Lynn Myers: Madam Speaker, I want to reply to the question in terms of what we as a government are doing in western Canada.

We talk about the variety of issues that hon. member raised. We do so on a continuing basis. It is important to engage the Canadian people wherever they may live in this great country of ours in the kind of debate that is necessary to provide good government.

We are very proud of economic diversification and what it does for people in the west. It is a very good foundation upon which to build. Businesses, aboriginal people, young people and all kinds of western Canadians benefit as a result.

I am very proud of what our government has accomplished in this area. I will repeat what I said at the outset. I find it quite silly that members of the Reform Party, in their usual extremist views and their usual attempt to alienate people and pit people against each other, would go to this extent. It is a kind of sad reflection on them in terms of how they think, but I guess it is the reality of where they are coming from.

I am more for our government being an inclusive government, as opposed to the Reformers who exclude people, who want to break people apart and who do those kinds of things to the detriment of Canada. I do not want any part of that and most Canadians do not either.

Ms. Louise Hardy (Yukon, NDP): Madam Speaker, there has been a massive withdrawal of federal presence in the north. The privatization of Navigation Canada has meant that where food has to be flown in it is now incredibly expensive. There is a withdrawal of flood watch warnings and the weather station. The air traffic control tower will completely leave Yukon.

On top of that we now have three territories in the north with roughly equivalent populations, but Yukon gets \$200 million a year less in transfer payments than either of the other two territories.

It is a sense of almost not belonging because the federal presence has been so withdrawn from the north. I can understand the difference in the geography and wanting to compensate the other

Supply

two territories so that they have the extra money, but I cannot justify a difference of \$200 million. I would like the hon. member to comment on that.

Mr. Lynn Myers: Madam Speaker, I emphasize that the Government of Canada continues to want to provide and will continue to provide the kinds of services that are required for any of our regions no matter where they exist in Canada including, and especially in the north, Yukon and the other two territories.

It is fundamental that we as a federal government ensure that there is a federal presence to make sure that the quality of life for people, not only in the north but across this great country of ours, is sustained in a fashion that we have taken for granted over the years and is consistent with the values that we share and cherish as Canadians.

I know that the federal government will continue to do that in a manner that is meaningful for people wherever they may live.

Mr. Jim Pankiw (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the motion before the House today reads:

That this House condemns the government for alienating itself from the regions of Canada by failing to identify and address the concerns and issues of those regions, and as a symbolic first step towards taking responsibility for all of the regions of Canada, the government should rename the Liberal committee on western alienation the "Liberal Alienation Committee".

The depths to which western alienation goes are so deep that I do not really know where to begin or where to end. Let me start with the Liberal alienation committee.

I represent the constituency of Saskatoon—Humboldt in the province of Saskatchewan. The Liberal government did not even bother to appoint a single person from Saskatchewan to the Liberal alienation committee.

• (1255)

Worse than that, three of the ten members of the task force are senators. Ironically one of the biggest sources of western alienation is the unelected, unaccountable and unequal Senate. With these senators there, it makes me wonder exactly how the logistics will work. Will they fly a plane in from Mexico, pick them up with a bus and stop by the penitentiary on the way to the consultations? Exactly how will it work?

Sending senators to Saskatchewan to find out why we feel alienated is like sending Bill Clinton to consult with sexually harassed women. It does not make a lot of sense. They are the source of our alienation. They are the reason we feel resentment and we feel alienated.

The fact of the matter is that southern Ontario and southern Quebec have more members of parliament than all the rest of Canada combined. The modus operandi of those MPs is to pacify the rest of Canada with lip service. We do not have any meaningful representation either here or in the Senate. Policy after policy is

passed contrary to the wishes and the interests of western Canadians.

If the Liberal government were interested in addressing the alienation, why did the Prime Minister appoint a senator from Alberta despite the fact that Alberta had already elected the senator it wanted to be appointed? That is a slap in the face.

Then he has the audacity to strike a committee to come out there to find out why we feel alienated. What kind of leadership is that? We know there will be another Senate vacancy because a current Saskatchewan senator has been convicted of an infamous crime and his removal from the Senate is imminent.

Since there is an upcoming election in Saskatchewan why does the Prime Minister not offer Saskatchewan the opportunity to elect its senator and appoint the democratically elected person? He will not though, will he? He is the prime minister in control of the direction of the country. Why does he not reform the Senate? We have been asking for that for years.

I could use many examples, but I will just pick a couple to illustrate the point. There is the language policy of the federal government. I accessed numbers from the public accounts of Canada which showed that last year the federal government spent a quarter of a billion dollars, \$250 million, to fund the official languages program.

I find it absolutely incredible that it tries to justify this kind of expenditure while in Saskatchewan hospital waiting lists are growing, our nurses are not paid well and are on strike right now as I speak, ordinary Canadians are having trouble making ends meet, and our taxation levels are absolutely burdensome. The government does not have a problem throwing a quarter of a million dollars into a program that quite frankly alienates and irritates us.

I will give another example. There is currently an income crisis among farmers in Saskatchewan. In January, while the House was not sitting, the eight Reform members of parliament from Saskatchewan conducted an extensive series of town hall meetings throughout the entire province to hear from farmers, to hear their views. It was publicly announced and open to everybody including the agriculture minister, but where was he? He was on vacation in the sunny south.

I do not begrudge the minister taking a vacation once in a while, but did he have to do it at the exact time we were facing a crisis which falls within the purview of his responsibilities as minister of agriculture? Why was he not out there listening to the concerns of farmers? Nonetheless, I do not mind doing it. That is my job and I was pleased to be part of that process.

The eight Reform MPs from Saskatchewan put together a two page letter which outlined the concerns of farmers and suggested ways the agriculture minister could change the program to meet the needs of the farmers it was supposedly designed to help. That letter

Supply

was written on February 4 and there was no response from the agriculture minister.

• (1300)

On February 22 I sent him another letter asking for a response, and there was no response. On March 29 I urgently appealed to him. I pointed out that spring was right around the corner, that farmers were in a crunch, and that more deficiencies in the program had revealed themselves since he has made it official and the forms were now available. The program is fraught with problems and difficulties. He responded yesterday, the day before we had the debate on western alienation. Is that not ironic?

The Liberal government wants to know why we feel alienated. We are consulting the people. As an elected representative I write letters to the minister. I come before the House of Commons to explain and debate the issues, and it falls on deaf ears. He would not even respond to my letter.

I will use another example, that of the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board. All the times last year we were before the House of Commons to debate reforms to the Canadian Wheat Board which we advocate must happen, we spoke on behalf of the farmers who elected us and sent us here. The minister for the Canadian Wheat Board was not here once to hear us. He was here when he spoke at the outset of consideration of the bill and then he was gone.

We were here talking to the walls and they wonder why we feel alienated. Every day we come before the House to explain the feelings of westerners. I am a westerner; I represent westerners. They ignore us and then strike a Liberal alienation committee to find out why westerners feel alienated.

The government will not table its schedule of where the Liberal alienation committee will be. It does not want the people to know where it will be because it will get flak.

I definitely speak for the vast majority of the residents of Saskatchewan. Perhaps it is not unanimous but it is close. Firearm registration, as everybody knows, will do nothing but target law-abiding owners of firearms. They look to me for leadership and ask me to do something.

I had a motion before the House in September to repeal the legislation and replace it with legislation that targets the illegal use of firearms. The Liberals voted against it. Last month I tabled a private member's bill that targets the criminal use of firearms, the 10-20 life law which will be debated Thursday evening in the House. What did the Liberal committee do? It was deemed non-votable.

I see my time is running short. That is unfortunate because I have many examples; I am barely getting started. In closing, I did not

have an opportunity to speak to the last Liberal speaker. He mentioned the Canada Foundation for Innovation fund and the Synchrotron light source of Saskatoon. I would like him to know that when the former Liberal MP from that riding was defeated the next day she said that Saskatchewan would pay for not re-electing a Liberal MP.

Damage control went in and some Liberal strategists negated that. At a press conference last month when the decision was announced, her name and the name of another former Liberal MP from Saskatoon were mentioned. Talk about a political ploy. The Minister of Industry and the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, the only Liberal MP from Saskatchewan, were there.

If this is an arm's length fund that administers funds for basic research, which is good and which it should, what are the Liberal MPs and ministers doing there? They are making political hay out of it and westerners resent that. We do not need our votes bought. We want accountable government.

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel (Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification), Lib.): Madam Speaker, first I want to know whether my colleague believes that the decision taken by the Canadian Foundation for Innovation, an independent organization which makes decisions based upon the evaluation of peers, the very best in the field, determining whether or not something should be supported, was a good decision for Saskatoon and a good decision for Canada.

My second point concerns the Official Languages Act. I have two questions in this regard. Does my colleague realize that when he quotes figures it provides translation services for our colleagues from Quebec who want to express themselves very often in their first language.

[*Translation*]

They want to speak their first language, French.

• (1305)

[*English*]

Does he realize as well that it involves services that we require in order to speak to people who do business with Canada from other countries? It is not simply money that is tossed away. Why is it that he and the Reform Party are so irritated by the French language? What is with them?

Mr. Jim Pankiw: Madam Speaker, his first question was whether the decision of the CFI was a good decision. I assume that it must have been because I believe an independent arm's length body made the decision. Since this has been done and it is an independent arm's length decision, why do Liberal MPs have to be there to try to take the credit for it?

Supply

People in Saskatoon are not stupid. They saw right through that. It is insulting for them to have even been there. Why did they not send the officials from the CFI to make the announcement, as it should be?

On that topic I point out that basic scientific research funding is a reasonable role of government. It is something that private industry cannot do or is unwilling to do.

When government spends \$500 million to fund special interest groups, the grants and giveaways to all its millennium projects and regional development funds that it hands out all the time, that is not a legitimate role of government. That is another source of western alienation: the size of government and the waste of money. More money could be spent on good projects like the Synchrotron light source if the government did not mismanage its finances such as it does.

His second question with respect to the Official Languages Act asked whether I realized that some of the money was spent for translation purposes and doing business with other countries, et cetera. Of course I do and I think that is wonderful. We should go to whatever extent we can to accommodate members in the House whose first language is not English. That is not a problem, but does it have to cost \$250 million a year? The hon. member knows full well that only a small fraction of that money is spent on legitimate government language services.

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am not exactly the youngest member in the House. I have lived in my home province for a long time. I have never seen more of an irritant in my province, and I am sure in the other provinces, as the AIDA package that just came out.

I am keeping track of this and I will make a pronouncement right now that the agitation in the west is so great there will be more of these forms thrown in the wastepaper basket than will be returned to the government. It costs up to \$500 for those who are not computer based to get the forms filled out.

In the experience of my colleague from Saskatoon—Humboldt, are his farmers as irritated as mine? I have only had two farmers admit that they filled out the forms. I wonder what will be the result in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Jim Pankiw: Madam Speaker, I have spoken to several accountants and accounting firms to find out how many farmers are actually filling out their forms. As near as I can tell it will be about 15%, and about 20% of them will actually qualify for assistance. Only a small fraction of farmers harmed by the failure of the Liberal government to address the trade deficiencies internationally by which all farmers are harmed will actually receive any compensation.

The end result of what my hon. colleague refers to is that western alienation will increase, and calls for Senate reform and for the heads of Liberal MPs will continue to increase.

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to today's supply motion. My point is to qualify clearly that the Liberals have lost complete track of the electoral populace and that constituents have lost faith in them.

Yesterday we heard the member for Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia state that task force members met with over 60 individuals and organizations across Manitoba. I congratulate those individuals for even being able to find the elusive Liberal task force. Nobody even knows what its schedule is.

● (1310)

If the committee actually listens to western Canadians its ears will be burning. However I doubt that the Liberal caucus will learn much of substance from this task force for the Liberal disposition for not being able to face the truth will likely reign supreme.

I am certain many people from Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia are very pleased to learn that the Liberal alienation committee plans to come to their province. I know numerous people in my home province of British Columbia who would love to meet with this task force and explain the facts of life in Canadian politics to them.

I challenge them to release its schedule and ensure that all members of the public are welcome to explain why they feel abandoned, taxed to death and sick over the current state of the health care system among many other things.

For the first 31 years of my life I lived in southern Ontario. I recently spent a good deal of time particularly in southwest Ontario. In this Liberal dominated province one would think that constituents would be pleased to be a part of the government majority. Family, friends, acquaintances and even perfect strangers have been telling me about their very strong concerns about how the government operates.

I would like to offer the top 10 concerns the people of Ontario have given to me about the Liberal government. These are not my words but what they would like conveyed in the House today.

Tenth, the Liberals have little or no grassroots involvement. The concept of actually having a bottom up form of government and ensuring that the people, the voters, the electorate, the ones who sent them here, actually have a say in what is going on is unheard of in the Liberal government. The concept is lost in the House.

Supply

Ninth, the Liberals are not accountable for their actions. As often as questions are raised on issues of the day, the Liberal government refuses to be accountable for its actions. A classic case in point is the hepatitis C debacle. Clearly the Liberal government erred in only including some of the hepatitis C victims in its compensation package. It was an obvious error and many of its backbenchers felt so. Yet the Liberals refused to account for and correct their past mistakes.

Eighth, the Liberal government is arrogant. The Liberal government knows no bounds. The decision making process in the House of Commons is an insult to democracy. The Liberal government has limited debate in one form or another 50 times since it was first elected in 1993. No other government in Canada's history has reached this number so quickly. I find that absolutely appalling.

Seventh, the Liberals run roughshod with aboriginal affairs. The people of Ontario are dismayed with the callous way the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development deals with people, native and non-native alike, in Ontario.

The people of Chatham—Kent were recently outraged when the Liberal government initiated a new reserve in their area. The outrage was not aimed at the need for settlement of aboriginal claims but was aimed at the Liberals for not working with the local residents. The residents wanted to be assured that the planned reserve would be compatible with current land uses and that an environmental impact assessment was completed.

In 1995 Dudley George was shot and killed at Ipperwash. The dispute around Ipperwash Provincial Park has been ongoing for some time now, yet the Liberal government insists that it knows what is best. The people of Ontario are still waiting for answers from the government for actions taken at Ipperwash four years ago.

Sixth, the Liberals have poor ethics. In the 1993 Liberal red book the Liberals stated that they would appoint an independent ethics counsellor who would report directly to parliament.

Here we are in 1999 and guess what? The ethics commissioner has been appointed by the Prime Minister but he reports only to the Prime Minister. This in itself creates a conflict since the current debate over ethics concerns the Prime Minister's shenanigans in Shawinigan. The office of the ethics commissioner only works when it is viewed as being unbiased by all. This is not the case today.

• (1315)

Fifth, the Liberals disregard the auditor general. Only in Canada could the office and authority of the auditor general be so blatantly ignored. At this time the auditor general has not signed off on the past two budgets of this government. The accounting method for balancing the federal budget has been called into question. New

accounting methods have been invented. Other recommendations by the auditor general's office are blatantly ignored.

Although the auditor general recommended more intensive efforts of consulting with parliament be made with regards to federal-provincial equalization payments, no such efforts have ever been made.

Fourth, the Liberals are not trusted. For many people of Ontario the level of trust for the Liberal government is at an all time low. While the bank accounts of the average Canadian decreases, the finance department dips into the EI surplus in order to help balance the budget.

The conclusion drawn by Ontarians is that just prior to the next federal election being called, all sorts of election goodies are going to be carted out. The people of Ontario are not blind to this action. This sort of chicanery is obvious and will be remembered by the electorate when they have their say at the next general election.

Third, the Liberals gag their backbenchers. Pavlov would be proud with the lever of control that the Prime Minister has over the Liberal backbenchers. The Liberal backbenchers are not allowed to speak out on behalf of their own constituents. It was sad to watch as Liberal members in an obvious conflict with their conscience, were not given the opportunity to vote as their constituents would have mandated on motions such as hepatitis C, child pornography and assorted private member's bills.

The Liberal backbench is under such tight control that these Ontario members must dread returning to their ridings and answering to the concerns of their own electorate. I cannot imagine how I would feel if I could not look a constituent in the eye and tell him or her that I was able to vote on any given issue with a clear conscience.

Second, the Liberals have destroyed the health care system. The Liberals have done more to institute a two tier health care system than any other government in Canada. Since 1993 the Liberal government has reduced the Canada health and social transfer by over \$21 billion. Then the government had the audacity to put token amounts back into the CHST and ask to be thanked. One of my hon. colleagues has described this as like thanking the mugger for bus fare after he stole your wallet.

While the federal Liberals were taking money out of the CHST, the Ontario provincial government was putting money in. Between 1995 and 1998, it actually increased provincial health care spending by \$1.2 billion, more than any other province. Why did it do this? It had no other alternative in the face of the massive Liberal gutting of the health care system of this country.

These are indisputable facts and yet the Minister of Health criticizes the Harris government for reducing taxes instead of spending more on health care.

Supply

The number one reason Ontarians do not trust the Liberal government is simply because of overtaxation. No matter who I talk to or where I am in Ontario, people are concerned with the high level of taxation they have to endure.

Why is it that a family earning what should be a reasonable income can just make financial ends meet? If they live frugally they can just get by. Single income families face greater taxation than the dual income family earning the same amount. EI payroll taxes are higher than the actuary recommends. Bracket creep sucks millions of dollars out of the national economy and into the federal government's coffers. Yet the Liberals just do not get it.

As this motion states, I hope that if nothing else the Liberals will heed the call to listen, not just here but actually listen to what Ontarians and other Canadians are saying. Communication is a two way process and right now Liberals are not listening.

Ontarians and Canadians are not satisfied with the Liberal government for the Liberals have successfully alienated every part of this country.

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York North, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to ask the member opposite why his own party has been ignoring the growing western alienation that the Reform Party is facing by its grassroots supporters.

As an example, I want to draw the attention of this House to a radio broadcast that was on CBC Radio as I drove from my riding of York North to Ottawa yesterday. There were two grassroots members of the Reform Party and one member representing GUARD, a group that is very concerned about the demise of the Reform Party.

• (1320)

I cannot begin to tell members how absolutely appalled and upset these individuals were that the leadership of the Reform Party was trying to foist a united alternative on their grassroots memberships without even the slightest bit of consultation or understanding of some of the issues that westerners face.

I ask the member opposite, why is his party ignoring alienation, lacking consultation and not listening to the people in his own party whom he professes to represent?

Mr. Reed Elley: Madam Speaker, I am absolutely thrilled to be able to get up and answer that question. It is obviously apparent that the Liberals have no idea about what is going on in the Reform Party today. The reason they do not is because such an open process of democratic decision making is total foreign to them. They have no idea of this huge grassroots exercise that is going on in this country to determine the future of the Reform Party and ultimately the future of Canada.

There has never been a more transparent process of trying to bring together like-minded Canadians across the country than what is going on with the united alternative today. If the hon. member ever cared to, she could come out and be an observer at these meetings and see what is actually going on.

Rather than listening to the radio, why does the member not get out there and really see what is going on in the grassroots because that is what Reform is all about? We are proud to have that kind of dissent in our party. At the end of the day, we will go forward to make this country a better Canada.

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I kind of got a kick out of listening to the question coming from the other side. I would like the hon. member to know that he answered it quite correctly.

I am not afraid to stand in the House and say I am in disagreement with the united alternative. This does not mean I am in disagreement or at odds with my leader. It just means I am not afraid to come out in public and state my concerns because I know I will not have to sit in some far off place like the members of the Liberal Party, or ex-members of the Liberal Party, after they have talked about the government. The members in that democratic party across the way either agree with what their leader says or they shut up.

Mr. Reed Elley: Madam Speaker, this hon. colleague of mine standing up and saying what he has said is just an absolute example of what I was saying previously.

It is an open and honest debate in our party. We brought this motion to the floor of the House today because we do not believe that Canadians across the country are well served at all by the undemocratic attitudes and actions of the Liberal Party which controls the Government of Canada today.

We would not have this kind of open debate in the country today if the Liberal Party was doing the same thing as we are.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Madam Speaker, on behalf of the government and especially as Secretary of State for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, I am pleased to rise today to speak to the Reform Party motion which, as my colleague, the Secretary of State for Science, Research and Development mentioned earlier, can be interpreted in a variety of ways.

Basically I understand that this Reform Party motion is a further illustration of the attitude adopted since 1993 by opposition parties as a whole, but more particularly by that one, a negative attitude, which runs contrary to the democratic meaning of constructive opposition.

Supply

• (1325)

I respectfully submit that we and Canadians as a whole should be entitled to constructive opposition. Unfortunately, the opposition parties as a whole tend too often to play petty politics. The interests of Canadians are too important for the government to put up with such rhetoric.

Since 1993, the government and the members of the Liberal Party have worked hard to manage public money in a responsible manner and to develop our regions' economy according to the realities in our country.

This morning I went to the archives to read a speech given in 1969 by Jean Marchand, a famous politician we are proud of as Quebecers and Canadians, when what was then called the Department of Regional Economic Expansion was established. It was obvious from this speech that the government wanted every region to have equal access to economic development opportunities. It tried to take all disparities into account and be sufficiently flexible to meet the very special needs of each region.

Mr. Marchand's vision was realized. We began with a national department and, at the time, this national department was required to consult with all other federal departments in the interest of improved co-ordination. Today, we have three economic development agencies. My colleague, the Secretary of State for Science and Technology, also mentioned another structure in Ontario.

These agencies have maximum flexibility. They are there to operate in terms of the economic realities of each part of this country and, as the Secretary of State responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada, my mandate is to do what is in the best interest of Quebecers. In order to take the particular features of each region into account, the Prime Minister made sure that agencies could derive the maximum benefit from economic development policies during the latest government reorganization.

We put the three agencies under one umbrella, Industry Canada, so that the agency and its economic development policies would be adapted to what the regions were facing and so that there would be a sense of family, the broader co-operation people had in mind when the Department of Regional Economic Expansion was created, which makes it possible to derive the maximum benefit from economic development policies designed with the entire country in mind while still taking into account the realities, needs and viewpoints of each of the agencies.

Today, I am proud to say that Canada has always been seen as an international leader in the area of regional economic development. Especially under the Liberal Party of Canada, this country has been able to create an approach which has made it the envy of many OECD member countries.

In our effort to adapt to changes and to a variety of requirements, we have also had a program review, which represented a major

turning point for all of my colleagues. When we speak of re-examining the way the Canadian government is involved in various areas of jurisdiction, we are also referring to the economic development of the regions.

• (1330)

In this connection, those of us at Economic Development Canada had, if I remember correctly, some 42 or 43 programs. As a result of program review, we created one program for SMBs, initially called IDEE-PME.

We also rethought our mandate on involvement in the regions, stressing the core of economic development which, as you may have guessed, is small and medium size business.

At the same time, taking advantage of program review, we re-examined our role. That exercise brought us to the conclusion that Economic Development Canada's activities would involve multiple roles.

I am proud to say that Economic Development Canada is the main gateway for any SMB that wants to have dealings with the federal government, the Canadian government. When they want information on all of the programs available in the departments, Economic Development Canada is the main gateway.

One of the important roles of myself and my team is the responsibility to represent within the federal machinery all the various issues relating to economic development that concern Quebecers.

Another facet of our mandate, and an important one, is promoting to the entire population of Quebec the various services of the Canadian government.

I would like to mention that we set up in 1997 what we called small and medium business fairs. This is a Government of Canada event that travels to all of Canada's regions. As regards my mandate, obviously, we are talking about Quebec. These fairs travel around to inform business people and those who will be in business of changes we have made since 1993 and of the various services available.

I am proud to tell you that, in 1997-98, there were eight small and medium business fairs in Quebec, and 11,000 business people or future business people had access to these services of the Government of Canada. They had access to major seminars on ways to set up a business, how to export and new economic realities. They also had access to our services.

In 1998-99, five fairs were held and 5,345 present or upcoming business people attended and had access to this source of information. The fairs are a mine of important information. We business

Supply

people know we are living in a new era. Often ready access to information means a capital gain that makes us more competitive.

In all, our concerted intervention has enabled 16,345 people in business to understand or better understand the federal machine and, in many cases as well, I hope, find programs that suit their needs. Or perhaps they met people, experts, who could help them with certain problems.

Another equally important aspect of our role is to resolve special mandates, hence the flexibility. The flexibility we sought in 1969 continues to be reflected in the Canadian machine today.

Here are some examples of special mandates: the management of the Canada-Quebec infrastructure program, which was given to Canada Economic Development for the province of Quebec, and the strategy for the Greater Montreal, on which I will report in the near future. During the July 1996 torrential rains, initiatives were also taken to help affected regions, and a liaison office was set up.

I should also mention the implementation of an economic recovery program following the ice storm. There is also a special and specific initiative for communities affected by the groundfish crisis called the Quebec coastal fund.

• (1335)

This is an important initiative because we know that there is currently a groundfish crisis affecting certain regions of Quebec and, of course, of Atlantic Canada. As a government, we reacted quickly and very matter-of-factly to these new situations. Our goal is to help all the individuals affected, but also the communities affected, in terms of their economic development.

The specific initiative regarding the groundfish crisis includes an economic development component. The responsibility for that component was given to Canada Economic Development. We are currently talking about a fund of close to \$20 million—and I recently had an opportunity to see the situation first hand in the affected regions—that was put at the disposal of Canada Economic Development. This organization manages that fund along with its other responsibilities. From March 1996 to December 1998, investments of \$9.1 million were made in Quebec. The total investments generated in Quebec regions to help people rethink their economic safety net are of the order of \$30 million.

A total of 203 projects and 560 jobs were either created or maintained in the regions that experienced particular problems. This regional development policy is one that reflects the Canadian way of doing things and which, to some extent, is despised by opposition parties. Thanks to this policy, these regions finally got a chance to take another look at how they did things and to rebuild an

economic net so that their communities could again hold their heads up, create jobs and generally get back on track.

There are a great variety of projects, including the one in support of the Pied du Vent cheese factory in Havre-aux-Maisons in the Magdalen Islands, which received \$80,000 from the Quebec coastal fund; of fisheries such as Marinar Limitée in Rivière-aux-Renards; of Ghislain Tanguay Complexe and Chez Maxime Enr. on the Lower North Shore, and at Baie-Johan-Beetz, where we have also invested in some very special projects.

These are some of the things we are doing that show the Canadian government's flexibility.

I could also mention some of the results. Earlier, I mentioned the Canada-Quebec infrastructure program run by Economic Development Canada. This program has had amazing success across the country and which has also shown that when we work as partners, when the parties and the various levels of government set aside their purely political interests and look at what is best for the public, together we can accomplish quite extraordinary things.

We funded 3,250 projects under the Canada-Quebec infrastructure program. The Canadian government contributed \$633 million, and \$2.7 billion in investments were generated. An estimated 35,646 jobs were created or maintained through this partnership. That is our role.

There is also the programming of Economic Development Canada, which we have tailored to the new economic realities. The IDEA-SME program enables us to intervene within the limitations of our jurisdiction and our expertise and to provide to all regions of Quebec an attractive partnership with the federal government.

IDEA-SME is an intervention in the areas of innovation, design, research and development. It encourages entrepreneurship in all regions of Quebec and of course helps them develop export markets.

The second program we created a little over a year ago is the Regional Strategic Initiatives Program. Its purpose is, if I may put it that way, to push to the limits—although there will perhaps never be any limit—the government's desire to work in partnership with all regions and to ensure the structuring of programs which truly correspond to the realities and needs of the local people.

• (1340)

Thus the Regional Strategic Initiatives Program enables us in each region of Quebec to structure an intervention which did not originate in my office but rather is prepared in a partnership with the stakeholders of economic development in each region. Its results truly speak for themselves.

Where the east of Quebec is concerned, we have announced a Regional Strategic Initiative called Technopol Maritimes. And in the greater Quebec City region, there is another RSI aimed at developing a techno-region with an international outreach. In Chaudière-Appalaches there is RSI-Amiante.

Through these specific initiatives, we have so far allocated \$72.4 million to the regions of Quebec.

Today, when we talk about economic development, we refer to initiatives that involve public moneys, but it is important to realize that, in the context of globalization and the new means of communication, the role that governments must play has changed completely.

When we talk about regional economic development, we must think in terms of partnerships, of the networks that we can provide to a region, and also at the international level. We must include the expertise, experience and economic development tools such as, for example, Industry Canada's Strategis web site, which is the largest commercial site in Canada, if not in North America.

With regard to partnerships, we have also created special links with the community futures development corporations in Quebec. These 54 corporations do a remarkable job and I believe they will play an increasingly important role within the great Canadian family, in terms of delivering services. Community futures development corporations have existed for 20 years in that format or in another and they currently provide good expertise that complements the input provided by the Canada Economic Development.

When governments want to work together, when we recognize that the concept of economic development has evolved over the last decade to encompass expertise, partnership and networking, when we recognize this together, I think there is an opportunity for all those who want to help do something about economic development.

This government's strategy is working and respects the legitimate aspirations of the regions, and under no circumstances will members on this side of the House sit back while the opposition parties trivialize the very important things we have done for all regions of Quebec and of Canada.

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ): Madam Speaker, the Secretary of State for economic development for the regions of Quebec criticized at the start of his speech the so called petty politics of the opposition parties. I would ask him to talk about the grand policies he intends to follow in partnership with the regions, by responding to three questions.

Can he assure us that he does not manage his portfolio according to partisan criteria? Is the money provided in Quebec ridings, apart from for the ice storm and catastrophes provided fairly as was the

Supply

case with the infrastructure program, because the Government of Quebec at the time had a say in it, as did the municipalities, naturally?

I would also ask him why, since he wants to work in partnership with the regions—he has said nothing of the Government of Quebec—he does not consider the strategic plans of the regional development councils in Quebec, in providing the money?

• (1345)

Why does he not allow to sit on the CFDCs the regional organizations funded by his department, someone from the regional development council, an existing structure, whose representatives he has up to now refused to consider?

Hon. Martin Cauchon: Madam Speaker, I am most happy that the member for Lévis asked this question. The only thing that saddens me is that I have little time to answer it. I could speak on the issue quite easily.

As regards petty politics and since my colleague has raised the issue, I must admit the idea crossed my mind, more specifically in reference to members of the Bloc. Why? Because some two or three weeks ago, I had the opportunity to deliver the main speech during a small and medium-size business fair. Presentations were followed by a period of questions from participants. Common sense commands us to give the floor, not for a political debate but to give participating entrepreneurs a chance to put questions to their elected representatives and to those up front who have expertise and some knowledge to offer.

At the fair I mentioned I was amazed to see that a representative of the Bloc held the floor during the whole question period—which was short—in order to denigrate the Canadian government whose goal was to inform the population about services it can offer.

This is rather a peculiar way of doing things. I want to assure Canadians that this is not the way Liberal members do things. We defend the interests of Canadians.

[*English*]

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the hon. member opposite talked about the role and flexibility of his government.

Being the former critic for CIDA, the Canadian International Development Agency, I discovered that 90% of CIDA money goes to two provinces, leaving only 10% for eight provinces and three territories.

With respect to immigration settlement dollars, British Columbia receives approximately \$980 per immigrant, whereas Quebec receives approximately \$3,333 per immigrant.

Supply

There is an unequal distribution of senators in the Senate, which is not very efficient as we know.

With respect to trade issues, the government is sitting on its hands, doing nothing about the Pacific salmon issue, the softwood lumber issue or agriculture. These issues affect my province of British Columbia.

The government has closed CFB Chilliwack, leaving British Columbia without emergency preparedness.

All of these issues indicate that this government is playing cheap politics with my province and other provinces, and the people are suffering.

Why does it not sink into Liberal heads that all provinces are equal? Why is there discrimination?

Hon. Martin Cauchon: Madam Speaker, that is a subject on which I could talk for hours.

When this motion was tabled this morning I realized that members of the Reform Party have a bad understanding of what economic development is all about. That is why I have been explaining it for the past 20 minutes. Following the question of the Reform member, I realized that they do not only have a huge misunderstanding of economic development, they also have a huge misunderstanding about what a federation is.

We are working together to help Canadians across the country. Of course when we talk about a federation, some parts of Canada they will get more for specific portfolios. Certain parts of Canada they will get more for immigration, for instance. Central Canada may get more in terms of economic development.

• (1350)

The beauty of a federation is that at the end of the day, when one looks at the federation as a whole, one makes sure there is a good balance of priorities and needs for the whole country, in all of its regions.

I am proud to stand in the House to say that our federation is a beautiful federation. It is probably the best in the world. We have the equalization system, which is there to help the population, the provinces and the municipalities.

I thank the hon. member for the question, but it is a pity to see such a lack of understanding.

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I know what the minister's answer is to economic development. He mentioned it in his speech. He said it was intervention based on taxpayer dollars.

The Liberal government's idea is to take taxpayer dollars and redistribute them in an unequal way, as my hon. colleague from Surrey just mentioned.

I want to ask the minister a specific question. He talked about having an open attitude in his speech. The Liberal task force will be going to the west, and perhaps to Atlantic Canada and Quebec later on because they are lacking seats there too. This question was asked earlier of his colleague, the minister responsible for western economic diversification. If this government has an open attitude, why does it have closed meetings? If it is going to find out what people want to hear about and why they are feeling alienated in these regions, why does this government, with an open attitude, have closed meetings instead of open public meetings to have real input from people and not just selected groups of people for manufactured consent? Why does it not have open public meetings?

Hon. Martin Cauchon: Madam Speaker, the media were at the meeting to which they referred.

We are obviously interested in proceeding with western economic diversification on an equal basis, and we all know that.

There is something that is annoying. The hon. member of the Reform Party spoke in terms of public money being invested in the economic development of a region, but it is a whole vision.

I mentioned in my 20 minute speech that we are proceeding in terms of repayable contributions, but today economic development is more than that. It is expertise. It is net worth. It is making sure that our industries in the regions across Canada have access to export markets.

There is a whole vision and that is why I am glad the Liberal Party is sitting on this side of the House.

Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to take part in the debate today on the alienation of most of this country or, better put, how Canadians perceive Ottawa.

The Prime Minister's task force was to seek out information from Manitobans on the future of Manitoba. Manitobans know about their future and they also have a vision for their future. What we want from this government and all federal governments is more transparency and accountability.

Manitobans speak daily to their members of parliament. Hopefully their members of parliament echo their concerns in the House. Does the government listen to the concerns that are raised in the House?

Let me do a quick review of some of the concerns that are raised by Manitobans: Bill C-68, the wheat board monopoly, unfair justice appointments, the use of federal spending powers to interfere in areas of provincial jurisdiction, the giveaway of our rail assets to CNR, the rail abandonment issue, little return of \$5 billion in fuel tax paid by consumers, waste and mismanagement of Indian affairs, and repayment of the flood compensation given to Manito-

bans. Most of these issues have been debated in the House over the course of the last two years. If only the government would listen.

Here is what the municipal leaders of Manitoba are saying about regional alienation and how their constituents perceive Ottawa.

• (1355)

Mayor Bill Schneider of the village of Benito said:

They don't worry one way or another. We are too far away. The people of Benito don't have too much say. The power is eastern based. The reality is that the population is in the east. They have the votes, which means that they have the seats.

Mayor Lorne Boguski of the town of Roblin said:

I think the further away you are from Ottawa, the less input one has. The decisions are made without the interests of the people from that region. The solution to reducing alienation would be to have more members of parliament interacting with the municipal leaders on a regular basis, from all parties. This would develop rapport. One would feel that they were becoming part of the total team, rather than feeling isolated as we are today from Ottawa.

I am also dissatisfied that the Minister of Natural Resources, a westerner, is not echoing the needs of farmers.

Mayor Michael Spence of the town of Churchill said:

I applaud the Minister of Foreign Affairs' intervention and assistance in privatizing the rail line in the port of Churchill. This gives Churchill the opportunity to look after its own future. Ottawa is too far away. Currently Churchill has embarked on a tripartite partnership with the Winnipeg Airport Authority and Omnitrac to develop future business for the rail line, the airport and the port of Churchill.

The federal government, when it comes to airports, lacks vision for the future. It can only think of saving money for the present. It bewilders me that the port is not utilized to its potential. The Canadian Wheat Board must ship more grain through the port of Churchill instead of east-west. We are up against the big business of east and west coast terminals.

Reeve George Richardson of the rural municipality of Dauphin said:

They don't know that we exist. It has always been, being in the hinterland, that we are the resource base for the east. That is the real attitude of the rural municipality of Dauphin. The east has had all the power and still does today. The only way to resolve this is to get rid of the Senate as it operates today or make it equal.

Take a look at the present farm aid program and you will see why we feel alienated.

Mayor Wally Yanchycki of the village of Erickson said:

We don't get our fair share. When I fill out my income tax, I know where our money is going: right into the big pockets of Ottawa. I don't think we get our fair share on transfer payments. Being far away doesn't help the feeling that we are alienated from Ottawa. We feel that Ontario and Quebec get preferential treatment over everyone else in this country.

The Speaker: It is almost 2 p.m. and I want to leave the member with enough time to get into the body of his debate. We will proceed with Statements by Members and the hon. member for Dauphin—Swan River will have the floor after question period.

S. O. 31

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

WINDSOR—ST. CLAIR

Mr. Murray Calder (Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, recently Statistics Canada announced that the unemployment rate across Canada has fallen from 8% to 7.8%, its lowest rate in eight years. Canadians are happy about this trend.

The results of yesterday's Windsor—St. Clair byelection revealed that support for both the Conservative and the Reform Party has fallen to just over 6%. That is a drop for both parties. Canadians are also happy about this trend.

Apparently the fine voters of Windsor are less than impressed with newly recycled Conservative Party. They are even less impressed with the united alternative, since they demoted Reform to fourth in yesterday's byelection.

I predict that we will continue to see steady decreases in both unemployment and the political fortunes of both the Reform and Conservative parties.

* * *

CANADIAN SIKH COMMUNITY

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Surrey Central has the largest concentration of Sikhs in the world outside India.

On this day 300 years ago the 10th Guru Sri Guru Gobind Singh Ji created Khalsa. He gave Sikhs a name, a visible identity, a code of conduct and discipline based on equality, love, justice, peace, courage, hard work, honesty, community service and universality. These values are important to all human kind and as a community Sikhs have easily fit into Canadian society. In the last 100 years the Canadian Sikh community has made a significant contribution to the social, cultural and economic prosperity of our great country.

Sikhs around the world are celebrating the tri-centenary of the creation of Khalsa and Vaisakhi. I invite all members of the House to join me in congratulating Sikhs and wishing them great success.

* * *

• (1400)

ROYAL CANADIAN AIR FORCE

Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Royal Canadian Air Force was officially established 75 years ago on April 1, 1924.

In the second world war, Canadian pilots flew with dedication and heroism beside our allies to establish peace. Canadian aviators

S. O. 31

flew in the Korean War and served in Europe throughout the cold war. In 1991 our pilots tasted battle again, flying a variety of missions during the gulf war.

At home the air force conducts a number of missions, including search and rescue, med-evac operations and fire evacuations.

Abroad, air crews have provided support to peacekeeping missions in the Congo and Kashmir. Canadian pilots have brought critical supplies to the displaced and dispossessed after natural disasters. In Rwanda, for a time, we alone provided airlift. We were one of the nations providing the humanitarian air bridge to besieged Sarajevo.

At this very moment, Canadian aviators are flying in the Balkans with 12 CF-18s, two Hercules and personnel aboard NATO AWACS.

The air force motto is as relevant today as it was 75 years ago, "Through adversity to the stars".

* * *

ERINOAK

Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in 1971 a group of parents and community-minded individuals in Mississauga established the Credit Valley Association for Handicapped Children.

Their goal was to recognize the special needs of individuals with physical disabilities, to help them be the best that they can be.

In May 1979 they opened the new Credit Valley Treatment Centre for Children, which they had raised funds to build. Today that centre is called Erinoak. With a staff of over 100, services have been extended to schools and homes. They have made a profound difference in many people's lives.

On March 25, Erinoak honoured its volunteers and supporters at a donor recognition evening.

I have seen first-hand the wonderful work this centre does. I salute the more than 200 dedicated volunteers of Erinoak and I thank them for their enormous contribution to our community in Mississauga.

* * *

YOM HASHOAH

Ms. Elinor Caplan (Thornhill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Yom Hashoah, Holocaust Remembrance Day. Just over 50 years ago atrocities were committed against men, women and children because of their race and culture.

A few short minutes ago I stood before you to honour Holocaust survivors. I also did that when they were here in the House several months ago.

The Holocaust was an act that Canadians and people around the world must never forget. I feel privileged to serve in a government where my leader, the Prime Minister of Canada, was our first prime minister to visit a Nazi death camp, accompanied by Mordechai Ronen, a survivor.

Particularly at this time of the bombings in Kosovo and given the current state of world events, I would like to remind all Canadians of the following words of wisdom "Never forgotten, never again".

* * *

CODE OF ETHICS

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has continually defended questionable actions of various members of his cabinet by saying that the ethics counsellor, Harold Wilson, judged that they were okay since they fall within the code of ethics.

Unfortunately, the Prime Minister steadfastly refuses to disclose what the rules of this much vaunted code of ethics really are.

One of the many Liberal red book promises not kept by this government was to appoint an ethics counsellor who would report directly to Parliament; that is a counsellor to oversee the actions of the ministers.

I urge the Prime Minister to at least make good on this one promise and, at a minimum, to reveal to the House and the Canadian people his highly secretive ministers' code of ethics.

* * *

TAIPEI ECONOMIC AND CULTURE OFFICE

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week representatives of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office visited Oxford county.

Along with county Warden Mark Harrison, Woodstock Mayor John Geoghagen and Zorra township Mayor James Mutterer, we toured the county with our Taiwanese visitors. We visited a hydroponic tobacco greenhouse in Norwich township and a working dairy farm in Zorra township.

The day included a visit to Embro where we were able to visit the sites associated with Reverend George Lesley Mackay. Reverend Mackay was born in Embro and went to Taipei as a missionary in 1871. He set up Oxford College in Tamsui in 1882 with money donated by Oxford county citizens. The college and a large hospital founded by Reverend Mackay continue to serve the people of Tamsui.

It is my hope that this visit will lead to future beneficial exchanges between Oxford and the Tamsui region of Taiwan.

S. O. 31

[Translation]

JACQUES PARIZEAU

Mr. Denis Coderre (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the new Bloc Québécois researcher, Jacques Parizeau, is travelling around Quebec saying loud and clear to all those who will listen that he could not care less about the brain drain in Quebec. “Leave”, he told them frankly last weekend.

● (1405)

To those who fear Quebec’s separation from the rest of Canada, he said, I repeat, “Leave”. A brilliant remark, when Quebec is doing everything in its power to keep the young people it educates at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Brilliant too, when the young people would like to stay and do the job they were trained for. They are looking for an appropriate environment to show Quebecers that there is still a way to contribute to improving the quality of life in Quebec and Canada.

The new Bloc Québécois researcher is clearly totally irresponsible. The Bloc should terminate his contract immediately.

* * *

[English]

NUNAVUT

Mrs. Nancy Karetak-Lindell (Nunavut, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1999 the long-awaited ceremonies took place for the new Nunavut territory and in Iqaluit the Nunavut flag, the coat of arms and the legislature mace were revealed to a worldwide audience.

I would like to congratulate and thank all those who participated in the design and creation process of these items. Elders were consulted by the artists with the result that Inuit culture was incorporated into the design.

The Inuit culture was also very evident in the first sitting of the legislative assembly. The Inuktitut language was used in all aspects of the celebrations and was a welcome change.

The evening gala revealed the tremendous musical and acting talent of the north. Overall, the show was fabulous.

Thank you, Canada, for celebrating with us.

* * *

[Translation]

THE FRANCOPHONIE

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, in Saint-Hyacinthe, the world francophone community experienced an unparalleled and unique moment. Over

2,000 young francophones from some 40 countries and every continent around the world met to celebrate the Grande Fête de la jeunesse, de la culture et du français.

“Vivre le monde de la francophonie” was an incredible success. Just imagine bringing over 2,000 young people together in a huge event.

The exploit is primarily the handiwork of Gaston Vachon of the Saint-Hyacinthe school board, who not only set up a flawless organization to look out for the young people, but gave them the gift of an experience they will never forget.

The wrapping of this superb gift took the form of the national grand prize for the best Internet site awarded to Marie-Josée Tôth, who was in charge of the Internet site created for this event. The prize was awarded by the Association canadienne d’éducation de langue française.

I offer my heartiest congratulations to Ms. Tôth and Mr. Vachon and to the hundreds of volunteers who contributed directly or indirectly to the extraordinary success of this event.

* * *

[English]

SPECIALTY WOOD PRODUCTS

Mr. John Duncan: Mr. Speaker, thousands of letters have been sent to B.C. MPs to urge the government to strongly oppose the U.S. attempt to restrict the import of specialty wood products by reclassifying them as softwood lumber.

When lumber was freely traded, we paid duties on these very same specialty products. Now these duties are phased out because of NAFTA but lumber is no longer freely traded because of restrictions brought in by the 1996 softwood lumber quota system.

Specialty wood products are a \$3 billion industry for Canada. We need the strongest political action from our government to oppose new restrictions.

So far, the Liberals are just going through the motions and responding to U.S. measures on technical grounds alone.

We need strong political representation. When can we expect to see the government giving this issue the political priority it deserves?

* * *

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ASIA-PACIFIC

Mr. Jacques Saada (Brossard—La Prairie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State for Asia-Pacific, during his recent mission to Indonesia in October, raised the issue of human rights with President Habibie.

S. O. 31

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the secretary of state for his initiative, not only in Indonesia but in raising human rights issues wherever he goes at every forum which is open to him.

I must say that Indonesia's President Habibie was defensive about these issues. Our secretary of state refused to be intimidated by President Habibie. I understand that his October visit enabled Canada to obtain first-hand information on the situation in Indonesia with regards to human rights, the social impact—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys.

* * *

SIKHISM

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, these are very special days for Sikhs in India, in Canada and throughout the world.

Three hundred years ago the 10th Sikh Guru, Gobind Singh, restructured the Sikh community known as the Khalsa. The first baptism ceremony took place on April 13, 1669 in Andapur South, Punjab, India. It was the first day of the Festival of Vaisakhi and since then Sikhism has grown to be the fifth and youngest of the world's great religions.

• (1410)

Founded by Guru Nanak, it evolved through the 10 living gurus until Guru Gobind Singh passed the rule of the religion on to the devout followers of the religion and the Guru Granth Sahib a collection of holy scriptures of all the gurus and of other enlightened persons.

This year we celebrate the inauguration of the Khalsa and today we acknowledge the first baptism ceremony of a religion from which we all have much to learn.

* * *

WINDSOR—ST. CLAIR

Ms. Susan Whelan (Essex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the results are in. We finally have an answer to that mysterious question that has been vexing us all year: Which party on the right do Canadians like better, the Reform Party or the Conservative Party? The voters in Windsor—St. Clair gave us their answer. Neither.

Both parties received just over 6% of the vote yesterday. Even if we combined both parties, as some are suggesting, they still would not have had enough votes to get their deposits back.

Who did voters from Windsor—St. Clair elect as their federal member of Parliament yesterday? I am proud to say a hard-working, dedicated Liberal by the name of Rick Limoges.

This victory is a testament to Rick's talent and fine record as a Windsor city councillor and is also a testament to the legacy of Shaughnessy Cohen.

I congratulate Rick, his campaign team, his family and friends for this hard fought by-election victory. We look forward to working with Rick as a great addition to our Liberal team.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUEBEC BENCH

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that the Bloc Québécois pays tribute to the appointment of Juanita Westmoreland-Traoré as a judge in the criminal and family divisions of the Quebec Court.

Madame Justice Westmoreland-Traoré was awarded the Ordre national du Québec in 1991 and has been an ardent defender of minority rights. The first black woman to be appointed to the bench in Quebec, she is currently dean of the law faculty at the University of Windsor in Ontario.

The appointment of this talented jurist is a sign of the openness that characterizes our society and marks an important moment in our collective history. Cultural communities are now represented and well represented at the highest level of the Quebec judiciary.

Through her openness, tolerance and generosity, Ms. Westmoreland-Traoré is representative of the Quebec of today and the future.

We offer her our heartiest congratulations.

* * *

[*English*]

BUILDING CONTRACTS

Mr. Jim Jones (Markham, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister asks the people of Canada to trust him. He asks Canadians to believe in his claim of no inappropriate conduct in the Chateau Shawinigan affair without any corroborating evidence.

He asks Canadians to have faith in the little guy when his cabinet ministers and backbenchers do everything possible to prevent all the facts from coming out. Meanwhile, the Prime Minister refuses to use section 11 of the Auditor General Act to conduct an independent audit of the Thibault and Duhaime deals.

This afternoon the industry committee will be asked to vote on a motion I tabled to summon the manager of the Prime Minister's blind trust to appear before the committee in camera. If there are no grounds for further investigations, then surely the Liberal majority should support my motion.

Oral Questions

I urge the Prime Minister to ask his Liberal committee members to support my motion to prove that his integrity is worth more than a cup of coffee.

* * *

CONSOLIDATED GROWERS AND PROCESSORS

Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last Friday agriculture in Canada received good news. Consolidated Growers and Processors, an international company, announced plans to build the world's largest, most sophisticated industrial hemp processing plant to be located in my riding of Dauphin—Swan River. CGP, the Hemp Growers Association, the City of Dauphin, the rural municipality of Dauphin and ARDI deserve credit for putting this project together.

Canadian farmers can be proud to be at the threshold of becoming world leaders in a new global market for hemp products. Hemp is a model crop that is environmentally friendly. Its uses are many: medicine, clothing, perfume, insulation, making automobile parts and food. This is good news for Canadian agriculture.

I ask all members of the House to support this initiative as Canadian farmers prepare to take the first steps to lead the world in industrial hemp.

* * *

DAFFODIL MONTH

Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, April is daffodil month in Canada, an event formerly known as cancer month.

Annually, the Canadian Cancer Society organizes a countrywide fundraising campaign for cancer victims, sending thousands of volunteers door to door to collect donations for a very worthy cause. Last year in Ontario alone donations from generous Canadians provided more than \$25 million for cancer research.

The sad facts are that 129,200 new cases of cancer were discovered in Canada in 1998, along with 62,700 cancer related deaths. The most frequent cancers continue to be breast cancer for women and prostate cancer for men. During their lifetimes this is a real problem and research will help us combat cancer.

• (1415)

The daffodil, which the Canadian Cancer Society has chosen as a symbol, gives a sense of hope and renewed life. During the month of April I urge all Canadians to be generous and to contribute to the Canadian Cancer Society effort to combat this terrible disease. The reward is wonderful.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

KOSOVO

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in a debate that began yesterday and lasted until early this morning, all members in the House voiced their support for a Canadian role in the Balkan crisis.

We support the fight against ethnic cleansing, the diplomatic efforts, the NATO air strikes, and of course we support our Canadian Armed Forces personnel.

Why will the Prime Minister not allow us to show our support with a vote, clarifying Canada's role in an expanded activity in the Balkans?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have explained that we made an agreement with the opposition parties that there was to be a take note debate. We have had that and hon. members carried on until this morning. I was told that some would like to speak later today and I said fine. It is the best way to express our support.

I want to thank all hon. members and the leaders for their participation in the debate. It was evidence of their support.

The procedure has been established that there were to be take note debates in those circumstances. Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition asked me, if we were to send troops into a combat position, if we would have a vote. I said that if we have to face that problem, and I hope we never will, I would consider it at that time, but for the moment it is hypothetical.

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last night Canadian pilots flew their 100th sortie in the Balkan crisis. Today the Serbs occupied a town in Albania.

The possibility of NATO ground troops being used in the Balkans is not hypothetical. It was raised by the Prime Minister's own defence minister and cannot be discounted by the House.

When will the Prime Minister bring a votable motion to parliament establishing a mandate and conditions for an expanding Canadian role in the Balkans? Will it be before the decision is made, or will it only be after?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are not confronted with this problem at this time.

I want to say to the House of Commons that when if ever we are confronted, and I hope we will not be, I will try to have a debate in the House of Commons as quickly as possible.

Oral Questions

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we are not talking debate. We are talking about votes. I want to read something:

My deepest concern is that they will simply be using parliament to try to rubber-stamp or ratify decisions already taken as opposed to letting parliament be the forum in which those decisions are formulated.

Those are not my words. Those are the words of the current Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1991 when the Liberals were in opposition.

Would the Prime Minister care to tell us when he and his Minister of Foreign Affairs lost their faith in parliamentary democracy?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have had three debates so far on Kosovo, three take note debates according to the rules established and agreed upon by all opposition parties.

I am informed, for example, that in Great Britain there was a statement by the prime minister, no debate and no vote. Here we have had three debates so far.

I think that we are giving opportunity to everybody to speak. Even tonight those who want to express their views will be able to speak. That is democracy.

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we know that the Yugoslavian army crossed the border and took control of an Albanian town. It has since been driven back. This is yet another sign that this conflict is escalating.

The government clearly has a responsibility to plan for all possibilities. Last week the Minister of National Defence admitted that preparations were under way for the possibility of sending ground forces into Kosovo. Will the Minister of National Defence tell the House specifically what these preparations entail?

• (1420)

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first we do not know about the alleged incursion this morning into the Albanian border, but the matter is being looked into and we hope to have information on it soon.

With respect to the matter of ground forces, of course ground forces have always been a part of the peace implementation plan which would come after a peace agreement has been signed.

With respect to any other alternative uses or any other options, military planners always look at all options at all times. That is a normal thing to do, but as far as it has gone we have one plan and that is to continue the air campaign in Yugoslavia.

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the defence minister should take note of the British prime minister's

comments. Tony Blair today announced that Britain would be sending another 2,000 troops to the Kosovo region, and some specialized troops at that.

Mr. Blair has taken note and informed the people of Britain as well as the military of what their plans are. They are preparing so I am asking the defence minister again to tell Canadian people exactly what the minister and the government are doing in preparation for sending Canada's—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of National Defence.

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised the hon. member did not note that Prime Minister Blair did not have a vote on his decision.

We already had a discussion in the House going back to February 17 when we decided that indeed, with the support of all parties I might add, that 600 troops should be part of a peace implementation force. That continues to stand. We have not at this point in time been asked for any other additional resources.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the situation in the Balkans is evolving rapidly.

Could the Prime Minister give us a brief rundown on the humanitarian, diplomatic and military situation, particularly in light of the meeting between the American Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, and the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Igor Ivanov?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said in the House yesterday, it is very desirable that the Russians be involved in any attempt to find a solution. I hope that the meeting that took place yesterday between the American Secretary of State and the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs had positive results.

Naturally, the best solution would be a diplomatic one. As I said yesterday, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the UN ambassador are working on such a solution in New York.

I myself wrote to Russia's president. I hope that the meeting that took place between the two individuals mentioned earlier will have positive results.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Serb attack this morning on two villages in Albania is perhaps a turning point in the conflict, for it raises the probability—I repeat, the probability—of ground military action to dislodge the Serb army in Albania and Kosovo.

Will the Prime Minister admit that today's events in Albania make the likelihood of a land war, in which Canada would be called to participate, not just hypothetical but probable?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the leader of the Bloc Québécois is going a bit far.

Insofar as possible, we are hoping to avoid—and this is NATO policy as well—sending troops to Kosovo. We want President Milosevic to agree to the conditions proposed by NATO and approved by the UN secretary general so that peace can be restored in the region and the Kosovars allowed to return to their homes throughout Kosovo.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday a NATO communiqué stated that it was unacceptable for the territorial integrity of Albania and Macedonia to be threatened. The communiqué announced that NATO would react if this occurred.

I am asking the Prime Minister whether he considers the Serbian intrusion of today to be purely and simply a provocation of NATO. Is it not a response to the position taken in yesterday's statement?

• (1425)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are not exactly aware of everything that went on yesterday at the Albanian border. The Minister of Defence has just now mentioned the possibility that Serbian forces did cross the border. Apparently they turned around.

Was this strictly a mistake, or was it provocation? I am not in a position at this time to pass judgment, because I do not have sufficient information.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as a participant in all of these discussions, I am asking the Prime Minister whether this possibility of a Serbian invasion of Albania had been envisaged by the Canadian government, and how the Canadian government plans to react to what took place this morning.

Have discussions been undertaken, as we speak, in reaction to this?

[*English*]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday at the NATO ministerial meeting the matter was raised about any potential incursion across the border.

The best answer was given by Secretary General Solana when he said that any attempt by Milosevic to destabilize the frontline states along current borders would be taken with great seriousness by NATO itself, and that we would be expecting him to respond to the very clear letter of responsibility he has not to cross those borders.

The matter was addressed, the warning was issued, and we would take this very seriously and ask the Milosevic government to cease and desist any further incursions.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Yesterday the defence minister insisted that Kosovo peacekeepers be a NATO led force.

Just hours ago the Russian foreign minister dismissed that position as a non-starter. Canada's foreign affairs minister showed some flexibility yesterday when he stated "NATO will be heavily involved but it will not necessarily be exclusively NATO".

Could the Prime Minister tell us what is Canada's position: a NATO dominated force or a truly international force?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I replied to this point yesterday. The leader of the the New Democratic Party approved of what I said yesterday. I said that we hope it will involve more than NATO.

I have always spoken about the involvement of others, especially the Russians. I said that in the House and the same thing was said in Brussels by the Minister of Foreign Affairs. The position of this government is very clear, but, as I said yesterday, if we cannot have an agreement to have more than NATO we will have to go with a NATO force.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of what the government hopes; it is a question of what the government is doing about it.

It is clear that for Russia a NATO dominated force is out of the question. For France, a key NATO member, Russian involvement is absolutely essential. The Prime Minister says that Russian involvement is hoped for. Other NATO members are speaking up.

Will the Prime Minister assure the House that Canada too is speaking up in favour of a truly international force?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I spoke about it yesterday. The Minister of Foreign Affairs spoke about it yesterday. I wrote to President Yeltsin last week asking the Russians to get involved and saying that it was very important for them to get involved.

The position of the Canadian government is clear and was stated before any question was asked by the leader of the NDP.

Mr. David Price (Compton—Stanstead, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Yugoslav infantry occupied the village of Kemenica, Albania.

I have just confirmed that briefings were held in Kingston, Ontario, that offered three ground force options for Kosovo: one for a small observer force, one for a 500 to 800 person group built around an armoured squadron, and one for a much larger force of 2,000 soldiers.

Oral Questions

Will the minister confirm that there are plans in existence to deploy 2,000 soldiers to Kosovo?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the only plan in existence and the only plan that is approved is the plan that involves some 600 troops that would be part of a peacekeeping implementation force following a peace agreement.

• (1430)

Mr. David Price (Compton—Stanstead, PC): Mr. Speaker, has the minister or any other minister in the government already agreed to send Canadian ground troops to Kosovo for offensive military operations? Is this why the Prime Minister will not allow a vote in the House?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, just before the finance minister took off on his “I am not running for leadership” tour, the government released an astounding number. It pointed out that the EI surplus will hit \$26 billion by year’s end, \$1,800 per worker is what that works out to. That number is absolutely outrageous.

How much more money will the minister rip off from workers before he is satisfied?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we took office the EI premiums were at \$3.07. They were going to rise to \$3.30 in that time period. Since we have taken office they have dropped to \$2.55. That is over \$4 billion. It is the largest decrease in EI premiums in the history of employment insurance.

Regarding the trip to British Columbia, the people of British Columbia in the ridings of the members opposite were delighted to see me.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I think the finance minister just told another whopping rival. We have the tape running.

The unemployment rate is 85% higher in Canada than in the United States. We know the finance minister recently admitted that young people are leaving Canada to go to the U.S. because they are paid better wages. Certainly the minister should not be proud of that fact.

Given these facts, why is it that the minister continues to refuse to lower taxes in a significant way so that Canadians can see their standard of living improve?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we have cut taxes by \$16.5 billion over the next 36 months.

We could have cut taxes more but we did not because our priority in the last budget was health care. That was the priority of Canadians. It was not the priority of the Reform Party. Yesterday Canadians in Windsor—St. Clair told the Reform Party what they thought about its priorities.

* * *

[Translation]

KOSOVO

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, to explain his refusal to deal with the possibility of ground warfare in Kosovo and the possibility of Canadian troops participating in such operations, the Prime Minister said the whole issue was hypothetical. Now, there is every indication that it is becoming less and less hypothetical.

Would the Prime Minister agree to have a motion put before parliament today to allow for an emergency debate on the latest developments, with the intrusion into Albania this morning of Serb troops and the implications—

The Speaker: The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday’s debate is not over. It will continue this evening. If the hon. member wants to make representations, he can do so this evening. We have agreed to extend the debate this evening if there are members who want to address this issue.

Therefore, I do not see the need for a new debate, particularly since there have been no significant changes since yesterday in the conflict in Kosovo.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I think the Prime Minister just surprised his parliamentary leader, because there is no debate on Kosovo planned for this evening. If the issue is being dealt in such cavalier fashion, this is worrisome.

Our colleagues from the Reform Party would gladly agree to postpone their opposition day to hold a debate on sending ground troops into the Balkans if this is necessary, and particularly to vote on such a measure, instead of being put before a fait accompli.

Will the Prime Minister wake up and find out what is going on in the House?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at this point, as the Minister of National Defence mentioned, the strategy approved by the 19 countries is the air bombing phase in Kosovo.

Oral Questions

• (1435)

The only commitment made by Canada during the talks in Rambouillet is that we are prepared to send 600 Canadian troops to take part in the peacekeeping mission, if an agreement is reached to allow Kosovars to return to their homes in Kosovo.

This is not the time to discuss sending in troops, because this possibility is not being mentioned at any level in the discussions.

* * *

[*English*]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is bad enough that the EI overpayment will reach a whopping \$26 billion this year, but even more disturbing is the fact that half of that amount will come from Canadians who earn less than the average wage.

I ask the finance minister, does it bother him that it is low income Canadians who really bear the brunt of his EI rip-off?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously the single most important part of any government's policy is job creation.

If the hon. member will take a look, it is low income Canadians who have benefited from the fact that over 1.5 million jobs have been created since 1993, that over 500,000 jobs have been created in the course of the last year. Low income Canadians and high income Canadians are benefiting at the same time.

If the hon. member looks at the policies of the government, the policies of my colleague the Minister of Human Resources Development and the child tax benefit, those are directed to low income Canadians.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is nice to have a job. It is also nice to keep the income that one earns. The finance minister keeps taking more and more of it. It does not have to be this way. The finance minister knows very well that the chief actuary of the EI fund told him that premiums could go down by as much as a third, not the pennies that the finance minister grudgingly put back in the last budget.

Everyone but the finance minister agrees that relief in the EI overpayment is long overdue. How much longer will Canadians have to wait for EI tax fairness?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, \$4 billion to \$4.5 billion may be pennies to the Reform Party, but it happens to be real money to Canadians.

The real issue is if the Reform Party members are so concerned about low income Canadians, why did they vote against the child tax benefit? Why did they vote against the prenatal nutrition program? Why did they vote against CAPC? If they are sincere in what they are saying, why have they voted against every single legislative measure brought to this House to help low income Canadians?

* * *

[*Translation*]

KOSOVO

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this morning, Milosevic's Serb security forces crossed the Yugoslav border to continue their attacks on Albanian soil, even taking the village of Kemenica in the process.

My question is for the Prime Minister. In view of the possibility the conflict may spread into the region, does the Prime Minister not consider it essential now to raise this possibility with the UN security council?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday there was an important meeting of all the NATO ministers of foreign affairs.

We decided unequivocally to continue the air campaign against the Milosevic regime. This is the best way to fight the actions of Milosevic. I call on members to support this decision. It is vital to have the support of all Canadians and all members of this House.

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we are and remain concerned about having the UN involved in this conflict so that this international organization does not become extraneous.

There is another question and that is whether specific security measures will be taken to protect the Kosovar refugee camps on Albanian soil in the light of last night's events.

[*English*]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we also are very engaged in having the United Nations play a responsible role. That is the reason just a week ago I was at the United Nations to meet with the secretary general. It is why we had G-8 meetings this week to discuss with the Russians how we might establish some joint initiatives at the United Nations. Those talks are ongoing.

As for the second part of the question, NATO troops are in both Macedonia and Albania for the very clear reason to help secure the position of refugees in those countries.

Oral Questions

• (1440)

BUILDING CONTRACTS

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I see that the Prime Minister is exploring other job opportunities. He has taken to writing fiction for the *National Post*. On Saturday I see that he wrote a public letter to the *National Post* and he said that he is an ordinary, humble MP who just happens to be helping fortunate business folks who just happen to live in his riding.

If that is the case and the Prime Minister has nothing to hide, will he release all the documents surrounding his involvement with helping these incredibly lucky people who just happen to receive incredibly generous grants and loans from the government?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the letter I have written. I have given all the facts. I will ask permission to table the letter in both French and English in the House of Commons.

As a good member of parliament I will still work to help my constituents.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we have already read the letter. That is not the problem. The problem is all the documentation that surrounds the issue of the loans to these incredibly fortunate people. One had business dealings with the Prime Minister, another was a convicted embezzler and another was a three time convict.

Canadians want to know the facts. If the Prime Minister has nothing to hide, and if he did not personally benefit from these business arrangements, then why does he not table all the documentation, cancel the white-out, and just table all the documents here so we can all have a look at them?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I replied to the question. I stated the facts. I note again that the members opposite make statements in the House of Commons and are chickening out. They never repeat the words they use in the House of Commons outside because they know—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien: And the people of Windsor told them that they do not like cheap politics.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: Order. No one's courage is being questioned in the House of Commons so please stay away from words such as chickening out.

[Translation]

KOSOVO

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there is no way that the chief of the defence staff has not considered from the beginning the possibility of having to send ground troops to Kosovo. With a call from NATO possible at any time, they had to be prepared.

My question for the Prime Minister is this: Is the Canadian army ready or not to send in troops? And, if so, what role will they play?

[English]

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated before, yes, the Canadian forces are ready to send troops in support of a peacekeeping implementation plan that has been previously discussed in this House. We are preparing 600 troops at the base in Edmonton for deployment into the area.

* * *

[Translation]

CULTURAL FORUMS

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Laval West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Recently, PQ minister Louise Beaudoin wrote the Minister of Foreign Affairs about the status of the Government of Quebec in cultural and economic forums throughout the world.

What is the Government of Canada's response?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I recently wrote Ms. Beaudoin to remind her of our commitment to defend and promote the interests of all Quebecers as Canadian citizens.

That being said, we are counting on the Government of Quebec to join our Canadian delegations, without departing from the rule whereby a sovereign country has only one representative.

* * *

[English]

BUILDING CONTRACTS

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, issues of public ethics are not settled behind closed doors, or by manipulating which facts are released to the public, or for that matter which facts are tabled in this place.

When a money losing hotel venture in the Prime Minister's riding receives numerous grants from the federal government,

Oral Questions

Canadians have a right to know all of the facts. We ask again, when will the Prime Minister release all of the documents without the gallons of white-out? When will he table them in this place?

• (1445)

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, only the Reform sees problems in these particular cases.

The Prime Minister, as the member for Shawinigan and Saint-Maurice, has done what all MPs do. He was consulted, as Reform MPs are when they do their work for their ridings and when the unemployment table is high.

The provincial member of the national assembly, who happens to be a Péquiste, also supported the project. The matter is crystal clear. It has created 40 real jobs in a region of high unemployment.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has used my support of a project in my riding to defend his actions. The difference is that when I was asked for my support I had not sold a money losing business to the applicant, nor did I even know the applicant. So there is clearly no conflict of interest in my case.

I have tried to table all of the relevant documents involved in the project in my riding—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please. We will hear the question.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, I have tried to table all of the relevant documents involved in the project in my riding in this place, but the Liberals have refused me to do so.

When will the Prime Minister clear the air and table all of the relevant documents involving the projects in his riding?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the process followed in every case is always the same. It is a very transparent process which has been supported by everyone in the riding, whether at the municipal, provincial or federal level.

The Prime Minister did his job. There was no more intervention than necessary to do the job of a member of parliament where the level of unemployment is high. It has worked and it has created real jobs.

* * *

KOSOVO

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Canadians are watching with growing horror the unfolding disaster of NATO's bombing campaign in the Balkans, with innocent civilians dying on a passenger train yesterday, cross-border attacks in Albania and a growing flood of desperate refugees.

Will the minister now show leadership and join with Russia in calling for an emergency meeting of the G-8 nations, and will he call for an immediate end to NATO bombing and Milosevic atrocities and a return to UN brokered negotiations?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member had read the communique issued yesterday at the NATO meetings, we in fact had a very specific proposal to reach out to the Russians, to work with them to try to find a solution.

Just today the secretary of state of the United States met with the foreign minister of Russia to determine whether there would be grounds for a G-8 meeting. We are certainly not opposed to that, but there must be Russian acceptance of a basic fact, that there must be an international force in Kosovo to protect the refugees. Without that no agreement is worth having. We must protect those innocent people.

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, no one disagrees that we must protect the innocent civilians and the refugees in Kosovo.

The question that the minister does not seem to understand is that NATO troops who have been involved in bombing in Serbia cannot then be involved in a peacekeeping force in Kosovo.

Does the minister not understand and will he not take to the NATO council the reality that a peacekeeping force in Kosovo must be made up of non-combatant troops under UN command? Will he not take that to NATO?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I understand, which apparently the hon. member does not, is that right now there are hundreds of members of the armed forces of NATO countries who are involved in doing exactly that, protecting the life and dignity and integrity of people in Kosovo against the repressions of the Milosevic government.

• (1450)

That is the fundamental fact that we are facing. We will not go into any agreement until we can have the assurance that there will be an international force in which countries of that good intention are represented to make sure that protection is there. Otherwise we will simply have a repetition of a—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Richmond—Arthabaska.

[Translation]

Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska, PC): Mr. Speaker, a number of things confirm that the Kosovo conflict is

Oral Questions

spreading to more regions, perhaps even to other countries, which means that sending ground forces would appear to many to be increasingly necessary, if not the only solution.

Yesterday, we learned that the Yugoslav government has voted in favour of the federation joining the union of Russia and Belarus. This morning, through the media once again, we learned that the Serbian army had crossed the Albania-Kosovo border, in order to confront the Kosovo Liberation Army in three villages and put an end to the fighting between the two. Today, my colleague for Compton—Stanstead tells us that Canada has moved far further ahead than planned.

My question is for the Minister of National Defence. Does he deny that a meeting of officers was held in Kingston in order to prepare an offensive—

The Speaker: The Minister of National Defence.

[English]

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my previous response to the other hon. member of the Progressive Conservative Party, we only have one plan with respect to the deployment of Canadian troops.

With respect to the skirmishes on the border, we are still awaiting confirmation as to what took place.

Certainly the plan of NATO is to have troops, as it does now in Macedonia and as it will have in Albania, to protect the refugees.

[Translation]

Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska, PC): Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the minister call Kingston.

On a related matter, whether we like it or not, the Kosovo Liberation Army is, and will continue to be, an increasingly important player in the conflict in Kosovo and in the possible solutions to that conflict.

That is why I would like to hear the Minister of Foreign Affairs tell us what he thinks of the Kosovo Liberation Army, commonly known as the UCK. In his opinion, is it a real or potential ally for NATO against Milosevic, is it too extremist to be an ally, or is it a group of no importance which might do more harm than good?

[English]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at the NATO meetings yesterday we had the opportunity to discuss what could be a transition period once there is an agreement made.

It was very clear that we all felt that it was very important to encourage the moderate leadership among the Kosovars who can help in the redevelopment, help in the rebuilding of government and help in the re-establishment of a social society.

I want to go back to one central point. That will only happen when the Milosevic regime agrees to the principles which say that

it has to withdraw its troops, it has to quit harassing and exploiting refugees, and it must stop using armed force against its own citizens.

* * *

WESTERN ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION

Ms. Sophia Leung (Vancouver Kingsway, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for Western Economic Diversification.

Today the official opposition has accused the federal government of alienating the west. Clearly women play a major role in the development of the western economy. What is the secretary of state doing to help women entrepreneurs in western Canada?

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel (Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last Friday on behalf of the Government of Canada I had the pleasure of renewing the mandate of the Women's Enterprise Centres, one for each of the western provinces, which amounted to a \$17.5 million renewal.

Why? Because independent evaluation showed that they did exceptionally well.

In what areas? Providing advice and counselling, access to funding, education, training, networking, mentoring and partnerships with government and non-government agencies. Women have been extremely successful in business. They need to be supported—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

* * *

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Mr. Gary Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, there is a seal crisis in Atlantic Canada. The minister's top seal scientist has confirmed today that the seal population is so large that the seals are eating at least twice as many fish than our fishermen have ever caught before in the history of Atlantic Canada.

We all agree that a mass slaughter is not the answer. We believe that increasing the quotas would go a long way to solving this crisis in Atlantic Canada. As the minister is opposed to increasing these quotas, we want to know what is his solution to this crisis.

• (1455)

Mr. Wayne Easter (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister has announced the total allowable catch for this year of 275,000. He has said that he will make his decision based on sound science. That is in part what the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans was doing this morning. It was hearing witnesses so that the committee can be helpful in recommending advice to the minister in the future.

Points of Order

[Translation]

KOSOVO

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Prime Minister said that our suggestion to use Canada's voice at the UN security council to promote the idea of an international protectorate in Kosovo would be useless. However, according to the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, NATO members are giving more and more thought to this solution and are calling on the UN and Russia to help settle the crisis.

Does the Prime Minister still think that getting the UN security council involved in the establishment of an international protectorate in Kosovo would produce no results?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I did not say that the involvement of the United Nations in this issue would produce no results. At this point, there is not much the United Nations can do, because the Russians do not want to participate.

As for the policy suggested by the hon. member, it is one of numerous options that we can discuss once peace is restored and the Kosovars have gone back home.

[English]

Mr. Gordon Earle (Halifax West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the office of the Minister of National Defence confirmed my fears that NATO is using depleted uranium in Kosovo.

This radioactive blight continues to cause stillbirths and birth defects in Iraq and is thought to be partly responsible for the gulf war syndrome.

Will the government begin work immediately to convince NATO allies, especially the U.S., to cease any and all use of depleted uranium in Kosovo before we share in condemning more innocent civilians to radioactive poisoning?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday, no Canadian munitions are using depleted uranium.

There may be use by other NATO allies, including the United States, and that matter is being looked into.

Mr. Norman Doyle (St. John's East, PC): Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 2 Canada was not accepting refugees from Kosovo. On Saturday, April 3 we were accepting 5,000 refugees. Then on Friday, April 9 we were only accepting refugees with special needs. On Sunday, April 11 the minister said that she was granting ministerial permits to refugees with special needs. At the same time our ambassador was saying that what we were talking about was not temporary protection, it was immigration.

Would the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration tell us if we are talking about immigration or are we talking about treating these people as refugees?

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think it was very clear from the High Commissioner for Refugees for the United Nations that the first appeal was for temporary protection of people. The second appeal, when Mrs. Ogata spoke last Friday, was for resettlement, which is on a permanent basis.

Right now we are waiting for referrals from the High Commissioner for the resettlement of some individuals who have specific needs or for family reunification.

Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

The minister has indicated in the media and in the House that persons fleeing Kosovo with families in Canada will be welcomed. Could she share with us as to how this is to happen? My office has been trying to get assistance for two families in my riding and has been told on more than one occasion that these families have to go through the usual process of application.

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, right now we have immigration officers there trying to identify possible family reunification cases.

For the families that are in Canada, there are special forms available from my department which they can fill out. We will also send these forms to our officers there to see if it will be possible to reunite families.

* * *

PRESENCE IN THE GALLERY

The Speaker: I draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of Mr. Vladimir A. Torlopov, leader of a delegation of Speakers and Deputy Speakers of eight legislatures of Northern Russia.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

● (1500)

POINTS OF ORDER

TABLING OF DOCUMENT

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a letter that the Prime Minister referred to earlier this day during question period in the House of Commons. Pursuant to the rules of Beauchesne's I am now tabling the letter.

Supply

[Translation]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Laval West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, during oral questions, the Minister of Foreign Affairs referred to a letter he had sent to the Quebec minister, Mrs. Louise Beaudoin.

I ask that a copy of that letter be tabled in the House.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to table in both official languages my letter to the Quebec Minister of International Relations.

[English]

TABLING OF DOCUMENT

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government House leader just tabled in the House a letter from the Prime Minister.

I think there has been some misunderstanding. What my colleague was asking for in question period was not just a letter, but all relevant documents to an issue. I hope the government does not take our acceptance of the tabling of the letter as all relevant documents because it is not.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—REGIONS OF CANADA

The House resumed consideration of the motion and of the amendment.

Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, prior to question period, on the debate on the alienation of all Canadians I was quoting what municipal leaders in Manitoba were saying about regional alienation and how their constituents perceived Ottawa. I will continue.

Reeve Maxine Plesiuk of the rural municipality of Ethelbert said:

We do feel alienated from Ottawa. Look at the distance. We are or appear to be out of reach of Ottawa. What made my blood boil was when I heard that the Liberal government task force on western alienation would meet with only Liberals by invitation. We sure were not contacted by them.

● (1505)

Mayor Gary Hopper from the town of The Pas:

You're never really part of the system if you're west of the Ontario border. The provinces do the same thing. They tend to alienate communities if they're located too far from Winnipeg. Distance doesn't help feeling you're a part of something. The solution is that the federal government needs to demonstrate a willingness to work with the provinces on all fronts. The feds can surely do something about levelling the playing field so that aboriginal businesses don't have the upper hand over non-aboriginal businesses. We need more free votes in the House of Commons so that local issues can be brought to the House for debate.

Mayor Bud Oliver from the city of Selkirk:

The perception, whether true or not, is that decisions are made in the best interest of the population base of the east, and not the west. People have not forgotten the CF-18 decision made by eastern politicians.

Mayor Bill Comaskey from the city of Thompson:

Alienation by Ottawa is evident by the frustration municipalities have in dealing with the federal bureaucracies. Case in point, Ottawa has broken off negotiations with Thompson in dealing with the transfer of the regional airport. The federal system has little credibility. Look at the GST promise, the Airbus scandal, the cancelling of the helicopter deal, the cancellation of the Pearson airport deal. The federal system needs fixing.

Mayor Reg Atkinson from the city of Brandon, which was one of the stops of the task force:

My solution for the federal government on the issue of alienation is that Ottawa needs to treat all parts of the country equally. We all know that discrimination causes only conflicts within our country.

Reeve Dwayne Lawless from the rural municipality of Rosburn:

Ottawa is far removed from here. They don't listen to our concerns. Case in point, with the reorganization and cutback of the local RCMP, why is it always that the locals are at the receiving end of the cutbacks? I'll bet that the RCMP in Ottawa isn't reduced. They should be cutting at the top, not the bottom where real policing needs to take place. We've lost control over government. They do as they want. Another case in point, the gun control Bill C-68. They keep pouring good money after bad. It would be better to put that money into the pockets of farmers who are about to go broke instead of into registering long guns, which will do nothing to reduce crime. People feel alienated from big government and are not happy.

I have received numerous calls on the farm aid package. These calls were very negative. These farmers, the likes of Richard Cleland and Ken Caldwell of Rosburn and John Puchailo of Gilbert Plains, are very disillusioned about the AIDA program. The method of calculation will ensure that very few, if any, farmers will receive assistance at all.

Farmers are smart businessmen. They write off most of their earnings into future business capital needs. Farmers are frustrated with the AIDA program. Farmers are being informed that it will cost them between \$500 and \$800 to get the applications filled out.

The task force of the Prime Minister started on the wrong foot. When the task force was first announced in Manitoba in January, the chairman, the member for Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia, indicated to the Winnipeg press that the Liberal task force would not consider any recommendations for change to the Firearms Act. How ironic. On the one hand the task force was to listen to Manitobans and on the other hand the task force would not listen to any concerns about the gun control Bill C-68.

Supply

No one objects to consulting Canadians. It is the process we object to.

Governments at all levels are elected to serve all their constituents. We are all Canadians and want to be treated equally. Manitobans have said to me that Ottawa does not treat them in an equal manner. This of course creates the feeling of alienation. I believe the only solution is for Ottawa to start listening to all members of parliament in this House and to start treating all parts of this country equally irrespective of political parties. All Canadians deserve good government.

Mr. Larry McCormick (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sure I heard something wrong from my hon. colleague but I will take the opportunity of asking him a question in a moment.

• (1510)

The gentleman mentioned the Prime Minister's task force on the four western provinces of which I am proud to be a member. Last week I visited Manitoba and I returned on the same airplane as this gentleman. I have been visiting the west for 45 years and I enjoy every part of it.

I understood the hon. member said that only Liberals were invited to appear before the task force. We had the chamber of commerce and municipal representatives. For example, in Brandon, Manitoba council members were present. I understand that the mayor was out of the city. I believe most of the members were there and I can assure everyone that they were not all Liberals. After we broke the session we had some conversations with these people and they were critical of our government. It was an opportunity to listen to people and to hear their concerns.

We met with the Women's Institute representing rural Canada. We met with economic development groups. We met with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. We met with the Keystone Agriculture Producers organization of Manitoba. We met with these people and listened to them. They gave us ideas to bring back to share with our colleagues.

I ask the member, did he put on the record that the witnesses to our task force were only Liberals by invitation only?

Mr. Inky Mark: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member opposite for the question.

I actually quoted the reeve from the rural municipality of Ethelbert. She said that she had heard about the Liberal task force.

I can certainly explain the real workings of what happened with the task force. My staff in my riding in Manitoba have followed the

works of the task force since January. We called the office of the member for Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia several times to get a schedule for the meetings and information on how one would access the meetings. We received requests from constituents in terms of how to access the hearings.

Unfortunately right up to the week previous we could not get a schedule of the meetings and no one seemed to know how to access them. It certainly was one of the best kept secrets of the task force. I would have appeared before the task force just to listen to the concerns of Manitobans. That is the reality of how the task force worked in Manitoba.

It is not that we do not support public consultation; we all do it. We need to do it, but it is how this Liberal government is doing it.

Mr. Larry McCormick: Mr. Speaker, I want to mention to my hon. member colleague that these were public consultations. Members of parliament did not appear before us. We did not have any members on this side of the House or on that side of the House appear before us. It was not a political exercise.

As far as my colleague saying that he did not have access to our program and schedule, I was not in charge of that. I certainly would not want my colleague to say to Canadians that we were there only to listen to elected members. Yes, we listened to municipal people who are elected but we did not have any of the provincial people there.

It reminds me that just before the break, Tony Clement, the minister of transport for Ontario, came to one of the standing committees. The Reform Party brought the minister into the room and wanted him to appear as a witness.

Mr. Inky Mark: Mr. Speaker, the whole idea of this task force I believe was to consult the public. We cannot consult the public if we do not tell the public where we are going to be and do not give them the access.

I am not talking about asking members of parliament to go before the task force. The grassroots people are the ones. I spoke to probably 15 different mayors and Reeves. I called them on the telephone and asked each one of them what they knew about the task force. Other than a few of the big city mayors, they did not know a thing about the task force.

• (1515)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Just before we go on to the next speaker and just so people understand, as long as there is someone on their feet representing a contraperspective to the debate and not from the same party, the other party will be recognized. It is just the way debate is.

Supply

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is good to participate in the debate today and to move from western Canada which my colleague just spoke about to New Brunswick.

Mr. Howard Hilstrom: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was attempting to ask a question and the debate was going back and forth.

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

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, it is still good to get move to the east coast now and talk about New Brunswick.

I would like to share with the House a few comments on some of the trips I have made to New Brunswick and how people in the east end of the country are feeling just as frustrated with the Liberal government as they are in the west. Maybe the Liberals can get a little task force together to look into the alienation of Atlantic Canadians as well, because I am sure they would get some news from that.

It is spring. You and I, Mr. Speaker, have just come back here from Edmonton. The snow has gone there and we have fresh clean air. It is wonderful that spring has hit Canada. It would be terrific if spring and some fresh air were to move through the House of Commons. It would be just super. It is certainly time for spring in Ottawa.

We have to look at a new country. The next spring that this country sees will be in the new millennium. It would be terrific to do some spring house cleaning as well and see a new government in Ottawa so that we could bring about some real changes, serious changes that would make Canadians from coast to coast feel proud to be Canadian again. I was speaking with someone last week who does not feel proud to be Canadian any more. That hurts all of our hearts, regardless of what side of the House we are on.

I wanted to ask the people of New Brunswick for some of their feedback. I am a westerner. Although I spend time in Atlantic Canada from time to time, I do not understand everything about it and never pretended to. I thought the best way would be to go to source and talk to New Brunswickers.

I sent out a form to several people asking them to distribute it around New Brunswick. I put two comments on the form asking for responses:

1. Here's how one Liberal policy in Ottawa has severely affected me and my fellow New Brunswickers.
2. Here's how I would fix that Liberal policy.

People had an opportunity to send in real comments and say this is how Liberal policy has affected them in New Brunswick as a New Brunswicker. I have had several responses from people. It is amazing the feedback that came from them. I suggest the Liberals

should listen to this also because they will find some incredible parallels to the task force on western alienation.

Number one was no surprise, taxes. People were concerned about taxes. They say taxes are grossly unfair, discriminatory and too high. That is no surprise, no matter what corner of the country they live in.

The Liberals promise job and wealth creation and they keep New Brunswick back from its potential. What a sad story it is to see people from across the country faxing MPs to say that taxes keep New Brunswick back from its potential. That is the saddest thing to me.

What federal taxes do New Brunswickers want reformed? Their biggest concern was about extending the tax deduction to single income families. We know this has been prevalent in the news lately, but we have seen a lot of people come forward like Kimberly Oliver who said:

I feel single income families are unfairly taxed. A stay at home parent cannot get a part time job because they lose it all at tax time at year end.

Here we are in mid-April. Everybody is working away on their taxes and they know the price that they are paying in the high taxation of the government. She continued:

Stay at home parents are ignored and put down for their services and unfairly taxed.

Here's how I would fix that Liberal policy.

A tax break for single income families and allow a dependant to earn more before penalties.

What a smart, practical idea that is. Somebody else, Innis McCready, wrote:

Taxes were too high for the average home owner and wage earner. As a parent, and now a grandparent, I am saddened to see young New Brunswick mothers (some of my relatives, friends and neighbours) being forced to leave to others the care of their preschool aged children to work outside the home in order to make ends meet, all because of the careless indifference of this government and its discriminatory tax laws.

• (1520)

How would this person change it? He said he would cut taxes to low income families and cut business taxes. What a great idea it would be to cut taxes; not just the way the federal finance minister talks about cutting taxes because he picks and chooses little areas here and there, but complete tax breaks across the country.

Lower payroll taxes. We have gone around and around in the House about that as well. The government might just bubble forth here and tell us how it has dropped the EI rate, but it forgets to tell us the part about raising CPP taxes so much. That must have been just an oversight. I am sure it was an accident on its part.

Allan MacMillan and Bernie Conway from New Brunswick have said we need to establish a flat tax. Bernie Conway wrote that he was:

—a second year law student at the University of New Brunswick in Fredericton. I will be entering the workforce in the year 2000. The amount of money that I will be paying in taxes is very disconcerting. I have invested both time and money into my education in hopes to make a better life for myself, my family and Canada. Yet the governing party in Ottawa (and its predecessors) have seen fit to saddle me (and all Canadians) with a tax system that will make this very difficult.

These letters from frustrated people go on and on. They want to work. They want to pay taxes but not high discriminatory taxes so they are burdened to death.

Lower taxes on retired people and pensioners. I go back to the CPP issue again. Our plan is to rescue the Canadian pension plan from bankruptcy through guaranteeing full benefits to Canadian seniors and creating super individually vested RRSPs that will allow Canadians to secure their own retirement without being taxed to death, perhaps before their natural time.

Revenue Canada must treat custodial and non-custodial parents fairly. I have comments from people who say there is no justice in the tax system when it comes to child maintenance and access.

The HST should be dropped from second hand sales. We do not have to live with the HST in western Canada. Maybe the Liberal task force has not come up with that yet. On second hand sales Susan Baxter from St. George, New Brunswick, wrote:

We are overtaxed! We just bought a second hand camper trailer. We had to pay sales tax on this item even though it was used (15% tax). There's no limit to the taxing.

The potential is that after several sales and resales of this old camper trailer the government gets HST. Somebody sells it again and the government gets HST. That is scandalous.

The second issue that people were concerned about was health care and education funding. Eric Banks from Second Falls, New Brunswick, wrote:

The health care and education are in real trouble because of federal government cuts. Nurses are leaving our country for jobs that are not here. . . The education department has been cut year after year. They call it amalgamation.

What a nice word. I also heard the words partnerships and networking. They sound so glossy, but basically it is a knife in the back. The Liberals are cutting them but if they dress it up with a fancy name and it will be oh so painless. That is scandalous and the government should be ashamed of itself, especially when it announced in its budget all the wonderful billions of dollars going back into health care. It cut \$20 billion and put \$11.5 billion in. Then it tries to tell me, an English major, that this is good math. Even I can figure out that it does not make much sense.

The third major issue that New Brunswickers talked about was gun registration. The present plan will not work. We have raised the issue that the wonderful firearm centre that is doing such tremendous work is sending out firearm acquisition certificates

Supply

with somebody else's picture on it. As good looking as you may be, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you would not want your picture on someone else's FAC. It would not be a good thing. Nor would your twin. I know he would be equally scandalized.

The fourth issue is about protecting the east coast fishery. What a devastation. We talked about the seal hunt today and how many cod seals are eating. Again, Eric Banks from Second Falls wrote:

The fisheries of the east coast is in a terrible mess and most of that problem is due to policies that destroy small fishing villages.

What he would do to fix that policy? He wrote:

The traditional fisherman should have a real say in laws and standards that affect their lives.

Would it not be a novel idea to have people in those industries being able to advise government?

The fifth issue is EI reform for seasonal workers. Many people in New Brunswick are seasonal workers. I have information from people there who said there was a problem with EI, and specifically the intensity rule, for people to be able to say that they work seasonally. Some of these industries are seasonal. There is no other way to cut it. They have seasonal employment.

● (1525)

In conclusion let me wrap up by saying that people in New Brunswick, the same as people in Alberta, Manitoba, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland and all across the country, are saying "All right already, we are being taxed to death. Lay off. We do not mind paying taxes but just back off and quit asking us for more and more and more".

Mr. Larry McCormick (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's task force was very well received across Manitoba, always a warm reception by the wonderful people of western Canada.

We held public sessions in several ridings, in several centres across Manitoba. We started in Winnipeg and we went north. We were in several ridings. Actually we were in ridings that were represented by at least three parties in the House. We were not there to lobby one group or another. We were there to listen to Canadians.

I tell my colleague who just spoke that we are a party that represents all parts of Canada. We did not just target ridings held by one group of people. Is this not evident in the results in the Windsor—St. Clair byelection yesterday? We got more votes. I feel for some parties because they will not even get back their deposit.

Supply

Does this byelection result not reflect the fact the Reform Party is a very regional party that is just unable to break out of the confines of representing a few people?

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the meetings were so well attended in Manitoba. In fact I have been talking about New Brunswick.

It seems to me those meetings were by invitation only. It seems as though we have to be members of a secret society to get in on some of these meetings that the Liberals are holding.

It would be really smart to put a general advertisement in the newspapers. If the Liberals are so concerned about finding out what westerners think, because he is back to the west now, surely to goodness they could make sure those meetings are well publicized and get everybody out to listen to their concerns.

When the hon. member talks about Liberals being the national party across the country, I might remind him of the seats that they lost in New Brunswick, to which I was just referring, and Nova Scotia. I must remember one of his friends, Doug Young, had some EI policies in New Brunswick. He knows exactly what happened to him, a very senior minister in cabinet who was gone after that.

Let us talk about the west because the hon. member seems obsessed with that. Let us talk about the seats that were lost in Manitoba by the Liberals. Let us look at Saskatchewan for just a minute. There is one lonely Liberal soul left from Saskatchewan. He has a wonderful tan today and he sits on the front bench, but irrelevant is irrelevant.

Let us move on to Alberta. Let us have a little look at Alberta for Liberals. They did not have a seat for a generation. They managed to squeak out four seats, probably purely by accident, in the 1993 election. Then we cut that in half to two seats, one of which I snapped away from a Liberal on June 2, 1997. It was a wonderful night in my life.

Let us look at B.C. if we are talking about a national party. There are precious few Liberals left. I dare the member and his Liberal friend from B.C. to put a public advertisement in the paper and invite people far and wide; not like the Minister of Justice, one of the two Liberals left in Alberta, who had a fundraising event recently and someone paid \$800 to have supper with her.

What a steal, \$800 to have supper with the justice minister. Guess who is not coming to dinner. It is the justice minister because she found out that one of the people who paid \$800, one of the guests, was going to be the president of the National Firearms Association, a perfectly civil, polite fellow. Then Link Byfield was coming to supper too, the editor of the *Alberta Report*. What do we think happened? Guess who is not coming for supper. One of those Liberals. They paid \$800 to have supper with her, but because she only wanted to have supper with Liberals, she would not have supper with them. If it is a truly national party and if it is proud of its stuff, it ought to have supper with anyone and brag about it.

• (1530)

Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear the travelogue of the member from Edmonton North who, I guess, was obviously on some kind of a vacation in New Brunswick. I did not know Reformers actually travelled east of the Manitoba border except to come to this place. Obviously, they are out campaigning on their own, talking to New Brunswickers, doing what I am sure they are accusing us of doing, looking for candidates.

Maybe the member should have spent some time in the byelection in Windsor where this party did not even get its deposit back, where this party came fourth, where this party got a message from the voters in Ontario that some day it is going to wake up and understand that those voters have no time for the Reform Party.

I have been advised that I am splitting my time with my good friend from Vancouver Quadra.

What I find astounding is the fact that we are debating what could only be called one of the silliest motions that I have ever seen in this House.

Last night through until 8 o'clock this morning, members of all parties stood in the House and talked about the war. Like it or not, this country is involved in a serious conflict and all we get from the member opposite is her travelogue from New Brunswick. Members should instead be standing up in the House and talking about important issues such as the war. What do we get on an opposition day?

Last night in a question period, the members opposite berated the government for not having a vote. While the lives of our fighting men and women are at risk, they wanted to play politics. They wanted to have a vote. That is terrific. This is the vote. We are going to vote on whether or not we should join our partners in NATO. Once we have had that vote, then we will send the message over to Mr. Milosevic, who I am sure will be busy listening to C-SPAN to hear exactly what we are saying.

If they wanted a vote on any of those issues, why would they not take that opportunity today? It is their day. The Canadian people should know that this is opposition day. The Reform Party, as the official opposition, has the option of putting forward almost any motion it wants, save and except a spending bill, for debate in this place, and then at the end of the day we would vote on it.

Why would the Reform Party not stand up in this place and introduce a motion to have a vote, in whatever way it wanted to frame it, surrounding the issue of the war in Kosovo? Why would it not do that?

Today of all days, when we awake this morning to the news that the Yugoslav army has invaded Albania with ground troops, we are talking to a motion that says we should rename a government

caucus task force, the liberation alienation committee, something about alienating the west.

Why would we not be debating the issues that Canadians have on their minds today? Canadians are worried about the men and women who are in Europe defending freedom and democracy, defending the refugees in that part of the world. Canadians are worried about the potential influx of thousands of refugees and how we are going to take care of them. They are calling all of our offices as MPs and opening up their hearts, wallets and homes to try to help these people, and the best the Reform Party can do is come up with some cockamamie motion about renaming a government task force.

I guess its nose is out of joint because the task force has found it necessary to go into the ridings represented by Reformers in western Canada and meet with people. We get phone calls from those people telling us their member of parliament has not told them about the details of the millennium fund, or their member of parliament has not told them about the details of the tax cuts in the recent budget. Why would the Reform Party not do that? I believe it is not doing its jobs.

• (1535)

I really do not care whether the members opposite agree with the millennium fund program. I really do not care whether or not they agree with the western diversification programs that are going on in western Canada. Whether they care or agree is not the point.

Once members of parliament are elected, they are obligated to represent everyone in their constituency whether or not they voted for them or carry the party card. They are not allowed to be partisan when it comes to representing the constituents in their communities. They are not allowed to display partisan material in their offices. There is a good reason for that.

When I was elected the member for Mississauga West, it was my duty and sworn responsibility to represent everyone whether they voted New Democrat or Tory. I know they certainly did not vote Bloc. A few in my riding voted Reform, although I do not believe they got their deposit back. This is a message that some of them should think about.

The battle cry of the Reform Party when it was formed some years ago was that the west wants in. Let me give some examples because the Reform members do not think that the west is in.

We have representatives doing terrific work and actually handling constituency complaints from ridings represented by Reformers because they are not doing their jobs. We have a dedicated, honest and hard-working woman in Vancouver Kingsway. Mem-

Supply

bers will hear shortly from the member for Vancouver—Quadra. We have a former mayor of Coquitlam who is a terrific, hard-working member for his constituents. We have the member for Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia. We have the members for Winnipeg South, Winnipeg North—St. Paul and Provencher. The west wants in. How much more in would it like?

We have the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans who has stood up and made sure, for the first time, that somebody is doing something about the fish. Is that not a revolution? Is that not a reform? This motion is about the west, but the truth is that our fisheries in eastern Canada were destroyed by former Tory ministers. This minister is fighting for them as he is for the salmon in western Canada.

The Minister of Revenue has changed the collection agency to make it a responsive agency. The Minister of Multiculturalism and the Status of Women stood in this place and defended single parents and single stay at home moms. The Minister for Asia-Pacific is representing and fighting on behalf of human rights issues all around the world. The Minister of Justice recently introduced amendments to the Young Offenders Act that are being lauded across the country. The Minister of Natural Resources is a fighter on behalf of the changes in the Kyoto agreement. The Minister of External Affairs, who nobody can say anything negative about, is one of the greatest parliamentarians in this place. He is a man known around the world for leading the fight to ban land mines. The west is clearly in.

The Reform Party should be looking at the Minister of Western Economic Diversification who is trying to find a way to funnel energy and economic growth into western Canada. All of these ministers are at the table on behalf of the people in western Canada. The additional members are in caucus fighting every day on behalf of their constituents and are doing the job that members in the Reform Party fail to do for their constituents.

• (1540)

Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the member. The business of this House is to discuss the important issues of the day. Therefore, I ask my hon. Liberal colleague why it was the Reform Party that initiated the discussion on hepatitis C compensation? Why was it the Reform Party that initiated the discussion on child pornography and the Young Offenders Act? Why was it the Reform Party that initiated the discussion on tax relief when it did not come, despite election promises? Why was it the Reform Party that initiated the discussion on APEC and whether or not students were going to be able to have access to funding and what was going to happen with the suppression of freedom of speech?

I wonder why it is the Reform Party that is talking about those issues. I wonder why it is the Reform Party that is asking for a debate and a vote on whether or not we send troops into Kosovo.

Supply

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, I was neglectful in not mentioning the member for Saint Boniface who is also the Secretary of State for Western Economic Diversification.

It is interesting that the member would talk about all these issues. I will agree with him on something. The Reform Party has stood up and mentioned many of those issues in the House, but generally it was the afternoon after it came out in the *Globe and Mail* or the *National Post*, which is where it does its research. It was not because it was on any kind of cutting edge or that it was being proactive.

The Reform Party members are reading the newspaper over morning coffee and saying, "Look at this, APEC. We had better talk about this. Holy smokes, there is a scandal. We had better talk about this". That is where they get their research.

If they would spend more time taking care of their constituents and giving them the information that comes out of this government in western Canada, just maybe there would not be a need for a task force to travel across the west.

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member first stood he said that this was a silly motion. I guess if it is such a silly motion it makes the member pretty silly for joining in.

If the member would not mind standing and feeling silly once again, I would ask him to explain how anything he said in his speech, anything at all, had the slightest bit of relevance to the alienation of the Liberals in the west or anywhere else in the country because of their ignoring of the concerns across the country.

For the member's interest, I would like him to know that a Mark Trend poll taken in B.C. and Alberta in mid-March found that the tax relief he puffed up as being something important that the Liberals were all calling him about, did not even receive favour with a fraction of a percentage of the people. The persons responding to the poll said that the average amount of tax relief they would like to see would be \$2,600 a year not the measly few hundred the government granted.

He talked about the Young Offenders Act being lauded across the country. It is being criticized across the country as tinkering around the edges as usual, nothing worthwhile and certainly nothing worth having.

He thinks, as many of the hon. members on that side have said all day, that throwing money at the west or anywhere else through diversification funds somehow responds to the concerns. What a lot of bunkum. The importance of the western diversification fund does not even appear as a blip on the radar screen in western Canada.

I would like the hon. member to get up, be silly again and tell us what relevance his speech had to the whole debate.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, I would not expect the hon. member to understand anything that I have said. I would not expect him to agree with it by any means, but I would tell the hon. member that as the Prime Minister's chair of the task force on youth entrepreneurship, which I have not seen him criticizing, I have travelled western and eastern Canada. I have met with representatives of western diversification. I have met with the service delivery people. I have met with the young entrepreneurs in western Canada.

To hear this member stand hear and say that the western diversification fund is not important to western Canada simply reinforces my view that the members of his party have neither their feet on the ground nor their ears to it. They are not representing their constituents in ensuring that they have access to government plans and government information. The reason why the Prime Minister has seen the need to strike a task force of parliamentarians who will travel through western Canada listening to the needs and concerns of western Canadians is because the Reform Party is not doing that.

• (1545)

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I also was puzzled by the choice of the topic of today's debate, but I am puzzled with all political parties at a certain time.

Two weeks ago we might have debated all night the Kosovo intervention but another party chose to debate something else on domestic politics. I do not criticize that. Then all parties decided to adjourn a day early and we had the debate two weeks later. The committees which are all-party committees, defence and foreign affairs themselves did not have any initiatives from government or opposition members to come back earlier than a week ago. The House sometimes chooses its business in ways that may seem strange to outside people but we do get our work done.

I assume that spring has arrived early in the west and that explains perhaps the tone, perhaps the thrust of the present debate. I hope you will allow me in that spirit, Mr. Speaker, simply to send a message to that well-known western raconteur and wit, Malcolm Parry, based on information he derived from the political chattering class.

Every party has its political chattering class. They hang around party headquarters. They do not get out in the trenches like the hon. members opposite or those around me.

Let me put the record straight. I do not intend to quit parliament. I am not about to be named roving ambassador for the Balkans. I am not about to be elected to the college of cardinals. I am not even the next general manager of the Vancouver Canucks. I might wish

such a fate upon some of the hon. members opposite, that is to say the Vancouver Canucks. But we are all optimistic in the west. We may find another Pavel Bure and we may somehow win the golden chalice again.

Some comments have been made and I am always complimented when I find members opposite listen to my speeches or in some cases read my householders, my letters to constituents. The member for Saanich—Gulf Islands is a very promising younger member of this House. In fact, Professor Sandra Anderson, who is an environmental specialist and I believe the wife of someone close to the present members of the House, has regarded him as one of her most promising, if unpredictable, students. He has made some comments on the issue of APEC funding. I would think that this would perhaps direct attention to the special role of western members. I include my colleagues opposite in this.

We are interested in getting results. We do not have to take the essay in imagination that a New Brunswick scholar has made in today's *Globe and Mail* on the transformation of the parliamentary system, nevertheless getting results in parliament is a matter of hard work. We have to research a file; we have to meet the parties concerned. If we make propositions, we have to quantify their social cost, their financial cost and we have to lobby people, ministers, our own caucus and others.

I feel very happy that after 15 months I was able to produce a result in the APEC funding issue that I felt to be the correct one and which I had recommended in the first place. I am glad to have hon. members opposite join me in that. I take the comment of the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands in that light.

I would also say to the hon. member for North Vancouver who has given me the benefit of his advice, and it has been valuable in many ways on certain matters involving native leaseholds and other things, that I have given about 150 hours of time since early December to the issue he discussed today, Bill C-49. I do not have the exact transcripts of his remarks, but I believe there is progress being made there.

There were issues in which I felt the legislation could be tidied up. I have been proceeding by quiet diplomacy, meeting with lawyers, meeting with the parties, the stakeholders and meeting with ministry officials. I am hopeful that a resolution which I would think would be satisfactory in terms of the constitution, the charter and the interests of the conflicting stakeholders will be reached.

In other words, I think it is an opportunity for correcting this simplistic view of parliament that our main work is making speeches and that it is sometimes good to make charges to the opposite side of the House and back, Don Quixote style.

• (1550)

Most of our work, and this applies to people in government and opposition, is hard slugging work. It is research. Sometimes I think

Supply

I am doing a half million dollar private lawyer's work for an MP's salary. I think that is true of all members of the House.

Some remarks have been made on the west. I would have to cavil with my colleagues on that. I understand the west is a large concept but I have argued since I was first elected in 1993 that B.C. is separate and distinct in itself. We are a fifth region, which is not to say we cannot coexist peacefully with the three prairie provinces and that we cannot co-operate as we are doing, as is obvious in the task force that has been referred to. But we are a distinct society and the Prime Minister recognized this in the joint resolution of both houses of parliament.

It has implications of course, concretely. For example, if we ever get around to reform of federal institutions and an elected Senate, I want a fifth of the seats in the elected Senate for British Columbia. I think the hon. member for North Vancouver would not disagree with me on that. I want to see proportional representation in federal institutions.

Since we contribute 13% of the national revenue from B.C. and five or six years ago got only 7% of federal funding for sciences and research and development, I am delighted to say that it has gone up. When it gets beyond 13% I think we will ask for 20% as a region.

In these areas the west has its own distinctness, but within it, I would argue B.C. has a distinctness more so even than Quebec has in relation to Canada as a whole. The miracle in our case is that we made the transition to a multicultural society without too much pain, with a great deal of optimism and goodwill, to the point where the ethnic communities are no longer a monolithic block, if they ever were one such block of people.

They are plural also. They have differences of opinions, differences of attitudes and anybody would have to be wary to take the vote for granted. For example on the issue of the intervention in Kosovo, different ethnic communities within my community of Vancouver take different positions and ask me to explain why I might take one position or the other. That is good and healthy.

In a way our charm in B.C. sometimes is an embarrassment to the rest of the country, but not to us. We produce interesting political leaders. I have sometimes had to rescue my province from its activities in giving counsel in various places, promoting peaceful transitions from impossible situations, from impossible political leaders, but I value the interesting variety and heterogeneity of our political personalities.

Our role is a little like that of the 19th century MP in Great Britain or perhaps the continental European politician today. One of my constituents said to me "We vote for you. You are part of your party but we do not like you to be 100% for your party. We like you to dissent sufficiently when we feel our interests are involved". There is an art in doing that. You recognize the gain you have from an affiliation with the party. You also have made the pledge when you accept membership that you in general will abide by its principles and its program but the dissent within the party,

Supply

the argumentation, the presentation of a reasoned case, the diversity of treatment, is there and opportunities are available.

When we do our job well, this is when we really do establish the western personality and in particular, if I may say again, the B.C. personality. There is nothing like it even in New Zealand, Australia, or anywhere else. We are distinct and we are very proud of it.

The pluralism within a party is something we have to ask for more and more in a period when presidential prime ministerships are the rule of the day. A French friend said we have a monarchical president. I said that sometimes it is an imperial president. Nevertheless the countervailing power in our society with an unreformed Senate and various other things is coming within the parties. That is where the give and take is. That is where the legislation is made and it is a healthy development. I think it has lessons for this side of the House and for the other side of the House.

• (1555)

I take it that it is in this spirit, the spirit of spring which came early to Vancouver as it always does, that this motion was put forward by the opposition. I accept it in that spirit.

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it was a very civil speech, although I am not sure how much relevance it actually had to the motion. A couple of interesting points came up in the speech. I do appreciate the member mentioning how he supports proportional representation.

I wonder if he has done the numbers, as I have. He certainly would have discovered that Reform would come out with 60 seats, but the Liberals would drop dramatically and would no longer be the majority government that they are today. I thank the hon. member for that endorsement of a process which would certainly be more representative of how people vote in the country. The situation that gives 100% of the power with 38% of the vote to that side of the House is really not healthy for the country.

I gave him credit earlier today and I do again for actually speaking out publicly from time to time, contrary to the will of his party, and representing his constituents. He is to be congratulated for that.

I wonder if he would mind speaking to the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, who did promise to speak out regularly and correct all the ills of the world, who never has said a word in this place and thinks that everything is fine with the land management bill. I wonder if the member would mind having a little chat with him and setting him straight.

Mr. Ted McWhinney: Mr. Speaker, I am glad we can enroll the member for North Vancouver in the process of parliamentary reform. It will be more complex I think than many members envisaged in 1993 when first elected.

The presidentialization of the prime minister's power in Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand and Canada is a phenomenon of our times. It cannot be reversed, but we can develop countervailing checks and balances, constitutional checks and balances, much as they were developed in Westminster in the 18th century, but they are more likely to be within the political parties themselves. I wish the hon. member would direct his very fertile mind and imagination to that task because he may have a good deal to offer us.

On reform of the electoral system, each electoral system begets its own practices and we could live with PR. I could myself. I have a feeling in some ways that it would be a more interesting House. Again, it would change the constitutional system and we would have to make corresponding changes in other institutions. I could suggest them, but it is a large test and we would be into a decade of work.

As for the business, the give and take between colleagues, the give and take across the House, it is one of the things I value. This is a continent widely divided. This country is the distance from Moscow to Vladivostok. One of the experiences on that long, five and a half hour flight twice a week from Vancouver to Ottawa and Ottawa to Vancouver, is that I meet with constituents and I meet with the opposition parties. There are more than two parties in B.C. federally. I have conversations. I believe there is a process of give and take and it is beneficial.

I think it was in that spirit, if I may say so, that it was suggested I was not speaking to the motion. But if the motion was whimsical, not perhaps serious, I put it down to the spring and the arrival of the daffodils. It was in that spirit that I attempted to offer a prairie rose to the hon. member for North Vancouver.

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. member mention during his speech that if and when his government gets around to it, he would like to see some democratic reform, especially with regard to the Senate having better representation of what is existent in B.C. population in the Senate. His government has been in power now for over six years and we have not seen any movement on democratic reform. There have been provinces, for instance Alberta, which have made an effort to try to change the Senate.

I would like to ask the hon. member a simple question. Will the government get around to democratic reform maybe before the end of the next millennium or some time sooner? When may that happen?

Supply

• (1600)

Mr. Ted McWhinney: Mr. Speaker, we have to establish our priorities by considering the ways and means that are available. Unfortunately, Senate reform is virtually impossible, except marginally because of Part V of the 1982 Constitution Act, which I advised against incidentally. The only way we are going to change the Senate, other than marginally, is with a constituent assembly.

I have the feeling that the generation of Canadians coming into political power very shortly will want to have a constituent assembly and will want an act of constitutionalization. But I would advise the hon. member that I think he could use his talents and energy in other areas of constitutional reform where we do not have that constitutional straightjacket that Part V of the Constitution imposes. It is a pity.

My friend Rafe Mair and I agree that we would like to be United States senators. There is no more beautiful job than that. But it is just unforeseeable for another 10 years here. Give us a constituent assembly and all will spill. But the country has to be ready for it and it is not quite ready yet.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues today in a discussion of the important issue of national alienation, in particular that of Quebec.

I am not a Quebecer myself, but I wish to point out that I respect and admire Quebecers. I have learned French, and continue to do so, because I wish to acquire a better understanding of Quebecers and of the francophone culture.

I asked for the national unity portfolio in our caucus in order to be able to help ensure that Quebec remains within Canada, by giving Quebec and the other provinces true equal powers and not mere symbols.

I want Quebec to stay within Canada, and I am prepared to fight the Liberal style federalism of the status quo, which continues to alienate Quebec and the other Canadian provinces.

Consequently, although not, of course, a Quebecer, I hope I am in a position to understand the feelings of alienation felt by the citizens of Canada living in that province.

The Liberal government understands that education is an area of provincial jurisdiction protected by the Constitution. It also understands that when it encroaches on areas of provincial jurisdiction protected by the Constitution, Quebecers become increasingly frustrated, and the feelings of alienation intensify.

Yet, the Liberals' instinct to meddle in everything is so strong and their condescending, paternalistic, interventionist, big brother attitude is so pronounced that they continue to get involved in areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction, in spite of the resulting damage to Canadian unity. The millennium fund is a prime example.

This fund is nothing but another inefficient and costly Liberal policy. For our friends from Quebec, it is a constant reminder that the current government refuses to recognize the division of powers provided under the Constitution.

Bloc Quebecois members, like Reformers, are just as interested in education as the Prime Minister is. They simply want the federal government to respect provincial jurisdiction, and they also know that provincial governments are in a better position to administer the programs than the federal government, which is far away.

Unfortunately, the Prime Minister does not care about national unity or constitutional issues. He is only interested in leaving his mark.

Instead, he will join the long list of federalist politicians who are advocates of the status quo and who turn a deaf ear when Quebecers are urging the current government not to get involved in provincial jurisdictions.

Before concluding, I want to ask the House to remember the debates on Bill C-36, dealing with the millennium fund.

• (1605)

All Quebecers should remember that the Reform Party put forward a recommendation that the provinces and territories be allowed to opt out and to conclude agreements with the millennium foundation, to use their share of the funds based on their own priorities for post-secondary education.

Our party has always recognized Quebec's right to determine how its education needs should be met.

[*English*]

I would like to shift to the topic of health care and the social union. The social union is about health, education and support for people in need.

When federal transfers to the provinces were cut by \$7 billion, when hospitals were closing and when 1,400 doctors left Canada in the last two years, we needed to address health care in the social union. But this government's solution was to play a money game and pit provincial premiers all across the country against Quebec. It was a shame because that in itself created even more alienation in the province of Quebec.

Supply

There was a real effort, for once, from the point when the Calgary declaration began, all the way through the talks on the social union, when we saw that provincial premiers were making progress in trying to come together and work together to put pressure on the federal government to address problems in the balance of powers in the country.

However, the government and the Prime Minister did not take that seriously. Instead they played the money game. They cut money out of transfers, especially to health care and education, and they left the provinces with really no choice. When it came to the crunch, they had to put that money back into health care and education. In the end they had to buy into a deal that was just not fair to the provinces, creating even more alienation in the province of Quebec when all of the other premiers had to take the cash. They had no choice because they had people to take care of in their provinces.

Unfortunately Quebec once again felt that it was left out of the process because there just was not a solution to take care of the balance, which we in the Reform Party have been trying to meet right across the country.

That is the success of this government. That is why it has been relegated to a majority in central Canada. It continues to succeed by pitting one part of this country against another. Then it asks the question: Why is there alienation in this country? It really is no surprise.

Another issue I would like to touch on very quickly is that of taxation. My hon. colleague from Edmonton North talked about the issue of taxation in the east.

In Quebec people are concerned about the high level of taxes they pay. I discussed with people from the Economic Institute of Montreal, a new think tank, the issues of high taxes and what they do to the economy of Quebec. They are a lone voice trying to talk to the federal government.

When we take into consideration the tax factor of the federal government and the provincial government, Quebecers unfortunately pay some of the highest taxes in the country, if not in North America.

That is another factor which the government has failed to address. At the end of the day, regardless of where we live, we want to make sure we can put food on the table. We want to make sure we can provide for our families. The tax rates are so high that even Quebecers feel alienated that no one is listening to them at all when it comes to that particular problem.

[*Translation*]

Canada has a national unity problem because Quebecers and other Canadians feel profoundly alienated, and this problem will not go away until honest discussion and real reforms replace the present empty rhetoric and divisive symbolism.

The Reform Party and most Canadians seem to understand that. In our opinion, the debate on national unity must be open to scrutiny and to public support, and the dialogue must be real.

This is why, as Reform critic for intergovernmental affairs, I am proud to defend the Reform Party's new law on Canada, a positive and creative measure to rebuild a Canada based on equality among people and provinces.

The distribution of powers must be reviewed to put an end to Canadians' feeling of alienation.

• (1610)

In our opinion Quebec and the other provinces must have the same real powers. This will bring out regional diversity. What is needed is a new distribution of powers giving all provinces greater autonomy in areas constitutionally under their jurisdiction.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the issue of the CHST cuts continues to come back. I remind the member that the cuts which the federal government made to its own fiscal expenditures were more than the cuts it made to the provinces. There was a sharing of the burden. There was a lesser percentage of revenue.

The member probably knows, and would probably like to confirm, that at a time when he admits the provinces were cutting health care and education because of the transfer cuts, was not the province of Alberta running surpluses and still cutting health care? Was not the province of Ontario actually giving 15% income tax cuts while cutting health care?

The cost to the province of Ontario of the tax reduction was in the order of \$1.2 billion. The reduction in transfers from the federal government was in the neighbourhood of \$400 million. There was a significant difference.

If the actions of the provincial governments were taken into account at the same time they were cutting health care and education, it would be very clear that the priorities of the provinces were not the same as the priorities of the federal government and the people of Canada. The priorities of the provinces were to either accumulate surpluses or grant tax cuts.

The member also should acknowledge that in any analysis like this he cannot ignore the reality of equalization payments in Canada, of which Quebec is the single largest recipient.

Mr. Rahim Jaffer: Mr. Speaker, I will address the hon. member's question briefly. As he knows, I was discussing alienation in Quebec, not in Alberta or Ontario.

However, with regard to the cuts in transfers from the federal government, the hon. member has to realize that there were targets and plans which the provinces had put into place for the money

that was to come from the federal government. The fact is that in Alberta, if we look at the way it managed health care, it made the sacrifices it had to make. However, alongside the cuts made by this government, it actually has more money to put into health care, plus, something which is totally foreign to this government, it actually paid down debt, giving more tax relief to Albertans, which overall is a much more positive move than this government will ever commit to.

In the province of Ontario the same thing happened. Harris actually put more money into health care over the time it was cut by the government but still balanced his priorities of debt reduction and tax relief; again something which is foreign to this government.

With regard to Quebec, the question of alienation was even more significant when it came to the cuts. Then, to come back, especially with the case of the millennium scholarship fund, and force Quebec to implement a program that it was not in favour of after the cuts were made by this government was outrageous.

Mr. John Harvard (Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened intently to the last speaker from the Reform Party and I heard some conciliatory words from him regarding the good province of Quebec. That is pleasing to my ears because all parliamentarians should always reach out to every part of the country.

I am sure the member remembers those embarrassing election ads in the election campaign of 1997 when the Reform Party actually said that it did not want any more prime ministers from the province of Quebec. That is what those ads said. Does the member remain embarrassed by those election ads almost three years hence?

• (1615)

Mr. Rahim Jaffer: Mr. Speaker, I am embarrassed for the hon. member's question and how he has twisted the whole direction of those ads.

I spend a lot of time travelling in the province of Quebec and talking with people. The actual message I hear from many Quebecers is that it would be nice to have representation in the highest office from somewhere else in the country, maybe from the west, to get a different balance of ideas.

When people in Quebec are agreeing with the message of those ads and wanting representation from across the country, I think the hon. member is completely out to lunch.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the

Supply

hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst, Health; the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, Employment Insurance; the hon. member for Markham, The Economy.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

INDUSTRY

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a meeting of the House leaders and I think you would find unanimous consent for the following motion:

That the Standing Committee on Industry be authorized to travel to St. Hubert, Quebec on Monday, April 26, 1999 for the purpose of visiting the Canadian Space Agency, and that the necessary staff do accompany the committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The House has heard the terms of the motion presented by the deputy government House leader. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—REGIONS OF CANADA

The House resumed consideration of the motion and of the amendment.

Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, once again the opposition has tried to address an issue, the idea of alienation, which the government does not seem able to bring before the House of Commons. The government is willing to strike committees to recruit candidates across the rest of the country, but is it willing to discuss the issue and generate debate on it in the House of Commons? No. Unfortunately that job is up to the opposition just like it was on a number of other issues.

I feel lonely in the House as many Liberals have poured out the door. I wonder if it is to go and talk with constituents in Newfoundland. Why do Newfoundland and Labrador feel alienated from the government? Since 1949 Newfoundland has been part of Canada and since 1949 the Government of Canada has mismanaged the fishery of Newfoundland.

Supply

In Alberta we have had many scuffles with the federal government over the control of natural resources. Predominantly oil and as are the ones that come to my mind. Nonetheless we have still been able to have those fights because Alberta has some jurisdiction over those issues.

In the case of Newfoundland, because we do not have an implementation of the Law of the Sea, foreign draggers and vessels pillage the ocean depths and destroy the fishery in Newfoundland. Newfoundlanders rely on the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and it does not allow the numbers to be accessed by the public. It is a secret organization that deprives fishermen of the numbers they need to sustain the fisheries in Newfoundland.

While the federal government is continuing to do this, and it must therefore accept responsibility, foreign vessels are fishing off the coast of Newfoundland, the Grand Banks and the surrounding areas. These foreign nations have quotas and are taking tens of thousands of fish. They are depriving Newfoundlanders of their jobs. The government says that it does not understand alienation and that it represents Newfoundland. That is a crying shame. It is a joke.

• (1620)

What does the government do? It goes ahead and tries to buy votes. It tries to hold it over people's heads. Instead of allowing the government and the people of Newfoundland to decide what happens with their fishery, the federal government lords it over them. It says that if they do not vote for the Liberals they can expect to get even worse. It threatens people. It is a shame that this is even carried over to the provincial government.

To obtain a licence in a province, whether it be for a restaurant or a liquor establishment, people basically have to beg forgiveness from provincial Liberals so that their small mom and pop operation are not shut down because they do not agree with the government in power.

Shame on the government that it does not have control over the fisheries. A number of governments over a period time have talked about the idea of Newfoundland having control over the fisheries and the resources of that province. The fisheries are not the only resource.

I will talk about some of the other resources over which the people Newfoundland and Labrador do not have control. As a result they continually have that held over their heads by this government which demands votes from them in order not to be taken advantage of any more than they are now.

Offshore oil could be a great boon for the province of Newfoundland. Once again the federal government went ahead and said that it was not within the jurisdiction of the province. I will talk later about what Pierre Elliott Trudeau did to that province in some of his early discussions with regard to jurisdictional issues.

There is also the issues of natural gas and hydro electricity which should fall under the purview of the province. Instead, because of federal intermingling on these issues, the government stripped the ability of Newfoundland to provide, to look after and to control its resources. As a result the fishery collapsed in 1992.

It is sad that when there is no control there is little or no hope. People lose hope if they cannot be expected to have an actual say and a direct impact on resources that are close to them, and if the federal government goes ahead and lords it over them, takes control of those things and does not let them run things as they should be run in order to make sure the resources are sustainable. That is exactly what has happened.

What does the federal government do? Rather than solve the problem so that 5, 10 or 20 years from now young people will not be leaving Newfoundland and seeking work elsewhere, it comes up with programs like NCARP and TAGS and keeps people beholden to those programs. It doles out its pennies and nickels. It keeps the people dependent and does not allow them local control over their resources. Shame on the government for depriving the people of Newfoundland of hope, control and opportunity.

We are talking about the whole issue of natural resources. What about the Churchill Falls travesty? The federal government could have had and should have had a responsibility to get involved in that situation. Once again it did not take Newfoundland's side. It did not step in when it was supposed to do so. As a result, Newfoundland loses \$600 million in annual revenues. If that were divided by every person in Newfoundland it would be some sort of an economic benefit, but the federal government did not take any responsibility for that.

Pierre Elliott Trudeau refused to cede any jurisdiction to the province in offshore oil, claiming that it fell under the federal government's power to regulate the territorial waters of the country. As a result Newfoundland has been suffering and the fishery stocks collapsed in 1992.

Let us look at some other islands that have been able to succeed with regard to their fisheries. Iceland, for example, had a crisis with its fishery and foreign fishing. It was able to come back because it had control of its resource. It was able to make the decisions. The government and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador have not even had the support of the federal government to go ahead and turf out any of the foreign fishers.

• (1625)

It is a crying shame that there are ships fishing offshore when the people of the Newfoundland cannot earn a living from something that had sustained them for hundreds of years. It is a crying shame that the people of Newfoundland have to put up with a federal government that alienates them in that way. It is ridiculous.

The feds have mismanaged the largest resource in the province. They had better take responsibility for the fallout when it comes, unless it is willing to give that responsibility back to the province. That is what the people of Newfoundland have been asking for and that is what they deserve.

Newfoundland recently had its 50th anniversary of joining Confederation. Some would say it was treated with some ambiguity. That is a shame. It is because of the alienation that province feels with regard to its control of natural resources and how the federal government has run roughshod over it.

Newfoundland and Labrador have a seal population to the tune of six million to eight million. According to DFO statistics each seal gobbles up 1.4 tonnes of fish per year. That alone accounts for two years of fishing on the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador. They should be allowed to go ahead and look after the seals. They are not even allowed to make their own decisions in that regard.

I have talked about Churchill Falls. I could talk about Inco and the Voisey's Bay dispute. I could talk about the Innu land claims or virtually any other dispute where the federal government does not directly benefit. It shoved Newfoundland and Labrador out of the picture and did not allow them to make local decisions on these issues. They are hurting.

If the government wants to see a solving of the problem and fewer young people leaving the province, it has to look at the long term and not just at the next election. That is where the federal government has failed the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I leave it to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador to decide. If they want more of the same, they can continue to vote for the Liberals who have alienated them and have not allowed them local control. They should vote for change.

Ms. Louise Hardy (Yukon, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am really worried about the massive withdrawal of federal presence in the north. I do not see it so much as an alienation but as sort of an abdication.

The head of the military in the area made a statement about how vulnerable we were in terms of our sovereignty in that space of land. We do not have the kind of protection in the north that we used to have. I thought of it earlier more in terms of people backing up a big tanker and hauling water away. We would never know it. In fact the military officer said that we could not even detect that by radar.

With the developments in Kosovo I am really concerned about how safe we are, considering Canada's proximity to where the danger lies and how short a distance it is over the pole. I would appreciate the member's comments on that.

Supply

Mr. Rob Anders: Mr. Speaker, this issue touches on the idea of the abdication of responsibility and sovereignty. The hon. member is referring to the north. My speech was directly related to Newfoundland and Labrador. As far as I can talk about abdication of responsibility and sovereignty, I will try to address that question.

Where the territory does not have a responsibility how can it possibly have any control or say over what is being done? If the federal government takes responsibility and sovereignty away from a province or territory, or does not grant it in the first place, it has no local control. We have seen that in Newfoundland and Labrador.

In terms of the abdication of responsibility in Newfoundland and Labrador, I believe the people of Newfoundland and Labrador would like to see more local control. They are willing to take with that control sovereignty and responsibility for those resources. They certainly have not been managed well over the last 50 years by the federal government.

Mr. Larry McCormick (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, alienation is certainly the word of the day and the password of the Reform Party.

• (1630)

We are in this Chamber talking about this foolishness of the motion that was put forward today. The Prime Minister even urged the Reform Party to put forward a motion on Kosovo today if that is what it wanted, but instead we are debating alienation. It is what members of the Reform Party know. So often they seem to look at the dark and dismal side of life, rather than what most Canadians enjoy.

Alienation is the only thing that the Reform Party knows. How else could one explain the blatantly anti-Quebec ads that party ran in the last federal election.

I think back to the time of the referendum in Quebec. People phoned my office and I talked to people on the streets, people who voted for the PC party, people who voted for the NDP, people who voted however they voted and they were all concerned about keeping this country together, but this party understands alienation.

The Reform leader has admitted that the Reform Party in its present form cannot form government because it alienates too many Canadians. Perhaps the best name for the new party would be the Reform alienation party. Now it appears that the Reform leader has managed to alienate at least 12 of his own members. Having run out of normal Canadians to anger and alienate he has turned to his own caucus.

I have a serious question to ask the member from cow town, which is a great town. I love Calgary. It is one of the finest parts of

Supply

Canada, located in the foothills. I love all parts of this country. I have travelled it for the last 50 years. I drove it for 40 years before I came to this Chamber and I respect all of its parts.

My question for the member is: Do they not share the desire to represent the issues of all Canadians? This is a party that wants to alienate and be a regional party. I am proud to be a member of a party which represents all Canadians.

Mr. Rob Anders: Mr. Speaker, I felt some love in the Chamber when the member rose to say that he wanted to be tolerant and inclusive, but then he went ahead and accused me of being from cow town.

Let me tell him a bit about alienation, as the hon. member raised the issue. I will change subjects for a second and talk about tax and spend Liberal policies.

Let us talk about Transport Canada controlling the St. John's Port Corporation. Oceanex, a company that does 84% of its business in that particular vicinity, said "Don't go ahead and put money into a new building, put it into a port facility; put it into the actual structure so that we can do a better job with what we have". But, no, indeed, a Liberal appointed hack, Sean Hanrahan, went ahead, tore down the old building and put up a new one.

There are only 18 employees. The building has 10,000 square feet, leaving each employee with an office bigger than that of the premier of Newfoundland. The premier has to be jealous. Deep down in his bones I know that the premier of Newfoundland is jealous.

Why did they build a new building? One could say that maybe St. John's has almost no vacant building space. As a matter of fact, the vacancy rate is higher than 20%. Yet we have a Liberal appointee who went ahead and took all that money to build a new structure to give everybody in that particular corporation an office bigger than the premier's.

That is alienation. That is Liberal tax and spend policies.

Mr. John Harvard (Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to take part in today's debate. As the chairman of the Prime Minister's task force on the four western provinces I must admit that I rise to speak today with mixed emotions. On the one hand I welcome the extra publicity that this debate will give our efforts to consult with Canadians across the prairies and in British Columbia. I did not expect this kind of a gift from the Reform Party of Canada.

On the other hand, I cannot imagine a more frivolous use of parliament's time. At a time when our nation is engaged in the most assertive military operation since the end of the Korean war the members of the Reform Party come forward with a motion that can only be described as silly. I strongly believe that Canadians do not

appreciate silly stunts and that perhaps explains the Reform Party's dismal performance in yesterday's byelection in Windsor—St. Clair.

● (1635)

Simply put, the Reform motion claims that this government has not addressed regional concerns and calls upon the government to rename the task force which I am honoured to chair.

This motion, however, speaks to much more than renaming a task force; it speaks to a fundamental difference between the Liberal vision of this country and the Reform Party's vision.

The Liberal vision is of one Canada, stretching from sea to sea to sea, with all Canadians confidently working together to build the greatest country on earth.

The Reform vision is one of petty regionalism, a vision in which one region competes with another for attention, a vision in which the politics of division are more important than the politics of unity.

We, as Liberals, seek out the common threads that strengthen our nation, not the device of shards that would tear us apart. We recognize that as the national governing party we have a responsibility to all Canadians, regardless of where they live.

I suspect that the timing of this motion has something to do with the fact that the Prime Minister's task force on the four western provinces recently spent a very rewarding Easter break consulting and meeting with many Manitobans.

As I mentioned yesterday, the response to the task force was indeed overwhelming. In just three days task force members met with over 60 individuals and organizations from across my home province. Manitobans shared with us not only their concerns, but also their dreams for tomorrow. So popular were the meetings that we found it necessary to break into two teams to cover as much ground as possible.

The response we had throughout Manitoba and the number of requests we had for meetings in other western provinces proves one thing: western Canadians reject Reform's parochial regionalism.

Canadians in the four western provinces, in fact Canadians right across this great land, want a national government, not a bunch of regional ones. They want a national government that reaches out to all Canadians, regardless of where they live.

It is interesting to note that whenever the regional parties, be it the Reform Party or the Bloc Québécois, realize that they are becoming increasingly irrelevant to most Canadians, they try to play the regional card. That is what we are witnessing today.

Supply

The Reform Party is sitting still in the polls. In fact, in yesterday's byelection, as I pointed out earlier, Reform placed fourth overall, behind the third place Tories. Combined, those two parties received a paltry 4,000 votes, compared to nearly 14,000 for the winning Liberal candidate. So much for the so-called united alternative. Rather than uniting it is splitting apart.

The Prime Minister's task force is being well received across western Canada. I can only conclude that the Reform Party feels so threatened that once again it is trying to divide Canadians into "them and us".

The Prime Minister's task force on the four western provinces was established to meet with and listen to western Canadians. It is a mandate to build on the work of the government's western MPs and senators by simply providing western Canadians with another opportunity, one of many, to shape the national decision making process.

Despite what the Reform Party wants us to believe, there is actually really nothing new in the government's approach. It is simply the time honoured practice of consulting, talking to people, listening to people and hearing their concerns. There is no hidden agenda. There is no radical departure from what this government has done in the past.

• (1640)

While we were meeting with Manitobans a similar caucus task force was meeting with and listening to Quebecers. Another caucus task force was meeting with and listening to young entrepreneurs from across the country. In fact we heard from the chairman of that task force about an hour or two ago in the Chamber.

Since 1993, the year that we came to power, the government has established no less than nine such caucus task forces to meet with Canadians on issues as diverse as the impact of information technology on Canada and the future of our aging population.

The Liberal government has made a regular habit of consulting with Canadians from every region of the country and it will continue to do so.

Why have we made it a habit to consult with Canadians? Simply put, it is because the Prime Minister understands that we cannot run a country as large as this and as diverse as this from behind a desk here on Parliament Hill. We have to get out and meet with the people. We have to understand their concerns. We have to understand their dreams.

The Reform Party simply does not understand that government has to consult with the governed. That is why we are government and they are the opposition. That is why they are wasting parliament's time today with this silly motion.

The government's record shows the influence that Liberal parliamentarians from across the west have in setting government priorities. Every week western voices speak for the west in our national caucus meetings. Western Canadians told us that we had to restore faith and credibility in the nation's finances. The government listened and acted. We introduced the first balanced budget in 30 years, reduced taxes by \$16.5 billion in our last two budgets and began paying down the national debt.

Western Canadians told us that we had to do something to ensure better access to education and improve the health care system. Again we listened and we acted. The government introduced the millennium scholarship program and increased health care spending by \$11.5 billion. My province of Manitoba will receive \$425 million in increased health care funding. When the farm income crisis erupted on the prairies we listened to western farmers and we acted. We introduced a \$900 million farm aid package.

Are these the actions of a government that is indifferent to regional concerns? I do not think so. As someone who was born and raised in western Canada, as someone who has lived and worked most of his life in western Canada and as someone who represents over 77,000 western Canadians in this place, I can assure members of the Reform Party that western Canadians are not interested in playing regional games. They want a responsible national government that will help them create opportunities for the future.

Western Canada is a vibrant and exciting place. The region has experienced strong economic and population growth. The people have confidence in themselves and in their future. They are comfortable with their regional identities, but consider themselves Canadians first. The sooner the Reform Party recognizes this, the sooner the Reform Party will stop wasting parliament's time with silly motions.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of arrogant things said in the House, but I think that speech really takes the cake.

We are seeing more Liberal arrogance, from the top down, suggesting that a motion brought forward by 60 MPs who represent western Canada is somehow wrong because it does not show their silly alienation committee in a good light. We are very sorry, but the fact is that if that member wanted to know how western Canadians feel he would listen to the debates in the House. Sixty Reform MPs were elected to tell the Liberal government exactly how the people in the west feel.

I think the hon. member from Winnipeg should give his head a shake and simply look across the way. We have told the government over and over again that we oppose its tax and spend policies. We have told the government that we oppose its mandatory gun registration, which will do absolutely nothing to stop crime. The hon. member knows that we are very upset about the wheat board issue in the west.

Supply

Over and over again we bring these issues to the attention of this government and its solution is to take a committee across the west to ask if there is anything wrong. He should know that they lost eight seats in the last election because they would not listen.

• (1645)

After all that has gone on before, why on earth does he think that sending a travelling road show around the west will somehow fix the problem?

Mr. John Harvard: Mr. Speaker, I just love the rhetoric. Let me tell the member for Medicine Hat something.

Last Friday we in the task force went to Brandon, Manitoba. I will tell him about a couple of witnesses we heard from.

There was one gentleman by the name of Bob Friesen from the town of Wawanesa, Manitoba. I grew up 19 miles from Wawanesa. Who is Mr. Friesen? He happens to be the president of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, the largest farm organization in the country. I can say that Mr. Friesen appreciated the opportunity to spend more than an hour with us talking about farm issues, very relevant agricultural issues. And he did not raise one word of concern about the Canadian Wheat Board.

Who else did we meet at lunch in Brandon? A gentleman by the name of Don Dewar. He is from the community of Dauphin, Manitoba and he is hardly a Liberal. As far as I know I have never seen him walk in Liberal corridors. Who is Mr. Dewar? He is the president of KAP, Keystone Agricultural Producers, the largest farm organization in the province of Manitoba. Does the hon. member think that he did not appreciate meeting with the Prime Minister's task force? You bet your britches he did. He appreciated every minute.

That is what these meetings are about. That is what consultations are about. This is what we mean by going out and meeting people directly.

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as the member has indicated that his own task force is not important enough for us to discuss in the House, I will ask him two quick questions.

First, will he give a commitment that tomorrow his government will introduce the motion he wants to debate along with a full vote on the Kosovo situation?

Second, will he table in the House right now the schedule for the upcoming meetings of his task force if he is truly serious about consultation instead of releasing it a week after the meetings have happened?

Mr. John Harvard: Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely flattered that this gentleman from North Vancouver really thinks I can table a motion which would have to be properly tabled by the Prime Minister of Canada. I am quite sure that when the appropriate

motion has to be tabled, the Prime Minister will do that job very adequately.

Let me tell the hon. member for North Vancouver that all of the task force will be going to the beautiful province of British Columbia, a province where I lived for three wonderful years. We will be there during the break week in the month of May.

We are still taking requests. We are still taking submissions from people who want to appear before the task force. When we get the schedule all together, I will be more than happy to share the schedule and itinerary with the hon. member for North Vancouver. Let me say that if the hon. member for North Vancouver does not have an opportunity to make an oral presentation to the task force, I would be delighted to receive a letter from him. I am sure that he can write.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite offers a hope that there will be some reason in my remarks today. I am afraid I may be a little less crisp than I like to be in the House as I have just gotten off a plane from Geneva. It is a bit of a shock. I am feeling a little bit of culture shock right now as I have been away from Canada for the last three weeks, and to drop back into the middle of this debate is a bit jarring.

• (1650)

Before I address the substance of the motion put forward, I would like to say one thing. I had the opportunity over the past three weeks to travel to China. I am in China frequently these days. I followed that up with some time in Delhi and in Geneva. In Geneva I had the opportunity to spend some time with the people who are working on the human rights commission.

One does not have to get very far out of this country to realize what an absolutely incredible country this is and what a privilege it is to be a Canadian and how we are admired all around the world by almost every other country. People in every other country want to be here.

We show leadership. I was absolutely astounded in Geneva to note that a little country like Canada provides almost 10% of the resolutions that are debated in Geneva in a community of 123 to 190 countries.

We hear about disunity and division in our country but Canadians outside the country are doing an incredible job on behalf of all of us. We all benefit from it enormously.

I think about the sense of the regional divisions. In Geneva there are young francophones from Quebec working very hard and energetically. They are very proud of their country and are very proud to be representing Canada in the very important work they do.

There are western entrepreneurs in and out of China all the time working hard to build relationships and expand trade. I was pleased to note that there are New Brunswickers and Nova Scotians in China trying to forge some new pathways. I even heard talk of

Supply

some port building. I believe there is some accommodation for the post-Panamax ships which will carry large quantities of containers into the Pacific Rim.

They are Canadians from all over the country who are working hard. They are building upon the goodwill all of us have built for all of us to enjoy.

I was a little surprised to note the kind of querulous tone in the House today. If the concern is that the government is not sensitive to the regions, one would think that with a task force going into western Canada and one going into Quebec people would be celebrating and saying that it is wonderful we are doing that.

Perhaps some of the concern about it comes from something my friend from Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia is a little too modest to talk about, which is the tremendous success of the task force. He mentioned that the task force he chairs will be going to B.C. in May. The B.C. caucus has been touring the province. We all do that. The Manitoba caucus holds meetings right around the province every three to four months. It hears submissions from people, as members do in their ridings every day.

That information comes back and forms part of the information that builds the kind of consensus which allows the government to do the work it does. The government has done some pretty remarkable things over the last five or six years.

An hon. member: I wouldn't brag about it.

Mr. Reg Alcock: The member says he would not brag about it but I do. I brag about it quite often and without any hesitation whatsoever.

There is a desire in the kind of heated atmosphere which is created in this chamber to solve every problem immediately. I used to enjoy debating some of my colleagues in the Reform Party by quoting a poster a friend of mine has in his office. It reads "For every complex problem there is a simple answer and it's wrong". That is my feeling when the Reform Party raises the kind of debate it does in this House, quick, glib, easy criticisms to complex problems.

I admire our Prime Minister. If you think about it, politics is one of the few businesses where we tend to devalue experience. What we are reminded of every day is that we have a leader who understands the country better than any other person in this House and who has served the country longer than almost everybody else in this House.

• (1655)

When confronted with an issue he knows when to act and when to watch. He knows how to listen very carefully, not in a flashy

way, not with a lot of bells and whistles, but very carefully step by step, issue by issue. He has gone about the work with the full support of this caucus in continuing to build upon the foundation that makes this the best country in the world.

When I was first elected in 1993 I recall that we had a very serious economic problem. We now have a surplus. That did not come about easily. It did not come about quickly. It did not come about magically. A lot of hard decisions were taken one by one, sticking to our guns and carefully keeping our eye on the target budget after budget. Even when we got into a surplus, we continued to exercise restraint and continued to be careful.

Look at the question of lack of co-operation with the provinces. Again, there was no national referendum. There was no big task force running around. We sat down and went issue by issue. When we needed to look at a national child benefit we sat down and negotiated a way that we could do that in co-operation with the provinces and the provinces signed on. We needed to look at the issue of training. We sat down and negotiated a series of agreements. Co-operation improves services to everybody.

I believe this was the crowning achievement. I worked in social services for a great many years. The social union framework represents to me the first time in as long as I have been working that we put aside all of the bickering and wrangling about jurisdiction and created an environment within which we could sit down, discuss, negotiate and come to an agreement on how we together can provide better services for the people in this country.

That basically is what Canada is. Canada is a partnership. It is a partnership of regions. It is a partnership of people. Partnership works extremely well.

Our government is able to do that because of the kind of work that is done by the member from Charleswood. Members in Quebec are doing this as well. The member from Mississauga is doing the one on youth entrepreneurship. We have had them on small business and on gas pricing. Members are constantly talking to Canadians, listening to what they have to say and trying to incorporate those ideas in all of the other opinions which they receive from all over the country. They bring that to caucus every week.

The Prime Minister sits in caucus every week to listen to us. He insists that people be there. He insists that it be an important forum for us to debate and discuss. Every single week we hear in that forum members saying what they are hearing in their regions over and over again.

I am a little saddened. I have to make some comments to my friends to the Bloc as well as my friends in the Reform. When I meet with my friends in the Bloc and with people in Quebec, I meet with people who are very interested in providing services and

enhancing the quality of life for people living in their province. They are energetic, smart, interested and not afraid of the challenges in this world.

In western Canada we see the same thing. The picture brought into this House by the Reform Party is not the western Canada I know. Two of the wealthiest governments in the country exist in western Canada. The front page of the *Globe and Mail* showed my province of Manitoba as having the lowest unemployment rate in the country.

We are doing very well. We are doing very well in western Canada right now. We are doing it because people have found a way to put aside the bickering and the battling. They are focusing on making this an even better country.

• (1700)

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the speech given by my colleague, with whom I worked on the human resources development and transport committees.

Although his vision of Canada is a bit heavy on sweetness and light, I would still like to ask him a question to do with the fact that the disparities between the various regions of Canada have not in any way been eliminated, not since I have been an MP in any event.

One thing that could be said is that the disparities have grown more pronounced under the present Liberal government, one reason being EI reform.

If the Liberal government's attitude towards Canada's regions and the various provinces were truly open-minded—and I am not talking about the second part of the Reform Party's motion referring to a committee, as this part of the motion concerns me less than the first part, which says that the federal government has trouble identifying and addressing the regions' problems—would it not, when introducing the EI reform, have ensured rapid adjustment mechanisms? I am thinking of such notorious problems as the intensity rule, which penalizes seasonal workers.

Could it not have come up with a regional economic diversification policy so that the gas pipeline project would have had to go through the maritimes and eastern Quebec and play an important economic development role, rather than leaving things up to the market? The gas is now going directly through Nova Scotia to the United States and we are left with the short end of the stick again and prevented from enjoying the benefits of this development tool.

If the Liberal government were truly interested in the regions, it would not have replied, as the Minister of Natural Resources did to me, that it was up to the market, that other factors could not be taken into account.

Does this sound like a central government sensitive to needs and concerns, that would allow the regions to develop equitably, which would avoid the present disparities?

[English]

Mr. Reg Alcock: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member pointed out that we worked together. He, the hon. member for Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière and I served on the committee that looked at reforms in employment insurance.

Travelling with them, meeting and knowing these members, gave me some very important and valuable insights into Quebec. I have talked about some of the strengths and energy that I see in Quebec. These things encourage me and excite me. They make me feel positive about what is happening in Quebec. It is through knowing members who contributed forcefully and effectively to that committee that I feel that way.

Two things went on at that time. I remind the member that took place in 1994-95 when we were at the height of battling the deficit. We were in the midst of trying to get government spending under control. There were some very definite changes in the benefit levels. Also a philosophical change took place which talked about active rather than passive measures and doing things to help people gain employment rather than simply sit in unemployment. I think we have seen some of that.

Contrary to advice that was offered by members of other parties about what the unemployment rate would be doing by the turn of the century, we have seen the unemployment rate come down rather substantially over the last few years.

It is not nearly enough. I share the concern of the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques. My friend from New Brunswick has been on his feet many times raising the concern about seasonal workers and the unemployed in rural areas of eastern Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland.

These issues should be brought to the floor of the House. Frankly I would sooner be standing here debating that issue today than spending time digging around in the entrails of this supposed alienation.

• (1705)

[Translation]

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by indicating that I am going to

be sharing my time with the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques.

I am pleased to take part in this debate on the motion of the hon. member for North Vancouver, whom I met this summer, and who spoke to me of his region. Speaking as the Bloc Québécois critic for regional development, on first examination the first part of the motion by the hon. member for North Vancouver strikes me as worthwhile, in that the Bloc Québécois can share his point of view about the feelings, the perception we have concerning the Liberal government's neglect of the regions.

Of course, with regard to the Liberal committee on alienation, I shall leave that part for his comments. Mine I shall reserve for regional development.

There are three Liberal secretaries of state responsible for regional development agencies, as they used to be called. Now they are Economic Development Canada. In the case of Quebec, the change occurred last year, not for the sake of regional development but to give the Liberal Party better visibility, as it insisted on adding the word Canada all over the place. Now the trend is not to refer to regional development but to Economic Development Canada for the Regions of Quebec.

If the government were serious in its efforts on behalf of the regions, it would be putting more money in if for no other reason than to offset inflation and so on. When we look at the figures, we can see this is not the case for these three agencies. I will not provide details for each of the programs, but in the case of the agency for Quebec, the current budget is reduced by some \$27,636,000.

In the case of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, this year there is a \$40 million cut, since last year it was \$320 million and this year it is \$290 million. For the west—and here I must express my agreement with the Reform member—the budget for western Canada economic diversification, which was \$313,626,000 has been reduced this year to \$195,055,000, a difference of \$118,571,000. That means a significant reduction in this year's budget. That is the budget for the three agencies.

In the case of the west, a look at the changes in per capita income since 1961 according to Statistics Canada data, reveals that the Liberal government is not entirely mistaken, if we use the per capita income criterion. I am looking at the figures between 1961 and 1986. If we compare the west to Ontario, it went from 84% per capita to 98%. By the west we mean the three central provinces and British Columbia. In 1996, per capita income was within 2%, and now most observers say that all the western provinces have caught up with Ontario in economic terms.

What about the Atlantic provinces? In 1961, their per capita income was 49% of Ontario's and since then it has risen slightly to

Supply

69%. Per capita income in Quebec, which was 76% of Ontario's in 1961 had increased to 82% of it by 1996.

• (1710)

Now, if we look at the figures for the agencies I mentioned earlier, we see that, between 1994 and 2001—since we are already dealing with the 2000-2001 budget—per capita federal spending on regional development in the maritimes is \$1,074.40. In western Canada, per capita spending is \$285.30. Quebec, like Ontario—which was at 82% in 1996—still has a lot of catching up to do, since our province is only getting \$325.20 per capita, or three times less than the maritime provinces.

I can understand the concerns and representations of western Canada. However, based on these two figures provided by Statistics Canada and on the official budget figures, we can see that Quebec and the maritimes are even worse off than western Canada. In our opinion, Quebec still has a shortfall of \$749 per capita, compared to the maritimes. The federal government is treating us even worse than the maritimes.

Let us now look at the situation inside the province. Is the money properly distributed in Quebec by the Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions Agency? We have figures from last year, since this data is released three months after the money is spent. We can see that, in Liberal ridings, investments totalled \$41,546,973, or an average of \$1.5 million per riding. In the case of ridings represented by Bloc Québécois members, the average amount is \$1.38 million.

I could go on and on, but time is quickly running out. Earlier, I heard the Secretary of State responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec say that he did not want to indulge in petty politics, something he charged the opposition parties with doing. He wanted to take the high road. I therefore asked him whether he could assure us that he was not using the regional development budget to make political hay.

When I look at the numbers for some ridings, it makes me wonder. The riding in Quebec that receives the most money is Westmount—Ville-Marie, the riding represented by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Westmount is in downtown Montreal. Questions are in order. The riding that gets the most federal regional development dollars is smack in the middle of Montreal, in Westmount, the richest area in Quebec.

There is more. In the two minutes I have left, I would like to mention that I asked the Secretary of State responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec why, if he was going to talk about partnership, he was not trying to reach agreement with the provincial governments, Quebec

Supply

in particular, which has a federal-provincial agreement. It has been ages since that was renegotiated.

I asked him why he was not undertaking to respect the strategic plans of regional development councils in Quebec. Why does he not do so? More locally, why does the Secretary of State for Quebec regional development obstinately refuse access to the boards of the CFDCs, these corporations that loan money to small businesses, to members of local development centres, which are structures on which all Quebec stakeholders, including the municipalities, are represented, and all other sectors. He refuses to do so.

Instead he is looking for a parallel policy in order to ensure visibility, for example by making arrangements to provide local chambers of commerce with computers so they can provide the federal programs with information, instead of seeking to join forces with structures that really represent the population.

A government that wants to reach agreement so as to forge partnerships ought to respect provincial policies first of all, second regional council policies, and third the agreements of citizens at the local level, who have joined forces with the local development centres in order to carry out projects.

• (1715)

Instead, the federal government is after visibility and wants to develop technology projects with no concern for strategic plans.

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the member opposite's references to the CFDCs.

There is one thing he neglected to mention. These were created with the key companies in Abitibi—Témiscamingue in 1983 and put in place by the government in 1984. Quebec turns up 15 years later with the CLDs. Are there volunteers?

Quebec Minister of Agriculture Rémi Trudel described the CFDCs a number of years ago as "the finest forum in the regions for concerted efforts; it comes from the federal government".

Today, I have a question and this is what I want to ask the hon. member: After 15 years of efforts by the CFDCs using federal funding and the money of Quebecers, this is the finest forum for concerted efforts and yet the member speaks of duplication. They are the ones who want to duplicate. Quebec wants to duplicate what the federal government is doing.

The member referred to the CLDs, which have just been created. They have virtually no funds, while the CFDCs are well established throughout the province of Quebec, Abitibi in particular.

I ask the member whether all this has to be done away with?

Mr. Antoine Dubé: Mr. Speaker, I would first like to say that I notice the member wants to recover go back some 15 years, to the time he spent as a Progressive Conservative member. It is a fine effort, and we see what he is up to. The words are the same, the party is different.

The member knows very well that the CLDs are a replacement structure, with an expanded mandate, which serve as a complement to the existing economic councils, even those existing 15 years ago.

The member speak of duplication by the federal government. It existed 15 years ago and still exists. The efforts of the Government of Quebec through various departments responsible for regional development mean the work done by the SADCs is recognized. They do an excellent job, no one is criticizing them. They act as volunteers on the boards.

They have expertise we want to promote, on the condition that the minister agrees these people can work on a co-operative basis. He is the one currently blocking things now. He is busting his britches looking only for visibility for the Liberal government, for his party and for federalism.

[English]

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I followed the debate and accessed some of the research points, and I think this goes to what the member has been saying.

Let us consider some of the examples respecting the western provinces like federal funding for Tri-University Meson Facility in B.C., \$166 million; \$670 million in Alberta in infrastructure projects; \$359 million in Saskatchewan for infrastructure projects and another \$1.5 billion for an aerospace industry initiative; and another \$224 million in Manitoba in federal assistance to the Red River Valley fund.

When we look at the different initiatives the federal government has taken with regard to the provinces I have just talked about, we recognize very clearly the diversity of Canada. Certainly Quebec has had its share of difficulties. The federal and the provincial governments have come together to address the needs of the people of Quebec, especially at times of need and natural disasters.

Would the member, in the brief time remaining, comment on the significance to him of the social union, and particularly the health accord to which the Premier of Quebec is a signatory? Would he view that as a sign of federal provincial co-operation which benefits all Canadians?

• (1720)

[Translation]

Mr. Antoine Dubé: Mr. Speaker, the member said a lot of things. It is very easy for anyone in this House to take a series of

Supply

figures, financial support here, a contract there and maybe a loan somewhere else. It can make different impressions.

We are mixing apples and oranges. Today's discussion is not about all the federal programs, but about regional development. The figures I quoted earlier are in the budget.

For fifteen seconds, I am going to comment on the social union. It is an agreement in which the provinces other than Quebec, wanting more money, sacrificed principles and jurisdictions for it, something Quebec was not prepared to do. It values its jurisdictions, it values its principles and its objectives and it will not be bought.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take part in the debate on the Reform Party motion, at the end of this opposition day.

I partially agree with the motion, particularly its first part, which provides that this House should condemn the government for failing to identify and address the main concerns and issues of the regions of Canada.

With regard to that first part of the motion, there are many issues, many realities which show that in Canada, since the last two elections, that is since the Liberals took office—and the membership of this parliament is a prime example—regional parties have a strong representation. These are parties that represent Canada's regions, because there is a great deal of frustration among our fellow citizens. Let me give you a few examples to support my point.

First, there is the whole issue of employment insurance. A few years ago, the government decided to completely change the unemployment insurance program and to transform it into what was called the employment insurance program. However, this is much more a program used by the government to fight the deficit, to try to pocket money as quickly as possible, without any regard for the impact on regional development.

In Canada, a kind of social pact had been in place for quite some time, in fact for several decades. There was a major seasonal industry in resource-based regions, such as those living off the agricultural, logging or fishing industry, since there were no permanent jobs in those industries. An EI system was introduced that allowed people to work during periods when there were jobs and to have supplemental income during periods when there were none.

A forestry worker cannot cut down trees year round. It is the same for fishers; there is a period of the year when it is not possible to work. Those who harvest peat, an industry in my region, have the same problem.

The federal government decided to scrap this social pact. It tightened up the EI program to the point where many people have no income at all for five, ten or fifteen weeks every year. Another result is that someone earning minimum wage will receive EI benefits that are actually less than welfare, and thus less than the minimum required to get by.

These are not hypothetical examples. I am talking about folks we see in our ridings. Recently, I met with someone in this very situation, a 51-year-old man who had always had a seasonal job and was therefore being penalized. He was losing 1% of his benefits for 15, 20 or 25 weeks every year. This is completely unacceptable.

For people such as these in our regions, the federal government's behaviour shows that it has no understanding of or sensitivity to regional development needs.

We have other similar examples. If the federal government were concerned about the needs of the regions, it would already have introduced a pro-shipbuilding strategy. It would listen to the suggestions of the member for Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière and this industrial sector could be revived in the regions where it once thrived.

Through its inaction and failure to understand what is needed to put things right, the federal government continues to ignore the needs of the regions, to stand in the way of their full development.

● (1725)

Another example is the millennium scholarships. Some will say that scholarships are far from being regional development. In Canada, however, there are people, federalists, who consider Quebec to be a region of Canada. They tell the Quebec government, which is responsible for education, "Your loan and scholarship program, the best in Canada, will be shunted aside and we will create a plan for merit-based scholarships which will directly finance the university studies of certain students but this will be according to their academic success and not their financial need". This is in direct contradiction with the basic principles of the Quebec program.

This is one more way for the federal government to show that it has solutions for everything and must, in order to raise its profile, trample on people's needs.

Earlier there was a debate on the CFDCs. No one has said that all federal government ideas are bad ones, but what is certainly bad is to have put in place and perpetuated for decades two regimes for local development, side by side. Even if today there are the Community Futures Development Corporations, with a mandate and a community base, there are also CLDs, local development centres. Why both, when each region could manage very well with just one? Because the federal government insists on being involved in regional development, a sector clearly not its responsibility.

Supply

There are many examples of how the federal government violated, if you will, the social pact that united Canadians. We witnessed this with the income sharing program and the changes to equalization rules.

The first part of the Reform Party motion obviously refers to people living in the various regions of Canada. Now, national policies are dictated by bureaucrats. This is not necessarily because elected representatives act in bad faith, but because of the huge bureaucracy that the government has allowed to develop in Ottawa over the past 20 or 25 years. Very quickly, those appointed to cabinet start speaking primarily on behalf of these bureaucrats, instead of representing their voters and the various regions of Canada.

We must root out this evil in Ottawa. In that sense, the Reform Party motion is right on target.

I can understand why the Liberal Party of Canada is desperately trying to establish roots in various parts of the country, because there are some regions where no Liberals have been elected for a long time, which is also a reflection of public discontent.

For example, how could people in Quebec's eastern region elect a Liberal candidate when, in recent years, the Liberal Party has reneged on its principles regarding how the unemployed should be treated, preferring instead to pursue the policies set in place by the Conservatives? People are not stupid. They know what they are doing when they vote. They are sending a message to the government, and the government should listen.

I will conclude by describing what I think would be the way the federal government could show clearly it is listening to the regions. Let us take the very real example of the gas pipeline, whose route, which was decided last year, could have been through eastern Quebec and northern New Brunswick and on to Sable Island. The decision was to let market rules apply.

This is what the Minister of Natural Resources blissfully told me in a letter "We have decided to leave the market rules,—to ensure the natural gas finds its way as quickly as possible to the United States—to let these people have a significant competitive edge". However, had the entire region between Bernières, the Rivière-du-Loup region and New Brunswick been provided with natural gas, there would have been a significant competitive edge that would have attracted business.

Either market rules prevail, and gas service is provided where business exists, or the government plays the role of financial lever of economic development and gives the regions appropriate tools. This is the sort of action the people in our regions are waiting for because at the moment there is deep dissatisfaction which is expressed in this House by among other things the first part of the Reform Party's motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Mr. Speaker, it being 5.30 p.m., it is my duty to inform the House that proceedings on the motion have expired.

• (1730)

[English]

BANK ACT

The House resumed from March 24 consideration of the motion that Bill C-67, an act to amend the Bank Act, the Winding-up and Restructuring Act and other acts relating to financial institutions and to make consequential amendments to other acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): It being 5.30 p.m., pursuant to order made on Wednesday, March 24, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-67.

Call in the members.

• (1800)

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

(Division No. 365)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Borotsik
Boudria	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brisson	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Casson
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chatters	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Elley
Epp	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Forseth	Fry
Gagliano	Gallaway
Godfrey	Goodale
Gouk	Graham
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Grose	Guarnieri
Hanger	Harb

Harris	Hart
Harvard	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Hubbard	Ianno
Ifody	Jackson
Jaffer	Jennings
Johnston	Jones
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kerpan
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Konrad	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
Lunn	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Mark	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McNally
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Mitchell
Morrison	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
Nunziata	Obhrai
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Pankiw	Parrish
Patry	Penson
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Power	Pratt
Price	Proud
Provenzano	Ramsay
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Ritz
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton)	Scott (Skeena)
Sekora	Serré
Solberg	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Vellacott	Volpe
Wappel	Wayne
Whelan	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)	Wilfert
Williams	Wood—212

NAYS

Members

Alarie	Asselin
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Blaikie	Brien
Canuel	Cardin
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dockrill	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Earle
Fournier	Gagnon

Private Members' Business

Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Guay
Guimond	Hardy
Laliberte	Lalonde
Laurin	Lebel
Lill	Loubier
Mancini	Marceau
Marchand	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough	Ménard
Mercier	Nystrom
Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Proctor
Riis	Robinson
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Solomon	St-Hilaire
Stoffer	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp	Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis—60	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Dumas	Finestone
Godin (Châteauguay)	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	Paradis
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Venne

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Finance.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

TRANSIT PASSES

The House resumed from March 24 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Wednesday, March 24, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 360 under Private Members' Business.

We have been through the private members' voting procedure before. We will take the vote starting with those in favour in the back row on my left. All those in favour of the motion will please rise.

Private Members' Business

● (1810)

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

*(Division No. 366)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Bélaïr
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blaikie
Bonin	Bonin
Borotsik	Borotsik
Bradshaw	Bradshaw
Brison	Brison
Bryden	Bryden
Byrne	Byrne
Cadman	Cadman
Cannis	Cannis
Caplan	Caplan
Carroll	Carroll
Cauchon	Cauchon
Chan	Chan
Chatters	Chatters
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre	Coderre
Comuzzi	Comuzzi
Crête	Crête
Dalphond-Guiral	Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye	de Savoye
Desjarlais	Desjarlais
DeVillers	DeVillers
Dion	Dion
Dockrill	Dockrill
Dromisky	Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Duceppe
Earle	Earle
Eggleton	Eggleton
Finlay	Finlay
Fontana	Fontana
Fournier	Fournier
Gagliano	Gagliano
Gallaway	Gallaway
Girard-Bujold	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham	Graham
Guay	Guay
Harb	Harb
Harris	Harris
Harvard	Harvard
Ianno	Ianno
Jackson	Jackson
Jennings	Jennings
Jones	Jones
Karetak-Lindell	Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)	Keddy (South Shore)
Keyes	Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan	Kraft Sloan
Lalonde	Lalonde
Laurin	Laurin
Lebel	Lebel
Leung	Leung
Lincoln	Lincoln
Loubier	Loubier
MacAulay	MacAulay
Mahoney	Mahoney
Maloney	Maloney
	Alonczy
	Alarie
	Anderson
	Assadourian
	Augustine
	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
	Bakopanos
	Bélaïr
	Bellemare
	Bergeron
	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
	Bevilacqua
	Blaikie
	Bonin
	Borotsik
	Bradshaw
	Brison
	Bryden
	Byrne
	Cadman
	Cannis
	Caplan
	Carroll
	Cauchon
	Chan
	Chatters
	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
	Coderre
	Comuzzi
	Crête
	Dalphond-Guiral
	de Savoye
	Desjarlais
	DeVillers
	Dion
	Dockrill
	Dromisky
	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
	Duceppe
	Earle
	Eggleton
	Finlay
	Fontana
	Fournier
	Gagliano
	Gallaway
	Girard-Bujold
	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
	Graham
	Guay
	Harb
	Harris
	Harvard
	Ianno
	Jackson
	Jennings
	Jones
	Karetak-Lindell
	Keddy (South Shore)
	Keyes
	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
	Kraft Sloan
	Lalonde
	Laurin
	Lebel
	Leung
	Lincoln
	Loubier
	MacAulay
	Mahoney
	Maloney
	Alonczy
	Alarie
	Anderson
	Assadourian
	Augustine
	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
	Bakopanos
	Bélaïr
	Bellemare
	Bergeron
	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
	Bevilacqua
	Blaikie
	Bonin
	Borotsik
	Bradshaw
	Brison
	Bryden
	Byrne
	Cadman
	Cannis
	Caplan
	Carroll
	Cauchon
	Chan
	Chatters
	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
	Coderre
	Comuzzi
	Crête
	Dalphond-Guiral
	de Savoye
	Desjarlais
	DeVillers
	Dion
	Dockrill
	Dromisky
	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
	Duceppe
	Earle
	Eggleton
	Finlay
	Fontana
	Fournier
	Gagliano
	Gallaway
	Girard-Bujold
	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
	Graham
	Guay
	Harb
	Harris
	Harvard
	Ianno
	Jackson
	Jennings
	Jones
	Karetak-Lindell
	Keddy (South Shore)
	Keyes
	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
	Kraft Sloan
	Lalonde
	Laurin
	Lebel
	Leung
	Lincoln
	Loubier
	MacAulay
	Mahoney
	Maloney

Manley	Marceau
Marchand	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Mifflin
Milliken	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Normand	Nunziata
Nystrom	Obhrai
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Perron	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Plamondon	Power
Pratt	Price
Proctor	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Riis
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton)
Scott (Skeena)	Sekora
Serré	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Hilaire
Stinson	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vancilief
Vautour	Vellacott
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcyia-Leis	Wayne
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—240	

NAYS

Members

Anders	Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Elley
Gouk	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Grose
Hanger	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoepfner	Hubbard
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Konrad
Mark	McNally
Mills (Red Deer)	Pillitteri
Richardson	Solberg
Strahl	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—25	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Dumas	Finestone
Godin (Châteauguay)	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	Paradis
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Venne

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1815)

[Translation]

COASTAL FISHERIES PROTECTION ACT

The House resumed from March 25 consideration of Bill C-27, an act to amend the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act and the Canada Shipping Act to enable Canada to implement the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 Relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks and other international fisheries treaties or arrangements, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made Thursday, March 25, 1999, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at report stage of Bill C-27.

[English]

The first question is on Motion No. 1.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members are in favour of the motion.

[English]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, NDP members present this evening vote yes to this motion.

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, members of the Conservative Party vote yes to this motion.

Government Orders

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the residents of York South—Weston I would vote against this motion.

Ms. Colleen Beaumier: Mr. Speaker, I did not vote on the last vote and I would like to be recorded as voting with my party on this vote.

Mr. Ted White: Mr. Speaker, as I abstained on the previous vote I would like my vote recorded as opposed to this one.

Mr. Gerry Ritz: Mr. Speaker, since I abstained on the last vote too, I would like my vote recorded as being opposed to this one.

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 367)

YEAS

Members

Alarie	Asselin
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Borotsik
Blaikie	Brisson
Brien	Cardin
Canuel	Crête
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Davies
Dalphondu-Guiral	Debien
de Savoye	Desrochers
Desjarlais	Doyle
Dockrill	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Earle
Duceppe	Gagnon
Fournier	Girard-Bujold
Gauthier	Guay
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Hardy
Guimond	Jones
Herron	Laliberte
Keddy (South Shore)	Laurin
Lalonde	Lill
Lebel	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Loubier	Marceau
Mancini	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Marchand	Ménard
McDonough	Muise
Mercier	Perron
Nystrom	Plamondon
Picard (Drummond)	Price
Power	Riis
Proctor	Rocheleau
Robinson	Solomon
Sauvageau	St-Jacques
St-Hilaire	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Stoffer	Turp
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Wasylycia-Leis
Vautour	
Wayne—76	

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Anders	Anderson

Government Orders

Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bailey	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Casson
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chatters	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Elley
Epp	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Forseth	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Godfrey	Goodale
Gouk	Graham
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Grose	Guarnieri
Hanger	Harb
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoeppner	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jaffer
Jennings	Johnston
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Konrad
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	Lunn
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Mark	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McNally
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Mitchell
Morrison	Murray
Myers	Nault
Normand	Nunziata
Obhrai	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Pankiw
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Proud	Provenzano
Ramsay	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Ritz	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton)
Scott (Skeena)	Sekora
Serré	Solberg
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
St-Julien	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (Wild Rose)

Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vellacott
Volpe	Wappel
Whelan	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)	Wilfert
Williams	Wood—196

PAIRED MEMBERS

Dumas	Finestone
Godin (Châteauguay)	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	Paradis
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Venne

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

• (1820)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the motion now before the House, and to Motions Nos. 4 and 8.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 368*)

YEAS

Members

Alarie	Asselin
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Borotsik
Blaikie	Brison
Brien	Cardin
Canuel	Crête
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Davies
Dalphond-Guiral	Debien
de Savoye	Desrochers
Desjarlais	Doyle
Dockrill	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Earle
Duceppe	Gagnon
Fournier	Girard-Bujold
Gauthier	Guay
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Hardy
Guimond	
Herron	

Government Orders

Jones
Laliberté
Laurin
Lill
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Ménard
Muisse
Perron
Plamondon
Price
Riis
Rocheleau
Solomon
St-Jacques
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Turp
Wasylycia-Leis

Keddy (South Shore)
Lalonde
Lebel
Loubier
Mancini
Marchand
McDonough
Mercier
Nystrom
Picard (Drummond)
Power
Proctor
Robinson
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Stoffer
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Vautour
Wayne—76

Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague
Meredith
Milliken
Minna
Morrison
Myers
Normand
Obhrai
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Penson
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proud
Ramsay
Reed
Ritz
Rock
Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Whelan
White (North Vancouver)
Williams

Konrad
Lastewka
Lee
Lincoln
Lunn
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Marleau
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McNally
McWhinney
Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Pankiw
Patry
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Provenzano
Redman
Richardson
Robillard
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora
Solberg
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Valeri
Vellacott
Wappel
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wilfert
Wood—196

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Anders
Assad
Augustine
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bryden
Byrne
Cadman
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Clouthier
Collenette
Coppes
De Villiers
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Epp
Folco
Forseth
Gagliano
Godfrey
Gouk
Grewal
Grose
Hanger
Harris
Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Ianno
Jackson
Jennings
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kerpan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Benoit
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Calder
Caplan
Casson
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Drouin
Easter
Elley
Finlay
Fontana
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Graham
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guarnieri
Harb
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Hubbard
Iftody
Jaffer
Johnston
Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Dumas
Godin (Châteauguay)
Massé
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Finestone
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Paradis
Venne

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 3. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 5, 6, 9, 11 and 17.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, you would find unanimous consent that the members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion currently before the House, with the Liberals voting nay.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Government Orders

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will vote yes to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, needless to say, the members of the Bloc Québécois will be voting in favour of this excellent motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, NDP members present vote yes to this motion.

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, members of the Conservative Party vote yes to this motion.

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I would vote in favour of this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 369*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bigras	Blaikie
Borotsik	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Brisson	Cadman
Canuel	Cardin
Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dockrill	Doyle
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duceppe	Earle
Elley	Epp
Forseath	Fournier
Gagnon	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gouk	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Hardy	Harris
Hart	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kerpan
Konrad	Laliberte
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Lill
Loubier	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McDonough
McNally	Ménard
Mercier	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Muise	Nunziata
Nystrom	Obhrai
Pankiw	

Perron
Plamondon
Price
Ramsay
Ritz
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solberg
St-Hilaire
St-Jacques
Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Turp
Vellacott
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—127

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepolo
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Proud
Provenzano	Redman

Government Orders

Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—145

Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

Dumas
Godin (Châteauguay)
Massé
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Finestone
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Paradis
Venne

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 3 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 5, 6, 9, 11 and 17 defeated. The next question is on Motion No. 4.

(The House divided on Motion No. 4, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 370)

YEAS

Members

Alarie	Asselin
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bergeron
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras
Blaikie	Borotsik
Brien	Brisson
Canuel	Cardin
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dockrill	Doyle
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duceppe	Earle
Fournier	Gagnon
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Guay
Guimond	Hardy
Herron	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	Laliberte
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Lill
Loubier	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini	Marceau
Marchand	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough	Ménard
Mercier	Muise
Nystrom	Perron
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Power	Price
Proctor	Riis
Robinson	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Solomon
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
Stoffer	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Turp
Vautour	Wasylycia-Leis
Wayne—76	

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bailey	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Casson
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chatters	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Elley
Epp	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Forseth	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Godfrey	Goodale
Gouk	Graham
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Grose	Guarnieri
Hanger	Harb
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoeppner	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jaffer
Jennings	Johnston
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Konrad
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	Lunn
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Mark	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McNally
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Mitchell
Morrison Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
Nunziata	Ohrai

Government Orders

O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Pankiw
Patri
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Provenzano
Redman
Richardson
Robillard
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora
Solberg
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Valeri
Véllacott
Wappel
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wilfert
Wood—196

O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Penson
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proud
Ramsay
Reed
Ritz
Rock
Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)
Serré
Speller
Steeckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Whelan
White (North Vancouver)
Williams

McDonough
Mercier
Nystrom
Picard (Drummond)
Power
Proctor
Robinson
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Stoffer
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Vautour
Wayne—76

Ménard
Muise
Perron
Plamondon
Price
Riis
Rocheleau
Solomon
St-Jacques
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Turp
Wasylcyia-Leis

PAIRED MEMBERS

Dumas
Godin (Châteauguay)
Massé
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Finestone
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Paradis
Venne

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 defeated. The next question is on Motion No. 8.

(The House divided on Motion No. 8, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 371)

YEAS

Members

Alarie	Asselin
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Borotsik
Blaikie	Brisson
Brien	Cardin
Canuel	Crête
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Davies
Dalphond-Guiral	Debien
de Savoye	Desrochers
Desjarlais	Doyle
Dockrill	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Earle
Duceppe	Gagnon
Fournier	Girard-Bujold
Gauthier	Guay
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Hardy
Guimond	Jones
Herron	Laliberte
Keddy (South Shore)	Laurin
Lalonde	Lill
Lebel	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Loubier	Marceau
Mancini	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Marchand	

Abbott
Adams
Anders
Assad
Augustine
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bryden
Byrne
Cadman
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Clouthier
Collenette
Coppes
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Epp
Folco
Forseth
Gagliano
Godfrey
Gouk
Grewal
Grose
Hanger
Harris
Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Ianno
Jackson
Jennings
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kerpan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
MacAulay

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Benoit
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Calder
Caplan
Casson
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Drouin
Easter
Elley
Finlay
Fontana
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Graham
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guarnieri
Hart
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Hubbard
Itody
Jaffer
Johnston
Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Lastewka
Lee
Lincoln
Lunn

Government Orders

Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Marleau
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McNally
McWhinney
Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Pankiw
Patry
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Provenzano
Redman
Richardson
Robillard
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora
Solberg
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Valeri
Vellacott
Wappel
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wilfert
Wood—196

Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague
Meredith
Milliken
Minna
Morrison
Myers
Normand
Obhrai
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Penson
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proud
Ramsay
Reed
Ritz
Rock
Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Whelan
White (North Vancouver)
Williams

PAIRED MEMBERS

Dumas
Godin (Châteauguay)
Massé
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Finestone
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Paradis
Venne

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 8 defeated. Therefore Motions Nos. 7 and 12 are also defeated.

The next question is on the amendment to Motion No. 10.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding that the member for Hamilton East had to leave, if the House would agreed I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: Before I ask the hon. whip to tell us what he will do, I remind members that we are voting on the amendment.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members vote yes to the amendment.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois oppose this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, NDP members present vote yes to the amendment.

[Translation]

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, the members of my party will vote yea on this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents I would vote yes to this motion.

• (1825)

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

(Division No. 372)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bailey
Benoit	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaikie	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brisson	Cadman
Casson	Chatters
Davies	Desjarlais
Dockrill	Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Earle
Elley	Epp
Forseth	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gouk	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hanger
Hardy	Harris
Hart	Herron
Hill (MacLeod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoeppner
Jaffer	Johnston
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kennedy (Calgary Southeast)	Kerpan
Konrad	Laliberte
Lill	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McDonough
McNally	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Muise	Nunziata
Nystrom	Obhrai
Pankiw	Penson
Power	Price
Proctor	Ramsay
Riis	Ritz
Robinson	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Solomon	Stinson
St-Jacques	Stoffer
Strahl	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Vautour
Vellacott	Wasylcia-Leis
Wayne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—88

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Adams
Alcock
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Caplan
Carroll
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
de Savoye
Desrochers
Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Drouin
Duceppe
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon
Gauthier
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harvard
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Leung
Longfield
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
Marchand
Marleau
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Mercier
Milliken
Mitchell
Myers
Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)

Alarie
Anderson
Assadourian
Augustine
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bertrand
Bigras
Bonin
Boudria
Brien
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Canuel
Cardin
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier
Collenette
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duhamel
Eggleton
Folco
Fournier
Gagliano
Gallaway
Girard-Bujold
Goodale
Grose
Guay
Harb
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lavigne
Lee
Lincoln
Loubier
Mahoney
Maloney
Marceau
Marchi
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Ménard
Mifflin
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)

O'Reilly
Parrish
Peric
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Plamondon
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rocheleau
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Hilaire
Szabo
Thibeault
Turp
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—183

Pagtakhan
Patri
Perron
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Pratt
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Rock
Sauvageau
Sekora
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

Dumas
Godin (Châteauguay)
Massé
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Finestone
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Paradis
Venne

The Speaker: I declare the amendment to Motion No. 10 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 10. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 13.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the motion now before the House.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 10, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 373)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Benoit
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brison
Casson
Davies
Dockrill
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Elley
Forseth
Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hardy
Hart
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)

Ablonczy
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Bailey
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cadman
Chatters
Desjarlais
Doyle
Earle
Epp
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Hanger
Harris
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan

Government Orders

Konrad	Laliberte	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Lill	Lunn	Kraft Sloan	Lalonde
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini	Lastewka	Laurin
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Lavigne	Lebel
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McDonough	Lee	Leung
McNally	Meredith	Lincoln	Longfield
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison	Loubier	MacAulay
Muise	Nunziata	Mahoney	Malhi
Nystrom	Obhrai	Maloney	Manley
Pankiw	Penson	Marceau	Marchand
Power	Price	Marchi	Marleau
Proctor	Ramsay	McCormick	McGuire
Riis	Ritz	McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
Robinson	Schmidt	McTeague	McWhinney
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg	Ménard	Mercier
Solomon	Stinson	Mifflin	Milliken
St-Jacques	Stoffer	Minna	Mitchell
Strahl	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Murray	Myers
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Vautour	Nault	Normand
Vellacott	Wasylycia-Leis	O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Wayne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)	O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—88	Parrish	Parry
		Peric	Perron
		Peterson	Pettigrew
		Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
		Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
		Plamondon	Pratt
		Proud	Provenzano
		Redman	Reed
		Richardson	Robillard
		Rocheleau	Rock
		Saada	Sauvageau
		Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
		Serré	Speller
		St. Denis	Steckle
		Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
		St-Hilaire	St-Julien
		Szabo	Telegdi
		Thibeault	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
		Turp	Ur
		Valeri	Vanclief
		Volpe	Wappel
		Whelan	Wilfert
		Wood—183	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brien
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Canuel
Caplan	Cardin
Carroll	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Comuzzi	Crête
Cullen	Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye	Debien
Desrochers	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dromiskya
Drouin	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fournier
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon	Galloway
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Grose
Guarnieri	Guay
Guimond	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Ifody
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Dumas	Finestone
Godin (Châteauguay)	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	Paradis
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Venne

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 10 lost. I therefore declare Motion No. 13 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 14.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Government Orders

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members vote no to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois vote nay on this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, NDP members present this evening vote yes to this motion.

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, members of the Conservative Party vote yes to this motion.

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents I would vote yes to this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 14, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 374)***YEAS***Members*

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Blaikie
Borotsik	Brison
Davies	Desjarlais
Dockrill	Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Hardy
Herron	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	Laliberte
Lill	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough	Muise
Nunziata	Nystrom
Power	Price
Proctor	Riis
Robinson	Solomon
St-Jacques	Stoffer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Vautour
Wasylcyia-Leis	Wayne—38

NAYS*Members*

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anders
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélaire	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bevilacqua
Bertrand	Blondin-Andrew
Bigras	Bonwick
Bonin	Bradshaw
Boudria	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Brown
Brien	Bulte
Bryden	Caccia
Byrne	Calder
Cadman	Canuel
Cannis	Cardin
Caplan	Casson
Carroll	Chamberlain
Cauchon	
Chan	

Charbonneau	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Crête	Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral	de Savoye
Debien	Desrochers
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duceppe
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Elley
Epp	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Forseth	Fournier
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon	Galloway
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Goodale
Gouk	Graham
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Hanger	Harb
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoepfner	Hubbard
Ianno	Ifody
Jackson	Jaffer
Jennings	Johnston
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Konrad
Kraft Sloan	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	Lunn
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marceau
Marchand	Marchi
Mark	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McNally
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Mitchell
Morrison	Murray
Myers	Nault
Normand	Obhrai
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Pankiw	Parrish
Patry	Penson
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pratt
Proud	Provenzano
Ramsay	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Ritz	Robillard
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Schmidt	

Government Orders

Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora
Solberg
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Hilaire
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Whelan
White (North Vancouver)
Williams

Scott (Skeena)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Turp
Valeri
Vellacott
Wappel
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wilfert
Wood—233

PAIRED MEMBERS

Dumas
Godin (Châteauguay)
Massé
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Finestone
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Paradis
Venne

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 14 defeated.

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

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, you will find unanimous consent that the members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion currently before the House, with the Liberals voting yea.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members agree with this motion and will vote yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois support this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, NDP members present vote yes to this motion.

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, members of the Progressive Conservative Party vote yes to this motion.

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting in favour of the motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 15, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 375*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Alcock
Anderson
Assadourian
Augustine

Ablonczy
Alarie
Anders
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bonin
Borosik
Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brisson
Bryden
Byrne
Cadman
Cannis
Caplan
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Doyle
Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel
Easter
Elley
Finlay
Fontana
Fournier
Gagliano
Galloway
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gouk
Grewal
Grose
Guay
Hanger
Hardy
Hart
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Ianno
Jackson
Jennings
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Leung
Lincoln
Loubier
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Marchand
Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McCormick

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumur
Bélanger
Bennett
Bergeron
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Calder
Canuel
Cardin
Casson
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier
Collenette
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Desjarlais
DeVillers
Dion
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe
Earle
Eggleton
Epp
Folco
Forseth
Fry
Gagnon
Gauthier
Godfrey
Goodale
Graham
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harb
Harris
Harvard
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Hubbard
Iftody
Jaffer
Johnston
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Laliberte
Lastewka
Lavigne
Lee
Lill
Longfield
Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marceau
Marchi
Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough

Government Orders

McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McNally
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Mitchell
Morrison	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
Nunziata	Nystrom
Obhrai	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Pankiw
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Perron	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Power	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proud	Provenzano
Ramsay	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Ritz
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton)
Scott (Skeena)	Sekora
Serré	Solberg
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Hilaire	Stinson
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Stoffer	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Vautour	Vellacott
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcia-Leis	Wayne
Whelan	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)	Wilfert
Williams	White—271

● (1830)

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no to this motion unless instructed otherwise by our constituents.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois support this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, NDP members present vote yes one more time.

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, Conservative Party members vote yes to this motion.

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I have been convinced by my friends in the Reform Party to vote no to this motion.

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

(Division No. 376)

NAYS

Members

*Nil/aucun

PAIRED MEMBERS

Dumas	Finestone
Godin (Châteauguay)	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	Paradis
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Venne

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 15 carried. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 16 and 18 carried.

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree, I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brisson
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cloutier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Cullen	Davies
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fry

Private Members' Business

Gagliano	Galloway	Epp	Forseth
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Fournier	Gagnon
Goodale	Graham	Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Grose	Guarnieri	Gouk	Grewal
Harb	Hardy	Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Harvard	Herron	Guimond	Hanger
Hubbard	Ianno	Harris	Hart
Iftody	Jackson	Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings	Jones	Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell	Jaffer	Johnston
Karygiannis	Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kerpan
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Konrad	Lalonde
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson	Laurin	Lebel
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte	Loubier	Lunn
Lastewka	Lavigne	Marceau	Marchand
Lee	Leung	Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Lill	Lincoln	McNally	Ménard
Longfield	MacAulay	Mercier	Meredith
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney	Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Malhi	Maloney	Nunziata	Obhrai
Mancini	Manley	Pankiw	Penson
Marchi	Marleau	Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McCormick	Plamondon	Ramsay
McDonough	McGuire	Ritz	Rocheleau
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)	Sauvageau	Schmidt
McTeague	McWhinney	Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Mifflin	Milliken	St-Hilaire	Stinson
Minna	Mitchell	Strahl	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Muise	Murray	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Turp
Myers	Nault	Vellacott	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Normand	Nystrom	White (North Vancouver)	Williams—90
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)		
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan		
Parrish	Patry		
Peric	Peterson		
Pettigrew	Phinney		
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri	Dumas	Finestone
Power	Pratt	Godin (Châteauguay)	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Price	Proctor	Massé	Paradis
Proud	Provenzano	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Venne
Redman	Reed		
Richardson	Riis		
Robillard	Robinson		
Rock	Saada		
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora		
Serré	Solomon		
Speller	St. Denis		
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)		
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Jacques		
St-Julien	Stoffer		
Szabo	Telegdi		
Thibeault	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)		
Ur	Valeri		
Vanclief	Vautour		
Volpe	Wappel		
Wasylycia-Leis	Wayne		
Whelan	Wilfert		
Wood —181			

PAIRED MEMBERS

Dumas	Finestone
Godin (Châteauguay)	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	Paradis
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Venne

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean) Bailey
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bigras	Brien
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Canuel
Cadman	Casson
Cardin	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Chatters	Dalphond-Guiral
Crête	Debien
de Savoye	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Desrochers	Elley
Duceppe	

CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

The House resumed from March 25 consideration of the motion that Bill S-11, an act to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act in order to add social condition as a prohibited ground of discrimination, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Thursday, March 25, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded

Private Members' Business

division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill S-11 under Private Members' Business.

Since this is a private member's bill we will vote as we usually do. The mover of the motion will be the first to vote and then we will proceed from my left to the last row coming down and then go to my right.

● (1840)

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

(Division No. 377)

YEAS

Members

Alarie	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes	Beaumier
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bigras	Blaikie
Borotsik	Brien
Brison	Caccia
Canuel	Cardin
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Coderre	Crête
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Discepola	Dockrill
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe
Earle	Fournier
Gagnon	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Graham
Guay	Guimond
Hardy	Herron
Ianno	Jennings
Jones	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lalonde
Laurin	Lebel
Leung	Lill
Lincoln	Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McDonough
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Minna	Muise
Nystrom	Peric
Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Power
Price	Proctor
Provenzano	Riis
Robinson	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton)
Solomon	St-Hilaire
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Stoffer	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Turp
Vautour	Wasylycia-Leis
Wayne—100	

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Cadman	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Casson	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chatters	Clouthier
Collenette	Comuzzi
Cullen	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Elley
Epp	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Forseth	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Goodale	Gouk
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Grose	Guarnieri
Hanger	Harb
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoeppner	Hubbard
Iftody	Jaffer
Johnston	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Konrad
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Longfield
Lunn	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Mark
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McNally
Meredith	Miffin
Mills (Red Deer)	Mitchell
Morrison	Murray
Myers	Nault
Normand	Nunziata
Obhrai	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Pankiw
Patry	Penson
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Proud	Ramsay
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Ritz
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Sekora
Serré	Solberg
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
Strahl	Szabo
Thibeault	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vellacott
Volpe	Wappel
Whelan	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)	Wilfert
Williams	Wood—162

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

It being 6.45 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's order paper.

* * *

• (1845)

CODE OF ETHICS

The House resumed from February 12 consideration of the motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): When debate was suspended the hon. member for Souris—Moose Mountain had five minutes remaining.

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House, as we finish this debate tonight, that my colleague and I are not holding any malice or prejudice. We want something that Canadians are asking for.

All of us in this House were elected to represent the people. If I did not go back often to my constituency and report to my constituents, I can imagine what their reaction would be.

When somebody has the honour of not only being elected but being appointed to the cabinet, which is an additional responsibility, we want and Canadians want that person to not only follow the code of ethics as an MP, as a cabinet minister and as someone serving in Her Majesty's government, but to also be more accountable to the people they serve.

All members of parliament are here to adhere to a code of ethics, a code that should be and is available to the public. However, the code of ethics which belongs to the executive branch, or the cabinet, is not made public. We believe that to be a disgrace.

There is a national trend around the country. School boards and businesses are publishing a code of ethics. We believe that it would be in the interest of not only the government but all Canadians to have a public code of ethics.

In the last two weeks my office was able to obtain a ministerial code of ethics from the following countries: Brazil, Germany, Israel, Japan, the United Kingdom, the United States and the European Union.

We have been asking the Prime Minister for over five years for a ministerial code of ethics. Some great democracies have made their codes of ethics public. As a matter of interest to members, many of

Private Members' Business

these codes of ethics from our fellow democracies are on the Internet. However, our country is keeping company with countries like China and North Korea who do not release any information.

I suppose the question that Canadians are most often asked is the question I want to ask the Prime Minister. What about openness? If he does not want his personal ethics and honesty called into account, why does he not just release the ministerial code of ethics to the public?

In today's world one not only has to be honest but one has to appear as honest. We could do a lot of good in this country and have a better image of this institution, parliament, if indeed we had this code.

I want to quote from an article in which the Prime Minister said the following:

I respect those who disagree with decisions I have made as Prime Minister. I welcome honest debate about the policy directions set by my government. But I will never countenance unwarranted attacks upon my personal ethics and honesty.

We believe that to be a fair statement. However, in the same article the Prime Minister goes on to say:

For 36 years I have conducted myself in an honest and ethical fashion and have tried to do my best for the people of my riding.

That is an admirable statement. This Prime Minister could go down in glory. The Prime Minister could leave with real credibility when he retires by introducing a code of ethics. It would be to his honour, to the honour of Canadians and certainly to the honour of all elected officials, including myself.

• (1850)

He is now in the position of not only being a Prime Minister who is responsible to his constituency, but he and his government is also in a position to make a significant change in how Canadians view their government. He is in a position to make a significant change in how Canadians should want to see their cabinet.

There are two basic questions which must be asked. First, is there a separate code of ethics for the cabinet? Second, like other democracies, will the Prime Minister make that document public?

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, I commend the hon. member for Souris—Moose Mountain for his motion and his remarks.

There has been much talk of ethics in politics of late, particularly in the United States, and I think it is something that bears discussion. We know that when it comes to transparency and openness, these are just empty words to this government, and particularly to the Prime Minister. They are about as worthless as red books No. 1 and No. 2.

The arrogance of this government truly knows no bounds. The Liberals cried foul toward the previous Conservative government

Private Members' Business

for years. The howls rained out from the Liberals, when they were in opposition, about patronage, conflict of interest and unethical behaviour. Now that they are in government they continue to act in a completely irresponsible manner. They continually distract the public's mind from their own public record by further perpetrating previously unoriginal untruths. They also continually make concerted efforts to soil the good names of their former political adversaries.

I only need make reference as truth to this of the continuing national and international embarrassment known only as the Airbus affair. This ill-conceived and maliciously politically motivated witch hunt continues and costs Canadians millions of dollars. We know that the acts of omission or commission perpetrated by members of the government will eventually be exposed. That is the only solace we have.

Given the actions of the Prime Minister and his minister, it is absolutely hilarious that we are in the House today debating a code of ethics that would apply to them. However, if we consider it ethical to maliciously attack a former prime minister with unsubstantiated legal accusations, or if we consider it ethical to shut down a democratically elected House when it is trying to have a debate to decide whether to upgrade or continue our country's participation in a foreign conflict, that perhaps might be ethical.

Please pardon my sarcasm, but it seems to me that it is an oxymoron when we even try to mention the word "ethics" in respect to the Prime Minister and this government.

The fact is the code of ethics that does exist, if it does exist, is not made public. I will repeat that. A public code of ethics does not exist when it comes to the Prime Minister. What are some examples of strict ethical guidelines that would govern the conduct of our esteemed ministers? Nobody knows. I suppose Canadians could simply listen and watch the government and decide if their ministers and the Prime Minister are acting ethically.

Upon looking at the action of the ministers, I guess one could say once again that for the Liberals an incident such as their decision on the Kosovo debate, or inaction on the Kosovo debate, might be deemed ethical, or perhaps we could look at the Prime Minister's own actions. I think a leader should lead by example and allow his party members to follow in his footsteps.

I wonder if, for example, Liberals would follow in the footsteps of their leader when it came to purchasing a money losing hotel in the Shawinigan area and then unloading it to convicted criminals who then receive hundreds of thousands of dollars from taxpayers? I wonder if that would be an example.

Perhaps there would be a chapter in this code of ethics that says it is morally and ethically acceptable to skip the funeral of a beloved and respected world leader. Perhaps the Liberal supporters could tell us about Pierre Corbeil. Maybe he could come in and lecture the cabinet about business ethics when it came to fundraising in the Quebec area.

• (1855)

Last, but not least, the Prime Minister could give an ethics class on the proper and ethical manner to use the national police force when it comes to furthering personal political vendettas. These moral and ethical standards that are not reached by the Prime Minister and the government are truly to the country's detriment.

All sarcasm aside, it is obvious that a code of ethics for ministers should exist and it should be open and transparent to public scrutiny. I humbly submit that if, in fact, the Liberal code of ethics does exist, then why would it not want to make it public? As the previous speaker mentioned, why would it not want to benefit from the support the public would find in knowing this document does in fact exist?

Why would the Liberals not want to try to increase the level of public confidence? Why would they not want to bolster somehow the public confidence, or try to do away with some of the cynicism that in fact exists? That is truly the situation in the country right now when it comes, unfortunately, to most politicians.

Canadians might then begin to have faith in their government and they could hold governments accountable for their actions by weighing in against the government on their own ethical conduct that they hold out as an example.

I commend the hon. member again for bringing this motion forward. It is high time that we started discussing things like this when it seems apparent that the public has lost so much faith in its elected representatives. Once again, I support the hon. member in his efforts thus far.

Mr. Richard M. Harris: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I understand that my speaking position on this motion actually closes the debate. Are there no other members to speak?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Since we just had a Reform Party member, and since we still have a fair amount of time left in debate, we will go to the Liberal side and then to the hon. member for Elk Island.

Mr. John Maloney (Erie—Lincoln, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Motion No. P-31, presented by the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley. It requests that the Prime Minister table in the House his ethics code for ministers.

We have made integrity and ethics a top priority for our government, as we promised in the 1993 and 1997 election campaigns. We have done this by keeping our promises for new policies and legislation and for new standards of ethical behaviour. We have delivered on our election commitments to meet the needs

Private Members' Business

of Canadians through new policies and programs. Allow me to point out a few.

We promised to improve prosperity for Canadians and the unemployment rate is now at the lowest level since 1990. In fact, in my area of Niagara, it is less than the national average.

We promised to reduce the budget deficit and we did. In fact, it is the first time this has occurred in almost three decades that we have a surplus. It speaks to the commitment this government has to Canadians.

The recent budget also contained important initiatives to develop Canada's international competitiveness in a knowledge-based global economy. These are promises made and delivered on by the government.

The integrity demonstrated by the government toward Canadians is not a paper exercise. It is a reality. It is an ongoing commitment we show Canadians each and every day.

The leadership the government has shown in creating a government Canadians are proud of sets an example of what integrity in government really means. We have kept our election promises about specific actions on integrity. Allow me to elaborate.

The Prime Minister tabled a new conflict of interest code for public office holders in the House on June 16, 1994, early in our first mandate. It sets out principles and clear rules for all public office holders, ministers, secretaries of state, parliamentary secretaries, ministerial staff and full time governor in council appointees.

• (1900)

We also strengthened the Lobbyists Registration Act and a new ethics councillor was appointed in 1994 with responsibilities for administering the code and investigating complaints about lobbying activities.

We have kept our election promises about new standards of ethical behaviour. The conflict of interest code has clear rules for public office holders, including ministers, and the government is committed to upholding it.

I oppose Motion No. P-31 which requests that the Prime Minister table his ethics code for ministers in the House. As noted, the Prime Minister has already tabled the conflict of interest code in parliament. It sets out principles and clear rules which apply to all public office holders, including ministers.

All parliamentarians have a responsibility to gain and keep the trust of Canadians in government institutions. This is an obligation that we take seriously. It is an obligation that I know my colleagues across the way also believe is a pillar of our democracy.

Let us cut through the smoke. This motion is really about access to the Prime Minister's personal advice to ministers on govern-

ment issues. The Prime Minister provides personal instructions to his ministers on a wide range of governance issues. Communications between the Prime Minister and the ministers by the nature of our system are confidential. This type of advice is protected as a cabinet confidence under section 69 of the Access to Information Act. Parliament itself, in passing the Access to Information Act, decided that documents which constitute advice from the Prime Minister to his ministers are cabinet confidences and would be protected under the act.

The heart of the Canadian system of government centres around collective responsibility. This means that the government is responsible to parliament. The government must maintain the confidences of the House in order to govern, but for ministers to fulfill their collective responsibility to parliament and Canadians they must be able to discuss their views frankly and fully. Cabinet confidentiality allows ministers to debate issues openly among themselves and to concentrate on the objective of our system of government, which is to take good policy decisions for the benefit of Canadians.

The government has already responded to the motion that we are debating by stating that information sought by the hon. member is considered a confidence of the Queen's Privy Council and in keeping with Beauchesne's sixth edition, citation 446(2)(i) and section 69 of the Access to Information Act, I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Richard M. Harris: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to clarify the remaining time left in this debate because my colleague from Elk Island, as I understand it, wants to speak.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): We have exactly 12 minutes left in debate. After 12 minutes have expired the member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley will have five minutes. So exactly at 7.15 p.m. the member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley should be ready to spring to his feet.

Mr. Richard M. Harris: Mr. Speaker, just out of curiosity, if the member for Elk Island takes only seven minutes, can he share another five minutes with me so that I may have 10 minutes in total for closing?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): No.

An hon. member: By unanimous consent?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): We can do anything we want by unanimous consent, but there could very well be other members who would wish to participate in the debate and the sands of time are running through the clock.

I want to make it clear that the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley will have the last five minutes of debate; no more, no less. I will make sure that I call him at the appropriate time.

Private Members' Business

Mr. John Maloney: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have not completed my comments, but I am very close. I just made a request to the hon. member to withdraw his motion. He has not acceded to my request. Therefore I wish to advise the House that I have no choice but to call upon my hon. colleagues to oppose the motion.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this is a subject which is very important to Canadian people. It has been one that has consumed me in my parliamentary life since I was elected in 1993.

• (1905)

Some hon. members here are new, so they may not know that in the previous parliament I was the Reform Party member on the special joint committee which studied a code of ethics for senators and members of parliament. Of course, as we all know, members of parliament include senators. We are all included in the term. I had the extraordinary privilege of serving on that committee.

Needless to say, it is another of those issues which is not black and white. It is not a simple issue. It is a very complicated issue in terms of what it is that we require public officers, cabinet ministers and, indeed, even ordinary members of parliament to disclose. Generally, the principle, in my view, is that there should be no hidden features of one's life.

I remember when I was a young man and my wife and I moved into a little town in Alberta. There were some 200 people in that town and some people said to me "How can you stand to live in that little town? Everybody knows what you are doing". I said "I don't plan on doing anything bad, so it doesn't matter".

That really is the essence of it. Generally speaking, people only want to have secrets if they are going to do something bad.

However, I am aware that there are exceptions. When people have business dealings, for example, sometimes there are things they do not want their competitors to know. That is valid. However, we have a rule in this country that members of parliament who become cabinet ministers have a higher code. They must divest themselves of their interests. They may not directly deal with government.

We have had a couple of issues with the Liberal government since 1993 which have consumed us and have really put into question the whole integrity of it. We have had a few issues lately with the Prime Minister himself.

I remember in the previous parliament a situation where there was an inappropriate use of a credit card by a cabinet minister. That puzzled me endlessly. If a person has credit card statements which prove that what they did was not wrong, why would they not disclose them?

We asked for them under access to information and they were denied. In fact, they were not denied. We got pages and pages of blank paper. The heading was at the top and then everything was whited out. Then there was a little code that said we could not have the information because it was personal.

That was the point exactly. A public credit card was being used for personal reasons, but we could not find out the details. It was really very bad.

It seems to me that one would be eager to disclose. That is what I said to reporters at the time because I was grilled on this. I said that the easiest thing in the world would be to simply bring out all of the statements. They are all on record. Bring them out and make copies of them. Show the reporters the originals. Let them have a copy of them. Here it is. There is nothing wrong. But as long as they are not disclosed, then the suspicion remains and there are all kinds of protestations.

They went through this motion of tabling stuff in the House. When we looked at what they tabled, it had no relevance at all to the question. It was just a snow job, if you will pardon the expression.

Now we have the question about the Prime Minister's code of ethics for his ministers. This is a very important issue. We know that it exists. We know that we have not seen it. It is not the public office holders' code, which is public. The reason we know that is because in the debate with the Prime Minister over this issue at various times he has said "My ministers have seen it. They have read it. They understand it. They obey it".

One cannot read nor understand that which does not exist. So we know that it exists. There was also a very clear indication that it was not just simply the public office holders' code.

What this motion for the production of papers calls for is simply that the code be made public. For the life of me, I do not know why anybody on this side of the House, whose job it is to hold the government accountable, would be against this motion. Of course we want to know what that code is.

I would think that every Liberal member on the other side who really believes in the Liberal red book and its promises to increase integrity in government would also want to vote in favour of this motion. Of course they would want to have openness in government. They would want the people of Canada to know what the rules of engagement are for ministers of the crown. That is an essential part of rebuilding the trust of government.

• (1910)

We have had some 30 years of Liberal and Conservative governments where the integrity of government has been ques-

Private Members' Business

tioned by Canadians. That is why there is so much cynicism. I think that is one of the reasons less than 50% of the people turned out in the recent byelection. They are so cynical that they say "What difference does it make?" It is time we restored to Canadians faith, trust and confidence in the integrity of the Canadian government.

I urge all members on both sides of the House to vote in favour of this most important motion. It is probably one of the most important motions that we will debate this evening.

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak to this motion. It is just happenstance that I happen to be here. However, I will say that I always like to support any motions or legislation which call for greater transparency.

However I do have to make a comment here because the flaw in the motive behind this motion is basically that there is no code of conduct for MPs.

I was amazed when I came to this House from a background in journalism to find that there was no written code of conduct for MPs, in the same sense that there is for journalists. At the *Toronto Star*, for example, there is a binder which contains page after page of descriptions on how expensive is an acceptable gift, how expensive is an unacceptable gift.

I have been incredibly surprised that there is no questioning whatsoever when MPs go on very expensive trips around the world which are financed by corporations. It is one thing to travel with a parliamentary committee when one is supported by one's whip, but when one accepts freebies on the part of corporations one has to question the ethics of the individuals who are accepting those freebies. Yet many in this House would see nothing wrong with accepting those freebies. I can assure members that when it comes to gifts in the world of journalism there are very strict rules.

I think the problem with the reluctance to disclose a prime ministerial code of ethics is that we do not have a minimum standard of ethics that applies to MPs in general. If we had that minimum standard I would suggest to the hon. member who is proposing the motion, whose intentions are very good, that there would be no need for the motion because then we could appreciate that the prime minister, any prime minister, might have a different level of ethics that he applies to his cabinet that pertain to the political ethics of the way members of cabinet conduct themselves both within this parliament and in the community.

I would never like to find myself on the side of not supporting a request for transparency, but the reality is that we cannot put any prime minister in the position where his code of ethics, which deals with politics rather than fundamental ethics, would put him in the situation where he would be disclosing what indeed are potential cabinet confidences. I think there is a real issue which pertains to the Access to Information Act.

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am impressed that the hon. member for Wentworth—Burlington has demonstrated that he can think for himself. I appreciate that.

I know that in his heart of hearts he sees merit in this motion. I also know that in his heart of hearts he does not truly believe the argument which he just put forward because it does not hold water. The fact that there apparently is no code of ethics for regular MPs has no bearing on the responsibility of our Prime Minister, the leading political figure of Canada. It does not exempt him in any way from showing leadership and producing a code of ethics which would apply to the most powerful decision makers in the country. We cannot compare the cabinet member's decision making powers with those of other MPs in this House. There is no comparison.

• (1915)

This motion is all about putting in place a code of ethics that would give Canadians confidence that the most powerful decision makers in this country, which are the cabinet members, have a code of conduct or guideline which they must adhere to in the performance of their duties and in their decision making exercise. This code of ethics should be transparent so that on a daily basis Canadians can observe whether these powerful decision makers are operating in a manner which is respectful and indicative of their jobs. That is not rocket science to understand.

The first reaction of most people who hear the opposition to Motion P-31 might be that the reason Liberal members of parliament and other MPs would oppose it is that they themselves lack a little trust in how the government's cabinet members conduct their jobs and how they conduct themselves in the performance of their duties. If they had full confidence in the ethics and integrity of their cabinet members, then what on earth would they have to fear about having a very public code of ethics? They would have no fear of their members breaking that code.

Liberal members are standing up to oppose the public presentation of a code of ethics for their cabinet ministers. For what reason? One has to assume they fear that their cabinet ministers may not be operating in an ethical manner. That is the only conclusion Canadians who are watching this debate tonight can draw. If they have nothing to hide, then put it out in the public. That is what Canadians understand.

The flaw is not that there is no common code of ethics for MPs. The Prime Minister has stood in the House and told us time and time again that there did exist a special code of ethics for his cabinet members, that his cabinet ministers have read it and they understand it. The big flaw in the government is that the Prime Minister is not going to let the public know exactly what that code of ethics is. How can the Canadian people have any trust in a Prime Minister who would withhold a code of ethics for his cabinet ministers?

Adjournment Debate

I urge all members to support this motion, including the Liberal members who will want to show the Canadian people that the government has an ethical cabinet.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): It is my duty to inform the House that the time provided for the debate has expired.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to an order made earlier this day, all the questions necessary to dispose of the motion are deemed put and the recorded division is deemed requested and deferred until Tuesday, April 20, 1999, at the end of Government Orders.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

● (1920)

[*Translation*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

HEALTH

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on February 11, 1999, I asked a question in the House about the situation in Montreal, where people had to wait 48 hours before getting a hospital bed. In Toronto, authorities were thinking about transferring sick children to the United States. In British Columbia, \$10 million were allocated to improve the situation. In Quebec, the figure was \$20 million.

The Minister of Health said that we had to be patient, that the budget was coming, that funds would be available, because health was a priority for the Prime Minister. We did as the minister suggested and waited patiently.

In 1969, it will be remembered, the federal government paid up to 50% of hospital expenditures in the provinces. This year, before the budget was brought down, the federal contribution for hospital costs was down to 11%. With the new budget, it has now gone up to about 15%.

The situation is becoming difficult for the provinces. Since health is such a priority for Canadians, it is important to put the emphasis on this issue and to review the cost sharing formula between the federal government and the provinces.

I am sure the federal government will say that it has invested *x* number of billions of dollars. Yet, at the same time, there are people waiting in the hospital corridors for care. People go to the hospital and have to wait until there is a cancellation to get an operation. Sometimes they have to wait as long as nine months for

heart surgery, for example. This is inhumane. It is totally unacceptable.

This is why I put the question on February 11 on behalf of Canadians throughout the country, so the government would invest a lot more and find solutions so that people—our parents, our grandparents, children needing health care—can get a hospital bed and are not put in the corridor. We must have proper care. We must make sure people with heart problems, cancer, or any other health problem, are treated as humans.

It is hard to see people waiting as long as 48 hours in a hospital to be seen by a doctor and receive appropriate care. This should be given high priority.

Government members themselves said that health was a priority for Canadians. I wish to remind the House again that, in 1969, the federal government paid 50% of each province's hospital care costs. Today, it pays around 15%. This is unacceptable. It is difficult for the provinces to administer health care systems if they do not receive the transfer payments from the federal government to which they are entitled and which they need in order to be able to help people.

[*English*]

Ms. Elinor Caplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to the member for Acadie—Bathurst.

Let me remind the hon. member that health is a shared jurisdiction. The federal government is responsible for the Canada Health Act, health protection and promotion, and the safety of Canadians when it comes to health. The provinces design and deliver health services to the people of their provinces.

When the Minister of Health answered the member's question in the House, he gave him a very good answer. He said that in the budget we will be making a very important significant investment because health and health care is a priority to this government.

● (1925)

In the budget we saw the biggest single investment this government has ever made. It went to increased transfers to the provinces and to the territories for health care very specifically. Other large investments as well went into many areas within the federal government's jurisdiction, our own programs which support the health of Canadians.

The budget demonstrated the government's commitment to defending medicare in the country. We are defending access to quality care, ensuring that care is available to all who need it regardless of their ability to pay. We have listened to the concerns of the people and to the provinces, and to the many groups who share as we do the concerns about the future directions of health care in the country.

Adjournment Debate

Canadians have told their governments they are concerned about health care and it is a priority to them. We have responded. We have listened. We have acted because health care and the health of Canadians is a priority to the government.

We listened and increased the Canada health and social transfer payment by \$11.5 billion over the next five years. The hon. member neglected to mention the important tax points that have been transferred to the provinces which generate growing income every year. There are now billions of dollars available from the tax points that have been transferred to the provinces for health care.

This budget is—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I am sorry. I did not realize the hon. parliamentary secretary was just winding up. I thought there was another page to go and it seemed like a good time to interrupt.

[Translation]

The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7.26 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Order in Council Appointments	
Mr. Adams	13715
Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Adams	13715
International Treaties	
Mr. Reed	13715
Interparliamentary Delegations	
Ms. Bulte	13715
Committees of the House	
Industry	
Mr. Murray	13715
Procedure and House Affairs	
Mr. Adams	13715
Antipoverty Act	
Bill C-491. Introduction and first reading	13715
Mr. Ménard	13715
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	13716
Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Motion for concurrence	13716
Mr. Adams	13716
(Motion agreed to)	13716
Petitions	
Canadian Wheat Board	
Mr. Mark	13716
Criminal Code	
Mr. Mark	13716
Parental Rights	
Mr. Mark	13716
Marriage	
Mr. Mark	13716
Abortion	
Mr. Mark	13716
Firearms Act	
Mr. Mark	13716
Freshwater Exports	
Mr. Riis	13716
Iraq	
Mr. Adams	13716
Canada Post Corporation	
Mr. Brison	13717
Marriage	
Mr. Brison	13717
Financial Services Sector	
Mr. Proctor	13717
Grain Transportation	
Mr. Proctor	13717
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Adams	13717
Questions Passed as Orders for Returns	
Mr. Adams	13720

Business of the House

Mr. Kilger	13721
Motion	13721
(Motion agreed to)	13721

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Supply

Allotted Day—Regions of Canada

Mr. Strahl	13721
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	13721
Motion	13721
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	13723
Mr. Riis	13723
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	13723
Mr. Asselin	13723
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	13724
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	13724
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	13724
Amendment	13725
Mr. Mitchell	13725
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	13725
Mr. Mitchell	13726
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	13726
Mr. Brison	13726
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	13726
Mr. Duhamel	13726
Mr. Duhamel	13727
Mr. Duhamel	13728
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	13728
Mr. Duhamel	13729
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	13729
Mr. Duhamel	13729
Mr. Riis	13729
Mr. Duhamel	13729
Mr. Riis	13729
Mr. Duhamel	13729
Mr. Riis	13729
Mr. Duhamel	13729
Mr. Brien	13729
Mr. Asselin	13731
Mr. Brien	13732
Mr. Riis	13732
Mr. Solberg	13734
Mr. Riis	13734
Mr. Borotsik	13734
Mr. Duhamel	13736
Mr. Borotsik	13736
Mr. Epp	13737
Mr. Borotsik	13737
Mr. Lunn	13737
Mr. Mitchell	13738
Mr. Lunn	13739
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	13739
Mr. Duhamel	13740
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	13741
Mr. Asselin	13741
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	13741
Mr. McGuire	13741

Mr. Epp	13742
Mr. McGuire	13743
Mr. Epp	13743
Mr. McGuire	13743
Mr. Myers	13743
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	13745
Mr. Myers	13745
Ms. Hardy	13745
Mr. Myers	13746
Mr. Pankiw	13746
Mr. Duhamel	13747
Mr. Pankiw	13747
Mr. Bailey	13748
Mr. Pankiw	13748
Mr. Elley	13748
Mrs. Kraft Sloan	13750
Mr. Elley	13750
Mr. Stinson	13750
Mr. Elley	13750
Mr. Cauchon	13750
Mr. Dubé (Lévis—et—Chutes—de—la—Chaudière)	13753
Mr. Cauchon	13753
Mr. Grewal	13753
Mr. Cauchon	13754
Mr. McNally	13754
Mr. Cauchon	13754
Mr. Mark	13754

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Windsor—St. Clair	
Mr. Calder	13755
Canadian Sikh Community	
Mr. Grewal	13755
Royal Canadian Air Force	
Mr. Proud	13755
Erinoak	
Mr. Mahoney	13756
Yom Hashoah	
Ms. Caplan	13756
Code of Ethics	
Mr. Harris	13756
Taipei Economic and Culture Office	
Mr. Finlay	13756
Jacques Parizeau	
Mr. Coderre	13757
Nunavut	
Mrs. Karetak—Lindell	13757
The Francophonie	
Mr. Loubier	13757
Specialty Wood Products	
Mr. Duncan	13757
Secretary of State for Asia—Pacific	
Mr. Saada	13757
Sikhism	
Mr. Riis	13758

Windsor—St. Clair	
Ms. Whelan	13758
Quebec Bench	
Mr. Marceau	13758
Building Contracts	
Mr. Jones	13758
Consolidated Growers and Processors	
Mr. Mark	13759
Daffodil Month	
Mr. Myers	13759

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Kosovo	
Mr. Manning	13759
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	13759
Mr. Manning	13759
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	13759
Mr. Manning	13760
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	13760
Mr. Hanger	13760
Mr. Eggleton	13760
Mr. Hanger	13760
Mr. Eggleton	13760
Mr. Duceppe	13760
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	13760
Mr. Duceppe	13760
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	13761
Mr. Gauthier	13761
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	13761
Mr. Gauthier	13761
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	13761
Ms. McDonough	13761
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	13761
Ms. McDonough	13761
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	13761
Mr. Price	13761
Mr. Eggleton	13762
Mr. Price	13762
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	13762
Employment Insurance	
Mr. Solberg	13762
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	13762
Taxation	
Mr. Solberg	13762
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	13762
Kosovo	
Mr. Duceppe	13762
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	13762
Mr. Duceppe	13762
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	13762
Employment Insurance	
Mrs. Ablonczy	13763
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	13763
Mrs. Ablonczy	13763
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	13763
Kosovo	
Mr. Turp	13763
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	13763
Mr. Turp	13763

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	13763
Building Contracts	
Mr. Strahl	13764
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	13764
Mr. Strahl	13764
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	13764
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	13764
Kosovo	
Mr. Laurin	13764
Mr. Eggleton	13764
Cultural Forums	
Ms. Folco	13764
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	13764
Building Contracts	
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	13764
Mr. Pettigrew	13765
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	13765
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	13765
Mr. Pettigrew	13765
Kosovo	
Mr. Robinson	13765
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	13765
Mr. Robinson	13765
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	13765
Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	13765
Mr. Eggleton	13766
Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	13766
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	13766
Western Economic Diversification	
Ms. Leung	13766
Mr. Duhamel	13766
Fisheries and Oceans	
Mr. Lunn	13766
Mr. Easter	13766
Kosovo	
Mrs. Guay	13767
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	13767
Mr. Earle	13767
Mr. Eggleton	13767
Mr. Doyle	13767
Ms. Robillard	13767
Ms. Desjarlais	13767
Ms. Robillard	13767
Presence in the Gallery	
The Speaker	13767
Points of Order	
Tabling of Document	
Mr. Boudria	13767
Oral Question Period	
Ms. Folco	13768
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	13768
Tabling of Document	
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	13768

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Supply

Allotted Day—Regions of Canada

Motion	13768
Mr. Mark	13768
Mr. McCormick	13769
Mr. Mark	13769
Mr. McCormick	13769
Mr. Mark	13769
Miss Grey	13770
Mr. Hilstrom	13770
Miss Grey	13770
Mr. McCormick	13771
Miss Grey	13772
Mr. Mahoney	13772
Mr. Anders	13773
Mr. Mahoney	13774
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	13774
Mr. Mahoney	13774
Mr. McWhinney	13774
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	13776
Mr. McWhinney	13776
Mr. Jaffer	13776
Mr. McWhinney	13777
Mr. Jaffer	13777
Mr. Szabo	13778
Mr. Jaffer	13778
Mr. Harvard	13779
Mr. Jaffer	13779

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House

Industry

Mr. Adams	13779
Motion	13779
(Motion agreed to)	13779

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Supply

Allotted Day—Regions of Canada

Motion	13779
Mr. Anders	13779
Ms. Hardy	13781
Mr. Anders	13781
Mr. McCormick	13781
Mr. Anders	13782
Mr. Harvard	13782
Mr. Solberg	13783
Mr. Harvard	13784
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	13784
Mr. Harvard	13784
Mr. Alcock	13784
Mr. Alcock	13785
Mr. Crête	13786
Mr. Alcock	13786
Mr. Dubé (Lévis—et—Chutes—de—la—Chaudière)	13786
Mr. St-Julien	13788
Mr. Dubé (Lévis—et—Chutes—de—la—Chaudière)	13788
Mr. Szabo	13788
Mr. Dubé (Lévis—et—Chutes—de—la—Chaudière)	13788
Mr. Crête	13789

Bank Act

Bill C-67. Second reading	13790
---------------------------------	-------

Motion agreed to	13791
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ...	13791

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Transit Passes

Motion	13791
Motion agreed to	13792

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Coastal Fisheries Protection Act

Bill C-27. Report Stage	13793
Mr. Kilger	13793
Mr. Strahl	13793
Mr. Bergeron	13793
Mr. Solomon	13793
Mr. Doyle	13793
Mr. Nunziata	13793
Ms. Beaumier	13793
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	13793
Mr. Ritz	13793
Motion No. 1 negatived	13794
Mr. Kilger	13794
Motion No. 2 negatived	13795
Mr. Kilger	13795
Mr. Strahl	13796
Mr. Bergeron	13796
Mr. Solomon	13796
Mr. Doyle	13796
Mr. Nunziata	13796
Motion No. 3 negatived	13797
Motion No. 4 negatived	13798
Motion No. 8 negatived	13799
Mr. Kilger	13799
Mr. Strahl	13799
Mr. Bergeron	13799
Mr. Solomon	13799
Mr. Doyle	13799
Mr. Nunziata	13799
Amendment negatived	13800
Mr. Kilger	13800
Motion No. 10 negatived	13801
Mr. Kilger	13801
Mr. Strahl	13802

Mr. Bergeron	13802
Mr. Solomon	13802
Mr. Doyle	13802
Mr. Nunziata	13802
Motion No. 14 negatived	13803
Mr. Kilger	13803
Mr. Strahl	13803
Mr. Bergeron	13803
Mr. Solomon	13803
Mr. Doyle	13803
Mr. Nunziata	13803
Motion No. 15 agreed to	13804
Motion for concurrence	13804
Mr. Anderson	13804
Mr. Kilger	13804
Mr. Strahl	13804
Mr. Bergeron	13804
Mr. Solomon	13804
Mr. Doyle	13804
Mr. Nunziata	13804
Motion agreed to	13805

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Canadian Human Rights Act

Bill S-11. Second reading	13805
Motion negatived	13807

Code of Ethics

Motion	13807
Mr. Bailey	13807
Mr. MacKay	13807
Mr. Harris	13808
Mr. Maloney	13808
Mr. Harris	13809
Mr. Maloney	13810
Mr. Epp	13810
Mr. Bryden	13811
Mr. Harris	13811
Division deemed demanded and deferred	13812

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Health

Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	13812
Ms. Caplan	13812

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

03159442

Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canadian Government Publishing,
45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,
45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :
<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9