CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 136 • NUMBER 035 • 2nd SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Monday, December 6, 1999

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, December 6, 1999

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

● (1100)

[*English*]

AN ACT FOR THE RECOGNITION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.) moved that Bill C-237, an act to amend an act for the recognition and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms and to amend the Constitution Act, 1867, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

● (1105)

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is the third time since I became a member of parliament that my property rights bill has been denied enough time for full debate. This is the third time that MPs have been denied the opportunity to vote for or against strengthening property rights in federal law. It is also three slaps in the face for each of the thousands of Canadians who have signed petitions supporting my bill. So far I have personally received 578 pages of petitions signed by 13,729 Canadians from all across Canada who support the bill.

It is also an insult to another major supporter of the legislation, the Canadian Real Estate Association, an association that represents more than 200 real estate boards in every province of the country.

I repeat for the third time in the House that it is time for us to make this bill, and all Private Members' Business that comes before the House, votable.

I will start the debate by asking a few questions. I know they will be difficult questions for many Liberals to answer and almost impossible for the socialists in the House to understand but I am going to ask them anyway.

What does anyone own that the Government of Canada cannot take away from them? The answer is nothing.

Does anyone think they have any right to own the satellite dish they bought, paid duties and taxes on, and enjoy the programs they pay for and watch on their TV? Does anyone think they have the right to own the gun that they legally bought to go target shooting or hunting with? Does anyone think they have the right to own the money they paid into their own government pension fund? Does anyone think they have the right to own and sell the crops they grow on their own land? Does anyone think they have any right in Canadian federal law to be compensated for any property that the government takes away from them, including their own land?

If anyone was thinking that as a Canadian citizen they had any of these rights or that somehow these rights were protected in Canadian law, I am sad to inform them that they are wrong. The federal government can take anything anyone owns, anytime it wants, and there is not a thing anyone can do about it. Only we in the House can do something about it.

Let us look at the government's track record at taking the property from Canadians. Over the years, an estimated 700,000 Canadians have purchased direct-to-home satellite equipment, services and programs from the United States because the equipment, services and programs were not available to them in Canada. This was a legal product that the Government of Canada collected both duty and taxes on. The government then unilaterally passed a law that declared the equipment, services and programming people watched using their own satellite dish, their own decoder and their own television illegal.

In May of this year, the RCMP announced a crackdown on these made in Ottawa criminals. My colleague, the member for Calgary Centre, made the directive public. The RCMP directive states:

> Although any such device or equipment brought into Canada may have had duty and taxes paid, the provisions of the Radiocommunication Act remain in effect. The possession, use, sale, etc. of any such equipment is therefore illegal.

Watching television illegally in Canada can result in a fine of up to $5,000 and/or up to 12 months in prison. So much for the right to own and enjoy property in Canada.

In 1994 a farmer with a firearms licence issued by the federal government went out and bought a gopher gun, a firearm commonly used for hunting and sporting purposes, from a government licensed firearms dealer. In 1995 the government passed Bill C-68 giving it the absolute power to prohibit any firearms if, in the opinion of the governor in council, really the Minister of Justice, he or she does not think the firearm should or could be used for hunting and sporting purposes.

I can hear by the noise in the background that the Liberals do not like this, but I think it is time they paid attention. If the bureaucrats in the justice department think a gun looks dangerous and can convince the justice minister that it is dangerous, the minister can ban the gun by order in council. Section 117.15(2) of the criminal code gives the government such sweeping authority that it can ban any gopher gun without producing a shred of evidence that the firearm it is banning is dangerous. The government can ban any gopher gun even while ignoring factual evidence that the firearm is ''commonly used for hunting and sporting'' purposes.

● (1110)

The government can ban any gopher gun without any debate in parliament. Nor is there any means of getting the prohibition reconsidered by parliament. The government can ban any gopher gun without any statutory right of appeal for individual owners of these firearms because the criminal code does not contain any such rights of appeal.

The government can ban any gopher gun and declare the owners do not have any right to be compensated for the loss in value resulting from the government's arbitrary prohibition order and no right to be compensated even if the government confiscates the firearm from its lawful owner.

Finally, not even the Supreme Court of Canada could overturn the arbitrary prohibition order because it would be virtually impossible for any court to substitute its opinion for the opinion of the governor in council. In fact, lawyers from the Library of Parliament confirmed this when they wrote, ''courts would be loathe to find the governor in council acted in bad faith''.

The punishment for possession of a prohibited firearm is imprisonment for up to five years. So much for the right to own and enjoy property in Canada.

For years, 670,000 federal public servants paid too much of their own salaries into their own government administered pension plans. In May of this year, the government passed Bill C-78 which declared that the surplus money these employees paid into their own pension plan was not theirs any more. It was the government's. The money the government stole was the property of its own employees.

Do employees not have the right to own the portion of money they pay into their own pension fund? Not if they work for the federal government. If these contributions individuals made to their own public service pensions are not safe from the plundering by the federal government, what makes anyone think that the contributions they make to their RRSPs are safe? So much for property rights in Canada.

A Saskatchewan farmer, David Bryan, grew a crop of wheat on his own land. He got into trouble when he tried to sell his wheat for a better price than the Canadian Wheat Board would pay him. The federal government charged Mr. Bryan with exporting his own grain to the United States without getting an export licence from the monopolistic dictatorial wheat board.

For violating this Soviet style decree, Mr. Bryan spent a week in jail, was fined $9,000 and received a two year suspended sentence. Mr. Bryan, with the help of the National Citizen's Coalition, appealed his conviction on the grounds that it violated his property right as guaranteed in the Canadian Bill of Rights and passed by parliament in 1960.

On February 4, 1999, the Manitoba Court of Appeal ruled against David Bryan's right to sell his own grain that he grew on his own land. On page 14 of the ruling of the Manitoba Court of Appeal it states:

> Section 1(a) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, which protects property rights through a ''due process'' clause, was not replicated in the Charter, and the right to ''enjoyment of property'' is not a constitutionally protected, fundamental part of Canadian society.

Can anyone who is listening to this debate or who reads the record of this debate believe these words came out of the Canadian court of law?

This ruling confirmed what constitutional expert Peter Hogg wrote in his book *Constitutional Law of Canada*, Third Edition. It states:

> The omission of property rights from s. 7 (of the Charter) greatly reduces its scope. It means that s. 7 affords no guarantee of compensation or even of a fair procedure for the taking of property by the government. It means that s. 7 affords no guarantee of fair treatment by courts, tribunals or officials with power over the purely economic interests of individuals or corporations.

That is citation 44.9, page 1030. Professor Hogg also wrote:

> The product is a s. 7 in which liberty must be interpreted as not including property, as not including freedom of contract, and, in short, as not including economic liberty.

That is citation 44.7(b), page 1028.

● (1115)

Therefore, without any protection of property rights and freedom of contract in the charter of rights and freedoms and with the courts ruling that the Canadian bill of rights does not provide any protection whatsoever from the federal government's arbitrary

taking of property or infringing on our fundamental economic liberty, I decided it was time to do something about it.

Amending the charter is a hugely complicated task because it requires a resolution to be passed in the House of Commons and in seven provincial legislatures, comprising about 50% of the population. I decided to draft a bill to strengthen the protection of property rights in the Canadian bill of rights. Consequently, this would only strengthen the protection of property rights in federal law.

In past debates the government has argued poorly that there is no need to strengthen property rights in federal law, that the Canadian bill of rights provides adequate protection of property rights. The Bryan case proves that it is totally wrong on this count. The bill of rights provides absolutely no protection of property rights. Even if the government ignores the Bryan judgment, these rights can be overridden by just saying so in any piece of legislation passed by the House.

My bill proposes to make it more difficult to override the property rights of Canadian citizens by requiring a two-thirds majority of the House. My amendments would not tie the government's hands to legislate, but would send a clear signal that members of parliament think that adequate protection of property rights is so important that an override clause should pass a higher test in the House.

Even if the government agreed to abide by the so-called guarantees in the Canadian bill of rights, as currently worded, it would only protect three things: the right to the enjoyment of property, the right not to be deprived of property except by due process, and the right to a fair hearing. Unfortunately the bill of rights does not prevent the arbitrary taking of property by the federal government. The bill of rights does not provide any protection of our right to be paid any compensation, let alone fair compensation. The bill of rights does not provide any protection of our right to have compensation fixed impartially. The bill of rights does not provide any protection of our right to receive timely compensation. Finally, the bill of rights does not provide any protection of our right to apply to the courts to obtain justice.

Bill C-237, my property rights bill, would provide this protection. I offer the government this opportunity to take corrective action by voting to strengthen property rights in the Canadian bill of rights. When passed by the House we could then work toward amending the charter of rights and freedoms, which is a much more complex process.

I would like to mention a couple of things in summation. Why are property rights good? There are three key reasons for which property rights are good and necessary. First, they make society richer. Second, they protect the freedom of individuals. Third, they protect the environment. Theoretically the protection of property rights makes society richer because those rights spur, through creative effort, the improvement of one's circumstances. Second, property rights protect the freedom of individuals because they allow people to make their own decisions about how to best use their existing possessions, including labour. Finally, property rights protect the environment because the problem of pollution is not that people pollute their own surroundings but that they pollute other people's surroundings.

I would like to briefly talk about the Magna Carta and the English bill of rights; however, I see that my time is up, Mr. Speaker, and I will have to do that another time.

These property rights have been around for a long time. It is only recently that we have neglected them and failed to put them in our charter of rights and freedoms.

I respectfully request the unanimous consent of the House to make Bill C-237 a votable item. I have given all the arguments for it. I think there is much sympathy in the House for it. In fact, many years ago it was passed and I think it is time we did it again.

• (1120)

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent that the bill be made a votable item?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. John Maloney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity this morning to speak to Bill C-237, an act to amend an act for the recognition and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms and to amend the Constitution Act, 1867.

In brief terms this bill would amend the Canadian bill of rights. The Minister of Justice feels strongly about the important role of property rights in our society. Property rights represent one of the fundamental pillars of our legal system and our democratic society. Indeed, our legal system is replete with protection for property rights. However, the Minister of Justice cannot support the bill because it raises some very important concerns.

The Canadian bill of rights already contains provisions for property rights in paragraph 1(a). Bill C-237 would remove these provisions and would enact new and broader provisions dealing with property rights. These broader provisions would have untold implications for federal laws. For example, they could affect everything from federal laws dealing with pollution to shareholder rights to divorce laws making provision for the division of property.

One only has to look at the American experience with constitutional property rights to understand the implications of extending

property rights. In the United States property rights have been extended in ways that no one could have anticipated. This has led to huge amounts of litigation and has complicated and burdened the process of lawmaking.

Early on in the history of the United States important social reforms were struck down by the courts in the name of property rights. I am not saying that this kind of unfortunate judicial intervention would necessarily happen here, but to date no proper consideration has been given to this possibility. One has to think very carefully before importing this kind of law into the Canadian context.

[*Translation*]

The protection of property rights is, of course, an important principle in Canadian society. No one in this Chamber would dispute that. While agreeing with the principle of protecting property rights, we must be careful to have a clear understanding of the impact that the kind of legislation being proposed by the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville will have.

[*English*]

In any event, as I have indicated, I think it is very important to remember that our legal system presently and appropriately acknowledges property rights. The concept of property rights is fundamental to our legal system. It is the basis of the operation of our economy. This is reflected in the legal framework that governs our economy. Every day property rights guide our actions in the way we do business. Contract law, real property law, personal property law and so on are built on the concept of property rights.

Our legal system could not function without it. As such, our legal system provides, as a matter of the common law that has been built over hundreds of years through court decisions, basic protections for property owners. Hundreds of years of jurisprudence must not be lightly disregarded.

[*Translation*]

The common law provides basic protections for individuals regarding state action that affects their property, and statute law is also filled with protections for property rights. Whether we are looking at shareholder laws, banking laws, criminal laws or otherwise, these laws contain a wide variety of provisions that are designed to ensure fair dealing with property.

[*English*]

Let us not forget that the Canadian bill of rights already provides protection for property rights. As the member has pointed out, section 1(a) of the Canadian bill of rights provides for ''the right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law''.

The hon. member's bill would also amend the Canadian bill of rights in a way that is not consistent with the treatment of other rights in the Canadian bill of rights. The bill would add charter-like provisions to the Canadian bill of rights that would be applicable only to property rights and not to the other human rights and fundamental freedoms contained in the Canadian bill of rights. This would include new provisions dealing with imposing limits on rights, overriding rights, and obtaining judicial remedies.

I am not certain why property rights are treated differently. I am not certain what the logic or rationale, if any, is for this. It seems to me that the bill is so focused on one issue that it does not recognize that the Canadian bill of rights contains other rights and freedoms, that the proposed changes do not fit in and that they do not treat all rights and freedoms on a consistent basis.

• (1125)

My reaction is that when we are dealing with something as fundamental as basic Canadian legal instruments for the protection of human rights, we need to examine all of the implications. Let me be clear, property rights are fundamental to our legal system and society. We will continue to support property rights and to promote respect for these and all rights of Canadians, but we cannot support a bill that unwittingly would put into jeopardy social and economic laws and policies that are important to the people of Canada.

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the speeches of my colleagues on this private member's bill today and I found their arguments to be interesting.

I appreciate that there are two points of view on this issue, but I want to add another voice to the discussion this morning regarding property rights, which refers quite directly to the recent talks of the World Trade Organization in Seattle.

It seems to me that we have gone out of our way in providing property rights to certain kinds of corporations. Under the NAFTA and the provisions of the WTO, in the future more rights will be given to corporations to overrule the decisions of duly elected representatives of parliaments and legislatures.

At the top of the list is the present initiative of Sun Belt Water Inc. of California, which wants to export fresh water from Canada to California. Because the provincial government of British Columbia passed legislation which prohibited that particular initiative from proceeding, Sun Belt is suing the federal government, on behalf of the British Columbian government, under the provisions of the NAFTA for what it says could be as much as $10 billion in lost profits.

This is the ultimate in property rights being represented. A company is saying that because elected Canadians, in their wisdom, chose legislation, in their judgment, to protect the welfare of future generations and the health of Canadians, it has property

rights and it will sue for lost revenues that it would accrue in the future. This is the ultimate in handing over rights to private corporations which will clearly, in many cases, go against the decisions of duly elected representatives of the people of Canada.

Let us be more specific. I could mention the legislation that we were driven into to protect patent rights for multinational drug companies. We were under incredible pressure to regulate and to legislate in favour of multinational drug companies to give them a 20 year monopoly on any new drug. We could debate whether 20 years is reasonable or whether it should be 2, 10, 50 or whatever, but there was absolutely no choice that the intellectual property rights of international drug companies required us to pass legislation guaranteeing them monopoly rights on new drugs for 20 years. One has to admit that is a very good deal.

I think you will remember those days, Mr. Speaker. The feeling was that we had no choice. We were driven into legislating in favour of protecting intellectual property rights that would benefit multinational drug companies against the best interests of the consuming public. When there is a monopoly drug situation, obviously there is not going to be any competition in the marketplace and people will be gouged. I do not think the evidence has ever been refuted. It is clear that because of the lack of competition by generic drug companies the prices for our drugs in this country are significantly higher than they normally would be or than they need be, which causes incredible pressure on our health care system, to say nothing of the consuming public in general.

When we talk about property rights, particularly as they focus on the corporate sector, this is getting close to Mecca. This is as close to corporate heaven as one could possibly get. I could read all sorts of examples other than all the national drug companies that have been handed this incredible property right.

• (1130)

There was a controversy over some of the big forest companies and their forest practices. People were saying that the legislation needed to be changed to stop the abuses of various forestry codes. The American companies said they would sue us for their lost profits if we imposed legislation to protect Canada's forests and stopped them from their cutting rights as they understood them.

Clearly, American corporations have great property rights, much greater than Canadian corporations. I could throw in Mexico as well. We have not been challenged by many Mexican companies but we have been by American companies.

Let me be more specific. In an article a little while back Time Canada Ltd. said that it would not have to make good on a threat to sue Canada for its pending magazine legislation. We can debate magazine legislation and cultural legislation, but the reality is we have been interested over the years in strengthening our cultural sector through legislation to give Canada's cultural industries a bit of a hand up and assistance to enable them to get under way to compete in the international markets. However, we have been reminded time and time again that if we assist our corporate sector particularly when it comes to culture, that they will sue. They have the right now under NAFTA to do just that, and they want to expand that to include all 134 countries under the WTO. So there is time.

I want to quote my friend Dalton Camp.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nelson Riis: I have lots of friends outside the realm of the New Democratic Party. He wrote a very interesting article in which he said: ''Parliament approved Bill C-29. It was a lot like motherhood. MMT, a product of Ethyl Corporation of Virginia, has been banned in Europe and in California. Almost every major U.S. petroleum producer, the minister said, had indicated support for the decision by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to forbid MMT being marketed as a gasoline additive''. He went on to point out that one-third of the American market, because of acute air pollution problems, prohibits MMT in these particular areas.

In other words, Europe does it. The state of California does it. One-third of the American market does it. And so Canada said that we would also do the same thing, which we attempted to do in Bill C-29. However, along came Ethyl Corporation which launched a $347 million lawsuit against the Government of Canada.

These lawsuits by Sun Belt Inc. and Ethyl Corporation against the Government of Canada, were not against the Prime Minister and a handful of people sitting in some office. Actually, the Government of Canada is the people of Canada, the taxpayers of Canada. The Government of Canada is all of us, all 30 million people. We represent those people in this place. When Ethyl Corporation sues the Government of Canada, it is suing the people of Canada. Men, women and children from coast to coast to coast are being sued by Ethyl Corporation over the MMT issue.

We all know what happened. The government said to Ethyl Corporation that it was sorry, that it would back off and pull the legislation, that it would settle out of court for $20 million and that it would also provide a written letter of apology. That is what we did.

Talk about property rights. Talk about corporate property rights. One could not get a better provision than what we call chapter 11 under NAFTA which essentially guarantees the ultimate in corporate property rights.

I know my friend who sponsored this legislation has done it in the best interests of the constituents he represents as he sees it. I do not think it is the right course when it comes to property rights in

our country. I am not a lawyer but lawyers have told me that about 90% of the cases in a law office are case law when it comes to property and that about 10% of cases refer to people. In terms of property being protected, the track record is very very good.

My colleagues elsewhere will articulate other reasons that this legislation ought not to proceed. I could talk about the provision of assets during divorce settlements as an initiative. If one of the spouses has property rights guaranteed and he or she owns 99% of the assets, how will that affect divorce proceedings in their settlements? These are all arguments we have heard many times before.

● (1135)

I want to throw in as part of today's discussion the fact that under chapter 11 of NAFTA we have legislated property rights to the largest and most powerful corporations in the country, particularly in the countries of the United States and Mexico. Now they want to expand that through the WTO into virtually all of the nations of the world that we trade with. That would be nothing short of catastrophic.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C-237, which is an act for the recognition and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Strengthening property rights is a sentiment that we in the Conservative Party embrace wholeheartedly. The party has a long history in this regard. This legislation would afford greater protection in the bill of rights for property rights for both individuals and corporations.

The bill was last before the House on October 1998. I congratulate the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville for bringing the issue of property rights back to the House of Commons. He has been very dogged in his pursuit of this issue and his perseverance is duly noted.

It is unfortunate in a way because if the bill of rights was properly respected to the letter, this type of amendment would not be necessary. Once again, it is to underscore or strengthen existing law to co-opt a good idea, so I think it is somewhat a statement of the obvious in some areas. The Progressive Conservative Party has always been a proponent of the rights of Canadians and in particular the rights to own and enjoy property. Fully and unconditionally we support this concept.

The Canadian bill of rights itself was enacted in 1960 by the Progressive Conservative prime minister of the day, John Diefenbaker. It extended protection for the right to enjoy property, the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process, and obviously the right to a fair hearing.

In my previous comments at second reading I noted that in 1995 the Progressive Conservative Party across Canada approved a new constitution which lists one of the four principles as the following:

> A belief that the best guarantors of the prosperity and the well-being of the people of Canada are:
>
> 1. the freedom of the individual Canadian to pursue their enlightened and legitimate self-interest within a competitive economy;
>
> 2. the freedom of individual Canadians to enjoy the fruits of their labour to the greatest possible extent; and
>
> 3. the right to own property.

That is in the Conservative constitution.

The protection of property rights has long been recognized as a fundamental aspect of social and economic justice in this country. From the first settlers to those who faced the most overwhelming challenges of the size of this country, property was an immediate challenge. Yet there are inconsistencies within the laws concerning property rights today.

Article 17 of the UN Declaration of Human Rights reads as follows:

> Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

Canada ratified the UN Declaration of Human Rights over 50 years ago. It underscores again the importance of these rights.

Through the costly and discriminatory Firearms Act, the government is depriving law-abiding Canadian citizens of their property. Let us not beat around the bush, this is what is at the principle of this bill. I am referring specifically but not exclusively to rural Canadians who rely on the use of long guns for hunting, and farmers who use them for the protection of their livestock, for the elimination of predators. It is viewed more as a tool and a farm implement.

It is incumbent upon me at this point to say that on the 10th anniversary of the Montreal massacre it is perhaps ill-timed that we find ourselves debating this issue. Anyone on either side of this gun registration debate I think would agree that we should be focusing on mourning the loss of the 14 bright young future leaders of our country who were gunned down in Montreal. Yet the debate is here, it is before the House.

It must be noted that even with the current Firearms Act, nothing could have been done to prevent the psychopathic killer Marc Lépine from engaging in his shooting rampage. Criminals simply do not register guns. The Liberals' gun registry will do nothing to prevent gun related crime, but will impose increasingly expensive and discriminatory regulations upon law-abiding citizens. Crimi-

nals will not participate in any form of legitimate gun registry. The Conservative Party would repeal that element of the gun registry system. This is a narrowly focused law. Other existing safety provisions introduced by the Conservative Party would be left in place, but the gun registry system would be gone.

• (1140)

Bill C-237 is not of great concern to many Liberals because most of their support comes from urban Canada. Only approximately 10% of the Canadian population would be immediately affected by this law. Most Canadians do not register their firearms. They do not have firearms to register. The perpetual costs and inconvenience of this law is affecting mostly rural gun owning Canadians who live outside of city centres.

Issues like gun registry are a concern everywhere. Guns are property. Law-abiding gun owners in rural Canada have a right to have guns.

The recent amendments to the Firearms Act unleash a discriminatory system on law-abiding property owners. The act was designed to put pressure on legitimate gun owners who have consistently demonstrated until now that they favour reasonable gun control and desire to live within the law. It targets the wrong group. The criminal code is being used to run roughshod over property rights in this regard.

Gun registry has been a complete failure, facing massive non-compliance by the over three million gun owners in Canada with seven million guns yet to be registered. Provincial challenges at the supreme court level are indicative of broad disagreement about the approach the government has taken.

With the costs now spiralling into the area of $300 million, one has to question the priorities of the government with respect to crime in Canada. As an example, $206 million has been set aside for the new youth criminal justice act over the next three years. This particular initiative has already cost Canadian taxpayers close to $300 million with very little impact, if any, on crime.

Even if registration could be processed on time, the cost is unreasonable to keep a farmer or a hunter from engaging in a very legitimate, legal exercise. Because the process has failed, many people will not register. The government will be confiscating property which legally belongs to the person in question without compensation. Many may face arrest as a result of this criminal code amendment.

To recap, big brother can take our property without compensation and then throw us in jail. This will commence an unchecked growth in illegal gun sales around the country, encouraging sales on the black market. A panel of Liberal experts told the justice minister this would happen but she did not listen to that advice.

The bill denies and drives more legitimate owners into selling their guns or giving them up. This will put more guns, illegal and otherwise, on the black market.

We know that our prison system is suffering problems from funding and overcrowding. We know that our police agencies are breaking down as a result of underfunding. But the government is spending millions of dollars seizing law-abiding citizens' property.

Will the government spend more money on organized crime? Not likely. Will it set a greater priority for where the money should actually be spent? It does not appear so. There is a lack of consistency on the part of the government. It is refusing to act on constitutional grounds with respect to this bill. It, among other groups, will oppose it. But the Progressive Conservative Party is going to support this bill for the reasons I have referred to.

The Liberals rejected a truly effective DNA data bank system for similar reasons. They said they were afraid of the legal consequences. Yet they are going to keep a law that barely survived the Alberta Court of Appeal and is now going before the Supreme Court of Canada which we hope will succeed.

Governments have a duty to taxpayers to wait until the supreme court settles issues of constitutionality. They should not be deterred or afraid by it. The government suffers perpetually from charter constipation. It has already spent close to $300 million and counting. This will be followed by confiscation and lengthy court battles as a result.

The government argues that property rights are already adequately protected under the Canadian bill of rights. If it cannot continue, this will violate article 17 of the UN Declaration of Human Rights by arbitrarily taking property from Canadian citizens.

The PC Party does not want to limit the government's ability to legislate. It needs to be constantly reminded that its powers to override property rights go against individual rights in this country. There is a delicate balance that must be respected.

The issue of property rights in our constitution is also very problematic. The omission of property rights from section 7 of the charter greatly reduces the scope of the charter in this regard. It means that section 7 affords no guarantee of compensation or a fair procedure for the taking of property by the government. It also means that section 7 affords no guarantee of fair treatment by courts, tribunals or officials with powers over purely economic interests of individuals or corporations.

• (1145)

Thus section 7 ''liberty must be interpreted as not including property, as not including freedom of contract, and, in short, as not including economic liberty''.

Bill C-237 will help enhance the protection that most people thought they already had under the constitution. It does not try to change or challenge the charter because this is a complicated process. Rather, it tries to strengthen property rights and provisions of the bill of rights.

Section 237 would also accord greater strength to the charter of rights and for Canadians to enjoy property. It would also enhance the right to be paid fair compensation, to have fixed compensation, to have timely compensation and to apply to the courts to obtain real justice.

Bill C-237 recognizes that the gun registry system has not been working. The protests and legal challenges continue to mount against the existing Firearms Act, but the Liberal government is not using its good discretion. It is abusing its authority. We need legislation such as Bill C-237 more than ever.

In conclusion, I want to send a message to those who do oppose gun registration. Today is the day to remember the 14 women who died at École Polytechnique. It is a day to remember that violence against women still exists. The PC Party feels that this particular bill is worthy of support. We want to send our condolences to those affected by this massacre.

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to join my hon. colleague for Yorkton—Melville who has led the way in the House on the issue of property rights.

It is exciting to be part of a debate in the House that gets right to the heart of important philosophical questions about the scope of government and the importance of individual freedom. I applaud my colleague for his integrity and his perseverance in the campaign to awaken Canadians to the frightening realization that property ownership is not a right in this country but a so-called privilege that the government grants and can take away at its whim.

What is so special about property rights? Nobel laureate Frederick Hayek wrote ''Private property is the most important guarantee of freedom''. More than any other social or political institution, the institution of private property is the primary mechanism by which we separate those activities and those choices which properly belong to government and those activities and choices which should be left within the jurisdiction and control of private citizens.

We will never limit the size and scope of government without clearly defined private property rights. Even the NDP wants to limit the size and scope of government. Nobody wants to live in a country in which the government has no limits on its power to intrude into our lives. The solution to intrusive government should be simple, but Canadians have no legal right to own property. The institution of private property does not exist in Canada.

In case any member of the House is unaware of the lack of constitutional protection for private property, I will provide some statements to my colleagues of various expert opinions on property rights in Canada:

> The arbitrary taking of private property by the government without compensation would not seem to be justified. However, the law clearly gives the government the right to pass legislation that takes private property without providing compensation, if the law so states. In Canada there is no constitutional guarantee for compensation and the power of the government in this area is unlimited.

This was written by Gerald Lafreniere, Law and Government Division, Research Branch, Library of Parliament.

Here is another quote:

> Several things are clear. The Charter has never before and still does not protect economic liberty or property rights. A deliberate choice was made to exclude them from the document. . .Those who assert that the Charter guarantees Canadians freedom to deal with their own property as they wish are flying in the face of unvarnished truth that the Charter does not even contain a freedom from State confiscation of Canadians' property.

This statement was made by Justice F. C. Muldoon in the judgment in Archibald v the Canadian Wheat Board case of April 11, 1997.

Here is another quote:

> The product is a s. 7 in which liberty must be interpreted as not including property, as not including freedom of contract, and, in short, as not including economic liberty.

This was written by Professor Hogg. I think it speaks to the essential connection between economic liberty and property.

I could go on. There are many more legal scholars who repeat the same fact that Canadians lack the constitutional protection against the violation of their right to own property.

● (1150)

I will give some examples of property rights violations or potential violations in the country. I want to give the House a taste of the scope of the problem.

In 1996, farmer Andy McMechan was shackled, strip searched and imprisoned for five months for selling his grain, his property, without the approval of the Canadian Wheat Board. He was allowed to go home for Christmas only after surrendering his tractor to Canada Customs.

After January 1, 2001, 555,000 short-barrelled handguns will forcibly be confiscated as a result of an arbitrary government prohibition of these firearms. Law-abiding gun owners have been told to turn in an estimated $280 million worth of property for destruction or disposal and will not be compensated.

I will also share a personal example on the issue of private property, which I have spoken about before in the House. My family came here as refugees, as millions of other Canadians who have been in similar circumstances. When we had to leave the country of Uganda our property was completely confiscated. My parents lost everything they had worked for.

Granted, when we come to this country there is a respect of law and order and that gives people a great sense of hope and belief in the country. Why not strengthen that element of property rights, as being proposed in this bill by my colleague for Yorkton—Melville? It would put the hearts and minds of people, who have been through the terrible experience, as was my family, of losing everything due to the lack of concern for property, at rest.

I have another example of an organization that has worked hard to promote the idea of property rights, which was given the runaround by the Department of Revenue's charities division with a complete runaround. I bring up the case because it relates directly to property rights and to the Canadian Property Rights Research Institute.

The *National Post* nominated the charities division of Revenue Canada as the slowest moving department in Ottawa. I wish to also nominate the bureaucrat in charge of the department, Mr. Neil Barclay, for the dubious honour of being the laziest civil servant in the federal government today.

In processing the application for charitable registration by the Canadian Property Rights Research Institute, Mr. Barclay received over 20 phone calls and letters from opposition and government parliamentarians alike. After two and a half years of broken promises and delays, CanPRRI has been denied its application.

While Mr. Barclay was busy approving the applications of various other groups, the Canadian Property Rights Research Institute has been ignored and mistreated by a bureaucrat with an ideological bone to pick.

I hope the revenue minister will address this problem in the charities division and will insist on a departmental review of this application for charitable status. We know how important property rights are in the country and we need to continue to promote institutions that are willing to fight for them.

I have spoken today about a number of cases. My colleague for Yorkton—Melville spoke about the importance of property rights. We have a chance to make a decision today and work toward strengthening private property rights in the charter of rights and freedoms. I also call on my constituents and indeed all Canadians, who believe in the freedom of limited government, to demand that the government protect their fundamental rights to keep the products of their labour.

Property rights might seem abstract but the simple act of locking one's door at night is an exercise of private property.

Did you know, Mr. Speaker, that the campaign to end slavery in the United States was based on the principle of self-ownership, an idea that was advanced centuries earlier by philosopher John Locke. John Locke believed that the right to self-ownership is a foundation of the right to material property. I stress this point to assure my colleagues that the private property debate is not just about land and wealthy landowners; it is a debate that affects us all.

Unfortunately, many Canadians take property rights for granted and do not understand that real individual rights begin with the right to own and to control private property.

The members of the House can do something that would strengthen the institution of private property and guarantee that Canada remains a free and prosperous nation. They can work together to demand that the charter of rights and freedoms no longer excludes the protection for the fundamental right to own, use and enjoy private property.

• (1155)

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I was home recently and the issue of property rights became a very important issue as I moved about my constituency and held five town hall meetings.

When I visited one of the farms, I was quite taken with a rifle that was hanging above the fireplace. The gentleman explained to me that this particular French rifle was now in his hands after five generations. He does not know if it works but it is a very precious commodity. Of all the things he could trace from his ancestors, who came from France to Quebec, later emigrating to Michigan and then to Saskatchewan, this was the family's pride. This was also the pride of my 10 year old grandson. However, because we do not have the right in this country to own property, potentially that family heirloom could be seized without any recourse in law at all.

Mr. Paul DeVillers: Nonsense.

Mr. Roy Bailey: No, it is not nonsense. It is absolutely true.

In my own area, I could drive on a back road and see four or five signs pointing out endangered species. Nobody protects endangered species like the people in rural Saskatchewan. Do members know what they genuinely fear? They fear that all of these signs could be taken down. If the government sees these endangered species signs, and the species the farmer is attempting to protect, it could, under new legislation coming and because there is no right to own property, confiscate any portion of that land. This is not just dreaming, this is actual fact.

Pierre Trudeau's name came over the radio last night because it seems that he will be named the parliamentarian or the politician of the century. Who was it who argued vigorously and repeatedly for the inclusion of property rights in the charter of rights and freedoms? He went to great lengths to guarantee Canadians the right to own property.

Resolutions were passed in the legislatures of British Columbia, Ontario and New Brunswick supporting inclusions of property rights in the charter but we do not have them.

Legal support is needed for the protection of property rights. The government knows this is a good bill. My colleague has taken it to the committee and has argued three times to have the bill become votable, but for no clear, enunciated reason, can anyone on that side of the House offer a reason why that cannot be done.

The way things are going in Canada, as we are moving from a democracy to a jurocracy, Canadians need to be worried. We in the Reform Party are worried about what is happening to the democratic principles in Canada. We are worried that more and more legal decisions and more and more legislations are being passed outside of these chambers.

I tell the hon. members opposite that the fear they have about giving Canadians the right to own property will come back to haunt them. By denying my colleague's bill, not once but three times, it will indeed come back to haunt them in the near future.

● (1200)

The Deputy Speaker: I have to interrupt the hon. member to allow the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville to have his five minute opportunity for reply. I should advise the House that when the hon. member speaks, he will close the debate.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all those members who spoke in support of my bill, the member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough and my own Reform Party colleagues.

Bill C-237 would amend the bill of rights to provide added protection for Canadian citizens from the arbitrary decisions made by the federal government to take their property.

I listened to the arguments the Liberals put forward. They all stem from the fact that it would limit them in their ability to legislate and override the rights of citizens to own property. They fear that their power as government would be undermined. They point to the bill of rights as enough support. The courts have clearly demonstrated that it was because it was not included in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms that it is not constitutionally protected.

The Liberals point out that there have been hundreds of years of jurisprudence to support property rights. However, in a few court decisions now, our courts in Canada have overridden all of that jurisprudence which stems back to 1215 and the Magna Carta. I think it is time we fixed that in the House.

I listened to the NDP members. They tried to spin my bill as protecting the corporations. Only corporations can challenge the legislation or can afford to challenge it I suppose. However from the speech by the hon. member of the NDP it became clear that corporations are better protected in Canada through NAFTA than are individuals. His arguments were really a support for what I am trying to do today and indicated the need for property rights within our Canadian context.

Article 17(2) of the UN Declaration of Human Rights states: ''No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property''. Voters in this country have to know that the federal government by its own legislation, legislation that government members have supported, condones the arbitrary taking of property in direct contravention of article 17 of the UN Declaration of Human Rights.

Let us be honest and up front and not be hypocritical in our debate today. Members of the Liberal government should hang their heads in shame rather than parade around the world claiming to be defenders of fundamental human rights. What a sham.

In 1903 Pope Pius X wrote to his bishops:

> The right of private property, the fruit of labour or industry, or of concession or donation by others, is an incontrovertible natural right; and everybody can dispose reasonably of such property as he thinks fit.

Today we have heard the proof that our fundamental property rights are under attack. Are we just going to ignore it? Just because a bill is passed in parliament does not make the use and abuse of government force to violate fundamental property rights and freedom of contract of its citizens a good thing.

In her book *Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal*, Ayn Rand wrote:

> The concept of a right pertains only to action—specifically to freedom of action. It means freedom from physical compulsion, coercion or interference by others. The right to life is the source of all rights—and the right to property is their only implementation. Without property rights, no other rights are possible. Since man has to sustain his life by his own effort, the man who has not right to the product of his effort has no means to sustain his life. The man who produces while others dispose of his product, is a slave.

Czech President Vaclav Havel also hit the nail on the head when he said: ''Human rights rank above state rights because people are the creation of God''.

Are the Liberals listening? My colleagues, property rights are our most important human right because they are fundamental to our right to life. This is a very serious matter that I fear many in the

House, especially those on the government side, are taking far too lightly.

My bill strengthens property rights in federal law. It does not tie the hands of government.

● (1205)

I talked about the Magna Carta. It is a very important document. Since that time we have had hundreds of years of jurisprudence. Our Canadian courts have done away with that. It is time we sent the signal to them that this is not acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, you have heard all the arguments. I think it needs to be studied further. I would like to respectfully request the House to do something else. I would like the unanimous consent of the House to refer Bill C-237 to the subcommittee on human rights for further study. I do not think anybody can reasonably deny that, so I would like to make that request at this time.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to refer the bill for further study?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business is now expired and the order is dropped from the order paper.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

BILL C-9—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am now ready to rule on a point of order raised by the House leader for the official opposition on Thursday, December 2, 1999 concerning the acceptability of report stage motions related to Bill C-9, an act to give effect to the Nisga'a final agreement, which were refused.

The first motion that the hon. member submitted sought to append the Nisga'a Final Agreement and Appendices as a schedule to Bill C-9. The member was informed by the Journals Branch that his motion was not in order and could therefore not be placed, pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(2), on the Notice Paper. A second motion seeking to add the Nisga'a Nation Taxation Agreement as a schedule was also refused for the same reasons. The member argued that the Speaker or the staff of the Journals Branch could have made the necessary corrections to ensure that his amendments were in order.

Before proceeding to the substantive issues raised, let me state that the onus has always been on members submitting amendments

to ensure that they are in order. There were however, more substantive reasons for ruling these motions out of order.

The member for Langley—Abbotsford made reference in his presentation to a ruling delivered by Speaker Beaudoin on May 17, 1956 and found on pages 567-569 of the *Journals*. I have read the ruling and was struck by what was said by my predecessor. At that time, in dealing with an issue having some similarities to the present case, the Speaker stated:

> —it was customary not to include agreements in bills providing for the carrying in to effect of these agreements.

He further drew members' attention to chapter 71 of the Statutes of 1948 in which are found an act to provide for carrying into effect treaties of peace between Canada and Italy, Romania, Hungary and Finland, in which none of the agreements were included.

[*Translation*]

A more recent example of this practice can be found in the James Bay and Northern Quebec Native Claims Settlement Act, which was assented to on July 14, 1977. Members consulting that statute will find that the agreement that is referred to throughout the act has not been appended to it as a schedule.

[*English*]

Nonetheless, the member is quite right in stating that a schedule containing an agreement or treaty has often been included in bills. Where agreements or treaties have not been tabled in the House, this may be a convenient way of providing information for the use of parliament.

[*Translation*]

I would now like to turn to the citations in Beauchesne's that the opposition House leader made reference to in his arguments.

One of them—citation 704—makes it abundantly clear that the addition of a schedule of this type to a bill is not necessary.

[*English*]

In another section of Beauchesne's sixth edition, a criterion is provided under which the Speaker will not permit an amendment to be proceeded with. In particular, an amendment is not acceptable as stated in subsection 3 of citation 699 if it is deemed that it would have no effect or was unnecessary. This principle is found as well on page 526 of the 19th edition of Erskine May. One reason behind this rule is simply to prevent the House from voting needlessly.

● (1210)

At the same time, this particular question is not one with respect to which an established practice or clear procedure exists. In trying to address this point of order, I have looked back to my predecessors and I find that they have not had to directly address this specific issue. Despite what might be regarded as a principle precluding such proposed amendments in Beauchesne's citations

699 and 704, I am prepared to grant the benefit of the doubt to the hon. member for Langley—Abbotsford in this instance. I am willing to allow the proposed motions to be considered by the House, albeit in a slightly altered form.

I stress that this is not a matter of technical detail. Since the agreements have previously been tabled in this House, the motions in amendment should refer specifically to the tabled documents. This will ensure that the text inserted in the bill pursuant to these motions is consistent with the documents already laid before the House. Accordingly, the form of the motions which will be proposed to the House will read as follows:

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 8, on page 10, Sessional Paper No. 8525-362-2, *The Nisga'a Final Agreement and related Appendices*, as Schedule 1.

[*Translation*]

And second:

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 8, on page 10, Sessional Paper No. 8525-362-3, The Nisga'a Nation Taxation agreement, as Schedule 2.

[*English*]

Accordingly, these new motions will be numbered 470 and 471, will be grouped for debate in Group No. 5 and voted on separately.

I would like to thank the hon. member for Langley—Abbotsford for drawing this matter to the attention of the House.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

NISGA'A FINAL AGREEMENT ACT

BILL C-9—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I move:

That, in relation to Bill C-9, An Act to give effect to the Nisga'a Final Agreement, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage of the Bill and one sitting day shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the said Bill; and that, 15 minutes before the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders on the day allotted to the consideration of the report stage and on the day allotted to the third reading stage of the said Bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this Order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the stage of the Bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

• (1215)

[*English*]

The 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.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1300)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 61*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy
Baker	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Chan
Charbonneau	Clouthier
Coderre	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
DeVillers	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Eggleton	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gallaway
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri	Harb
Hubbard	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
McKay (Scarborough East)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan

Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pratt
Proulx
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sgro
Speller
St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thibeault
Valeri
Volpe
Wilfert
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pillitteri
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Shepherd
St. Denis
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Vanclief
Whelan
Wood—126

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Bailey
Bergeron
Bigras
Brien
Cadman
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Earle
Fournier
Gilmour
Gouk
Guay
Hanger
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jaffer
Keddy (South Shore)
Lalonde
Lebel
Lunn
Manning
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Perron
Power
Reynolds
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Stinson
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp
Wasylycia-Leis
Williams—81
Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brison
Cardin
Cummins
de Savoye
Dockrill
Duceppe
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Hart
Herron
Hilstrom
Jones
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laurin
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Mayfield
Mercier
Muise
Penson
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Riis
Sauvageau
St-Jacques
Stoffer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vautour
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Alcock
Bakopanos
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Canuel
Collenette
Desrochers
Gauthier
Harvard
Asselin
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Calder
Cauchon
Crête
Folco
Girard-Bujold
Marchand
McGuire
Nunziata
McCormick
Normand
Venne

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

REPORT STAGE

The House resumed from December 2 consideration of Bill C-9, an act to give effect to the Nisga'a Final Agreement, as reported (without amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, discussions have taken place among all party whips and, pursuant to Standing Order 45, I believe you would find consent for the following motion:

That at the conclusion of today's debate on report stage of Bill C-9 all questions necessary to dispose of the said stage of the said bill be deemed put, a recorded division requested and deferred until the end of government orders on Tuesday, December 7, 1999.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it has been said that this treaty, this agreement, is a matter introduced overnight. I would simply remind this House that in the three year run-up to the signing of the treaty no less than 500 public meetings and consultations were held, 296 of them in the Nass Valley and 13, no less, in a row, with a group of non-aboriginal residents. If we compare this to city constituencies, it is an astonishing degree of public consultation.

In approaching this agreement we must remember that it becomes law as far as the federal government is concerned, as far as federal constitutional law is concerned, with this enabling law. The enabling law is the product of considerable discussion between members of parliament and the former minister of Indian affairs, the hon. member for Brant, who is now in another portfolio, but it does contain one very important factor which has been addressed by some people from outside and was the subject of representations which I made to the minister. It includes an express legal stipula-

tion that the treaty is subject to the constitution and the charter of rights. That is in the treaty itself, but to make assurance doubly sure I asked the minister to include this in the federal enabling legislation. It is there.

● (1305)

Further, I advised the minister that I and other members would be stating that our vote is cast on that basis. We would have the third assurance, les travaux préparatoires, of which the courts must take notice of the parliamentary intent that the treaty, as enacted by parliament, is subject to the charter and to the constitution. It means that there can be no provincial status, no third order of government unless it goes through the amending procedures, part V, sections 38 to 49 of the Constitution Act, 1982.

I think these corrections were necessary because of doubts that I had in relation to section 35(3) of the charter of rights which was not in the original charter but added in 1983, 12 months after its adoption. It applied to future treaties what was clearly applied in section 35(1), the original draft to existing treaties. Those existing treaties, all of them, were a known quantity, and we had all studied them, and they were clearly within the constitution and the charter that was being adopted.

To remove uncertainty I suggested at that time to the new minister of justice, one of our most distinguished jurists, Mark MacGuigan, the need for clarification. He thought, I think correctly, that it would be an extreme interpretation to say that this was a back door way of changing the constitution, that it could be settled in the future. In my view it has been done adequately and completely with the federal enabling legislation, the federal enacting law.

Let me get back to some other points on which the minister gave assurances to members of parliament that the treaty would not be a template for the remaining 50 treaties. It rests on its own special facts, among which is the fact that the Nisga'a leaders and the federal negotiators were superbly informed, they negotiated in good faith and with restraint. These conditions might or might not be replicated in future treaties because different federal teams take part. Every future treaty will have to be defended and supported on its own special sociological facts. Nisga'a stands alone. It is not a template.

I think when we get to the cities and municipal areas where conflicts of interest might reasonably be expected between different categories of rights, such as fee simple rights and claimed historic rights, that perhaps we need different and more advanced machinery, and I will come to that in a moment.

In recommendations to the Ministry of Indian Affairs and Northern Development as to future treaties, I have made these suggestions. In respect of all future treaties, the same principles and terms should be applied and the federal enabling legislation should cite that it is subject to the supremacy of the constitution and the charter of rights. In fact, this means that the principles of procedural due process of law, judicial review and, among other things, the principle of equality before the law and equal protection of the law are applicable. They are the supreme law of the land and in cases of conflict can be raised before the courts.

In respect of future treaty negotiations we also suggested that it be understood that the parties be required to undertake negotiations in good faith, which is a legal principle in international and constitutional law. They must also apply the principle of good neighbourliness, which is one of the oldest principles of civil law. It is part of the common law. In cases of breakdown there should be resort to the principle of arbitration and third party settlement.

We need improvement of facilities for judicial review. One of the problems we have had with cognate cases, not connected with the Nisga'a but the subject of some representations in the last few days to the parliamentary committee, is with the Federal Court of Canada. As an ambulatory federal court, it is not perhaps as fully seized of local social economic facts as local courts. It may be that there should be consideration given to establishing a mixed claims tribunal with developed expertise in economic issues, or else to investing provincial supreme courts, which after all are permanent courts in the locality, with competence to adjudicate economic evidence on reference. I simply say that these are suggestions for the future treaties still remaining.

● (1310)

One very useful suggestion is to include representatives of municipal and other elected governments in the negotiation processes for future treaties. The Union of British Columbia Municipalities has established a list of five principles. I think it makes sense because the local bodies have special expertise in relation to local water and power supply, as well as property title issues, and their expertise can be brought to bear.

I mention all this simply to say that Bill C-9 has been adequately considered and discussed. There have been three years of public consultation. It was open at all times to the parliamentary committee, if it wished, which is an all party committee. It has a single member majority on the government side. The opposition had only to ask for more detailed hearings. There was a strange silence in some areas of the opposition over those three or four years when jurisdiction could have been exercised in relation to the treaty.

I found this again in relation to a matter to which we gave some attention, Bill C-49, the native lands administration bill. It was reported by the committee with only one minor amendment, which had the unanimous endorsement of the committee. It was only at the last minute that we realized there were problems that should be

addressed. With the co-operation of members of the House and the Senate, both Conservative and government members of the Senate, changes were made to Bill C-49, the native lands administration bill, which incorporated the principles of due process and similar guarantees that are certainly part of the federal enabling law in relation to the Nisga'a treaty.

I put out four newsletters to my constituents after the signing of the treaty, perhaps about 6,000 words of detailed legal material, and asked for comments. The comments came back. They were passed on to the minister. The changes the minister of Indian affairs made to the federal enabling law, in the text of the law, were as a result of representations made by constituents.

I think this is participatory democracy in action. I think it is the way to proceed with legislation. It is the best way to ensure that in the run-up to the 50 remaining treaties in British Columbia we can produce agreements without discord. We do not want 19 long summers of discontent in British Columbia. Our economy needs help. There are other matters to attend to. In good will and in good faith I think we can proceed with the further treaties. I recommend adoption of the federal enabling law.

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just spoken said that this is not a template of settlements to come. If he would travel across Canada, as I did this past week, travelling across my constituency, he would not adhere to that particular hope or wish because it is already being stated across Canada by leaders of other Indian peoples that it will be a template. It was stated in my province about four days ago that it will be a template. To say that this will not be followed across Canada is sheer nonsense.

During this past week I had the privilege of travelling across my constituency where there are six native reserves. They are all fine people and we get along well, but the point I want to make is that they are waiting. They are waiting because there are some land claims to be settled. By that time, with the government's help, the Nisga'a treaty will become a reality, and they will follow it all the way through. It is what they will use in all future negotiations concerning land settlements.

A tract of land in northern Saskatchewan last week, as big as the entire Prince Albert National Park, was allotted to the Lac La Ronge band. They themselves say "Wait until the Nisga'a treaty comes down and we will see what happens".

• (1315)

One of the myths that came out of this whole thing was that it was just another type of municipal government. Nothing could be further from the truth. I served in local governments for a total of 21 years. I served in the provincial legislature for a term and now I am here. A municipal government anywhere in Canada is nothing but a creation of the provincial government in the province in which it is located.

This is what happens under a provincial government. The province states that municipalities must have regular elections. The provincial government spells out the electoral process. I do not see that. After the electoral process is spelled out, then what? The municipality must have a bonded administrator. That is a requirement of the provincial government. On top of that it must prepare a budget statement that must be forwarded to the province. At the end of the fiscal year it must then have a bonded chartered accountant to make sure the books are in order. When that takes place, it is printed and distributed among the citizens of the municipality.

The government has created the myth that it is just another municipal government. It is a brand new level of sovereignty created in the province.

Last week in Prince Albert the native workers at the casino decided they would unionize. With the help of the Canadian automobile workers, a union was created. There was going to be an argument but the three or four chiefs stepped back until the next day. They said that the building will soon be sitting on reserve land and when they get sovereignty like there is under the Nisga'a treaty the chiefs said they will not have to adhere to the labour regulation board in Saskatchewan and will not have to listen to the labour regulations of the Government of Canada because they will be a sovereign state. I wonder why they are talking that way already before using Nisga'a as a template. Why are they saying it is nothing but a municipal type of government?

Each province has a right to establish certain laws. The province in which I live has a highway traffic act. The municipalities within the province of Saskatchewan cannot create their own highway traffic act. The province of Saskatchewan also has the right to contain within legislation hunting rules and regulations. A municipality cannot do that. The province of Saskatchewan has the right to have a labour relations board. The municipalities cannot do that.

Why is the federal government trying to tell Canadians that this treaty is just another form of a municipality? That is simply false.

I worked with the Nisga'a people for one full year. I taught there for a year. I have many friends who live there. Let me say, they are afraid of the bill because of the various things I have just mentioned. They want to enjoy the clear-cut accountability the rest of us have. They do not want to be subject to a rollover to the same type of government which gives them more power but less accountability.

The provinces do not have a right to control trade. That is not within their jurisdiction. That is the federal government's. Yet enshrined in this new type of municipality is a right to trade. That is fine but do not come out and tell the people that it is just another municipality.

The danger is that we are creating, and could create very quickly in 10 years, 100 Nisga'a type treaties all across Canada, all a separate legal entity unto themselves. Can we see the map of Canada being drawn up with 100 different principalities, each creating their own labour laws, each creating all of those things that we give to the province and the federal government? What are we doing? We are dividing Canada into principalities and we are not doing anything to improve the overall governance level among our native people. That is wrong.

● (1320)

The Indian Act was wrong. The accountability today is wrong. It needs to be improved but this bill simply does not do it.

I attended five town hall meetings last week dealing with a very serious issue in agriculture. At each meeting the participants voluntarily got into this topic. They are concerned. They are very intelligent people. We cannot tell the people that this is just another form of municipal government because it is not. We are granting sovereign power. In many cases it is sovereign power that the province does not have. In many cases it is equal to and can challenge the federal legislation.

Why not just admit it? Why does the government continue to propagate this myth that it is just another type of government?

I want my grandchildren to have the same right that I have today and that is to go down to my school division—and I sign 21 of those—and ask for an audited financial statement. It must be due at a certain time every year. Why is the government saying that this is another municipal government?

I want the right to vote at a specific, regular time for the people who serve in my town or in my school division. I want to know that all of the moneys are being handled in accordance with the law of the province in which we live.

This is a very serious thing. We are not doing our native people any service or any value unless we instil within the bill the municipal type of accountability on a regular basis. Ask the young people, ask the women and ask in many cases the chiefs. That is what they want and it is not in the bill.

The government is going to proceed with this legislation. It will be to the detriment not just of the natives of the country but it very definitely is going to be to the detriment of all Canadians.

I beg hon. members to stop spreading the myth that it is just another municipal type of government. That indeed is a myth. That myth is not selling in my province one iota.

Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to this very important Nisga'a treaty. It is historic and one that all Canadians will benefit from as a result of the movement of this government and I believe rightfully so.

Because the Nisga'a agreement is an important page in Canada's history, I would like to take this opportunity to set out some of the facts surrounding this very important legislation. Perhaps even in the process I will correct some of the myths perpetuated by the Reform Party, including the member for Souris—Moose Mountain.

First and foremost I must stress that the Nisga'a treaty was negotiated within the constitutional framework of Canada. Everything done in the treaty was done in keeping with the constitution just as it is.

For example, section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982 recognizes and affirms the existing aboriginal treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada. However, we do not know precisely the nature, scope or extent of these rights. In many circumstances unresolved claims of aboriginal rights have hindered economic development. Accordingly a number of cases have been brought before the courts in Canada in an effort to define aboriginal rights.

● (1325)

Through these court decisions we have learned a great deal about aboriginal rights but not enough to resolve once and for all the disputes arising from continuing claims of aboriginal people. In the most recent cases for example dealing with the existence and nature of aboriginal rights in British Columbia, the Supreme Court of Canada found that in the absence of treaties, lands in that province may be subject to aboriginal title.

Most important is the fact that the courts have told us that aboriginal rights are group and site specific. That means that wherever the courts consider issues concerning aboriginal rights, the courts do so in the context of the particular facts presented and in consideration of the particular group before them. Accordingly, while some general principles can be drawn from current case law, we cannot yet rely upon court decisions to make conclusions about aboriginal rights that would apply to all locations in Canada or in British Columbia.

Given that some court cases on aboriginal rights might take as many as 10 years to resolve and that they may not resolve issues in all locations, imagine how long it would take and how expensive it would be to resolve all outstanding aboriginal issues in British Columbia in this manner. It is unthinkable quite frankly. We must all keep in mind that in all these instances, these court outcomes might not be palatable to everyone or for that matter, to anyone.

The government agrees with the courts that negotiation rather than litigation is a better way to resolve outstanding aboriginal rights issues. Besides, while litigation is adversarial and may not

lead to good relationships, negotiations do lead to mutually agreeable solutions and better relationships. That is the Canadian way. Unfortunately that is something the Reform Party has yet not understood.

In Canada the historic practice of negotiation and resolution of outstanding aboriginal rights issues is called treaty making. As in the case of existing aboriginal rights, the rights contained in treaties are also recognized and affirmed under section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982.

Although treaties covering much of Canada were concluded prior to 1927, in British Columbia this process was never completed. The Nisga'a treaty is the first modern treaty to be concluded in British Columbia. It resolves once and for all the Nisga'a outstanding claims of aboriginal rights including land and resources and self-government. This is something we truly can and will celebrate.

In 1995, Hon. Ronald Irwin made public the Government of Canada's approach to the implementation of the inherent right and the negotiation of aboriginal self-government. The approach he presented reflects an evolution in thinking that stretches over a long period of time.

For decades the citizens of Canada have been trying to find ways to reconcile the prior occupation of the country by aboriginal people with the sovereignty of the crown. Long before the arrival of Europeans, aboriginal people lived in this country and looked after their own affairs. First nations in British Columbia and elsewhere enjoyed existing governance and social systems.

Existing aboriginal rights are recognized and affirmed under section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982. The 1995 federal inherent right policy recognizes that those section 35 rights include a right to self-government and that Canada is prepared to negotiate workable and practical self-government agreements and include them in treaties. There are different views about the scope and content of the inherent right, as in the case of other aboriginal rights, but this government has chosen to resolve self-government issues through the negotiation of practical arrangements within the context of our constitutional framework and legal framework.

Allow me to explain briefly how a negotiated resolution of claimed aboriginal rights to self-government works within the current constitutional context.

The Constitution Act, 1867 defines the lawmaking powers of federal and provincial governments. These are set out primarily in sections 91 and 92 of the Constitution Act, 1867. The scope of any aboriginal right in self-government may vary from community to community and accordingly to the circumstances of the various first nations. Consequently the aboriginal right of self-government under section 35 must be considered on a case by case basis.

That is what happened in the case of the Nisga'a. The Nisga'a final agreement does not only set out all the land and resource related rights that the Nisga'a will have under section 35 of the constitution act, it also identifies the self-government rights the Nisga'a will have under the same section of the constitution. The Nisga'a treaty will not alter the federal and provincial heads of power as set out in sections 91 and 92 of the Constitution Act, 1867.

● (1330)

Some have charged that the Nisga'a final agreement creates a de facto third order of government that requires a constitutional amendment. The meaning of third order of government is not clear. What is clear, however, is that the Nisga'a final agreement works and that it works within the current constitutional framework.

The protection of section 35 rights under our constitution does not mean those rights are set out in constitutional concrete as some critics claim. Although section 35 rights are protected, they are not absolute. A number of Supreme Court of Canada decisions have confirmed that governments still retain an overall authority but must justify any interference with aboriginal or treaty rights.

The Nisga'a government will clearly operate within the Canadian constitutional framework. Anyone who has read the Nisga'a final agreement knows that the charter of rights and freedoms will apply to Nisga'a government. This means the Nisga'a laws will be subject to the charter as will Nisga'a government decisions, for example, in issuing permits or selling land. The Nisga'a government will be subject to the charter just as all other governments are as well.

At the risk of repeating what has been said many times before, federal and provincial laws such as the criminal code will apply on Nisga'a lands once the treaty comes into effect. While in certain limited circumstances Nisga'a laws may prevail, there will be no exclusive Nisga'a law-making powers. This is a current model of law-making and important to note.

Nisga'a laws will only prevail for matters internal to the Nisga'a themselves, for example, laws relating to their culture, their language, the management of their land and their assets. In all other cases either federal and provincial laws prevail or the Nisga'a law must meet or exceed existing federal or provincial standards in order to be valid. It would be clear to anyone who closely examines it that the Nisga'a treaty works within the current framework of the Canadian constitution.

Perhaps those who argue that the Nisga'a final agreement cannot be given full effect without first amending the Constitution of Canada just do not understand the process and do not understand the value of a negotiated reconciliation of aboriginal rights within

the Canadian federation. Perhaps they wish they could unilaterally impose their own arbitrary solutions. We on the government side prefer negotiation and reconciliation. After all, this is the Canadian way.

We all know where unilateral decisions would lead us. We have seen solutions imposed by one group on to another throughout history. Where possible lasting arrangements are best achieved when they are negotiated by all those who live by them. The Nisga'a treaty is one of these negotiated settlements.

I would urge all members of the House to leave the spurious, mean-spirited arguments behind, especially those of the Reform Party. I just do not understand why Reform insists on pitting people against people, group against group, region against region. It is not in keeping with the Canadian way. It is not what Canadians want.

I would ask that all members of the House move very expeditiously to pass this very important and historic treaty. I know that good judgment will prevail and that we will ensure the right thing is done. That is after all in keeping with what Canadians want, with what is good for Canada, and we will prevail in this matter.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to have an opportunity one last time to put out points of view regarding what I think is history in the making. I believe the passing of the Nisga'a deal is a monumental, pivotal point in Canadian history as we watch this group of aboriginal people take its first courageous steps toward true self-government. I hope we are seeing the beginning of the end of 130 years of absolute social tragedy: the Indian Act.

Like the member who just spoke, I too am shocked and appalled at some of the tone and the content of the arguments I have heard in the House of Commons as the bill is debated. I have watched as the Reform Party has systematically tried to discredit aboriginal people and tried to make the argument that somehow the Nisga'a are not ready for this move. It keeps threading together isolated incidents of misuse of funds from reserves across the country. It tries to thread that together into some argument that self-government is a bad thing or that aboriginal people are not ready or mature or competent enough.

● (1335)

I have even heard Reformers stoop so low as to compare the Nisga'a deal to apartheid. That is an injustice on many levels because it trivializes the struggle of black South Africans. Frankly, I do not think the people who said that even know what true apartheid is. It is shocking to me that they would make that kind of comparison.

For their benefit I did some research on what the apartheid regime really was. I went to the Library of Parliament and obtained the legislation that actually made up the apartheid system in South Africa.

I would like the House to hear some of what is in the legislation, compare it to what we know about the Nisga'a deal and if we think there is any comparison or relationship whatsoever.

One element of the apartheid regime was the Masters and Servants Act which made it a criminal offence to breach any contract of employment. Insolence, drunkenness, negligence and strikes would be considered criminal offences under the Masters and Servants Act.

Extra-marital intercourse between whites and blacks was outlawed by law. That became a crime.

The Native (Black) Affairs Administrative Act contained the pass laws. A black person had to carry a permit to enter a white neighbourhood. One could be charged with promoting feelings of hostility. In other words, if anything was said to anybody that may have promoted hostility, one could be arrested.

This is what black South African people went through under the apartheid regime. For the Reform Party to even compare the Nisga'a deal to apartheid, someone had to blow the whistle on that kind of ridiculous statement. In trying to stop the Nisga'a deal the Reform Party has also stooped so low during the debate as to spread myths that simply are not true. Reformers have said things about the Nisga'a deal that they know in their heart if they had ever read the deal are simply not true.

One of the things the Reform Party talks about is whether there should be a referendum on the agreement in the province of British Columbia. It knows full well that there is no precedence for a referendum. We did not have a referendum on NAFTA, or on the GST. We do not have referendums on these matters. We have a government that can decide these issues in the House of Commons or in the provincial legislatures. The reason there had to be a referendum vote among the Nisga'a people is that they did not have a structure of government which was binding on all of the people there or they would have been able to do that by a more conventional means, as well.

Should parliament not be able to change the treaty or alter it at this point to be able to make amendments to the deal? This is a three party agreement. Should any one party be able to impose their points of view on the other two?

An hon. member: Everybody in B.C. is against this deal.

Mr. Pat Martin: One of the members is saying that everybody in B.C.is against this deal. They are obviously wrong. This went to 46 communities in British Columbia. They toured the province. There was broad consultation. It was the longest debate ever in the history of the provincial legislature. It was ratified and passed and approved in its current form.

I heard the Reform Party say that this deal somehow denies women's rights. There is absolutely no basis for this claim. It is a

myth. It is trying to do anything to undermine the legitimacy of the Nisga'a deal.

Does this treaty protect property rights? Reformers were trying to say that property rights were at risk. The treaty transfers ownership of the land back to the Nisga'a people collectively. The treaty allows for various ways for people to then privately own the land that they live on.

All these things were brought up during the 100 years of negotiation. They were carefully contemplated. They were debated and the issues are addressed within the text of the actual deal.

I have raised this in the House before. What is really galling is to see the Reformers trying to sell themselves as the champions of aboriginal people. If we scratch the surface just a little, go back a year or so, we can see in *Hansard* what Reformers were saying about aboriginal issues; things like ''Just because we did not kill the Indians and have Indian wars, that does not mean we did not conquer these people. Is that not why they allowed themselves to be herded into little reserves in the most isolated, desolate, worthless parts of the country?'' This is a Reform MP's comments on aboriginal people.

• (1340)

There is another which I like even better. I am talking about a man by the name of Herb Grubel who now works for the Fraser Institute. When he was a member of parliament he likened Indians on reserves to people living on a south sea island courtesy of their rich uncle. This is the attitude of a man like Herb Grubel. If he is teaching school or university somewhere, he should be muzzled. He should have a muzzle on with attitudes like this. It is absolutely scandalous.

One of the advisers to the aboriginal task force of the Reform Party is a man named Mel Smith, a self-professed pundit. Mr. Smith wrote a book called *Our Home or Native Land*, a clever play on words, criticizing any concept of aboriginal self-government. Obviously this is the true attitude of the Reform Party toward aboriginal people. Look at the company it keeps, look at things the party says, look at quotes like I have mentioned which would make any decent person in this day and age shudder.

One of Reform's past advisers, Tom Flanagan, whom I think at the present time is a college professor at the University of Calgary, wrote a paper asking why Indians do not drive taxis? He proceeded to go on a diatribe about every other group of immigrants who come to Canada start at low paying jobs such as driving taxis and eventually work their way up the economic ladder. He was making the point that he felt these lazy people would not take low paying jobs and get into the workforce. This was from Tom Flanagan, another Reform adviser. This is truly horrifying and I could circulate copies of the article to members for their own information.

In the next day or so we will see the last little bit of political mischief on the part of the Reform Party. We will see those members go to the wall to do all they can to stop the Nisga'a deal. They are forcing 450 and some odd votes tomorrow night and will make us stand up for every vote. I liken it to Custer's last stand. These great Indian fighters are going to have one last stand. But let us look at history and what happened at Custer's last stand. The Indian people won and they will win tomorrow even if we have to stand up 500 times. I will stand up 500 times. I do not care.

It has been very hard for me to sit in such close physical proximity to the Reform Party members and hear them and their outrageous comments for these past many months. As a member of parliament from a riding with a huge aboriginal population, I for one am sick of hearing it. The sooner this deal gets ratified, voted on and implemented the better it will be for Canada and the better it will be for all of us.

There is the myth that this particular deal will form the template for all other subsequent land claim settlements. Again, this is absolutely untrue. The Government of Canada has the mandate under the constitution to enter into treaties of this nature. The government is charged with that mandate. It negotiates each individual contract based on the merits of the claim.

The only thing I would criticize about the Nisga'a process is that it took 100 years. There was nothing wrong with the process. It was just spread out over too great a length of time. If we could somehow compress that to a reasonable length of time and keep that model of true negotiation and reaching a settlement in an amicable, that is the most civilized way of doing business. When we compare it to the alternative, which is violent struggle, the most civilized way for resolving issues of this nature is at the table, through collective bargaining and negotiation which is really what occurred in this matter.

It is now up to us. We in the House have the privilege to vote on this deal. I am very glad that I have the opportunity to vote on this deal. This is the most significant thing I have been asked to do since becoming an elected member of parliament. I will be proud to stand up tomorrow and vote in favour of the Nisga'a treaty.

Mrs. Nancy Karetak-Lindell (Nunavut, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very honoured to be speaking to Bill C-9, the Nisga'a treaty. I would like to give the hon. members a description of who the Nisga'a people are, where they live and how their land claims agreement and the bill giving it effect have arrived here for the consideration of the House.

The Nisga'a live along the Nass River in a relatively remote area of northwestern British Columbia, 100 kilometres north of Terrace and Prince Rupert.

● (1345)

Other than the 2,500 Nisga'a who live in four villages along the river and at its mouth, approximately 125 other permanent residents occupy the 24,000 square kilometres of this valley. The only communities in the Nass Valley are Nisga'a communities.

Like many other similar northern British Columbia rural areas, forestry is by far the most important economic activity, although fishing, ecotourism, pine mushroom harvesting and a few service industries also contribute to employment. There are no mines or mineral claims, nor other major industries on the proposed Nisga'a land.

The Nisga'a who live in the Nass Valley are one cultural group based among the northwest coast aboriginal people. They have a complex culture based on the rich resources of the sea. Historically, like other northwest coast people, the Nisga'a were great artists, builders and crafts people. They still are and their art graces the exteriors and interiors of many of the buildings in their villages.

Salmon and the other resources of the Nass provide both food and the raw material for Nisga'a architectural, artistic and social achievements.

The Nisga'a live in large and beautifully built cedar post and beam houses located in the permanent villages. They have built ocean-going canoes, great totems, masks, horn spoons and many of the implements of everyday life.

Here on the banks of the Ottawa River, Nisga'a artistic and cultural achievements are on view in the Grand Hall of the Museum of Civilization and in the recently mounted ''Common Bowl'' exhibit. They can also be found in many of the world's museums. Nisga'a artists are also well represented in the world's art galleries.

Today about 2,500 of the 5,500 Nisga'a live in four villages: Kincolith, Greenville, Canyon City and New Aiyansh. Most of the other Nisga'a live in Terrace, Prince Rupert or Vancouver. Many Nisga'a still speak their traditional language, although everyone also speaks English.

Nisga'a villages have modern housing and infrastructure. The schools and community buildings are in constant use to hold Nisga'a social, cultural and ceremonial activities.

Although some of the Nisga'a share the difficulties common to all aboriginal communities, such as high unemployment and family breakdown, the Nisga'a have worked very hard to improve their circumstances. A high value is placed on schooling and post-secondary education. The Nisga'a operate their own provincial school district, school district No. 92. It offers kindergarten to grade 12 for both Nisga'a and other residents of the Nass Valley. One seat on the elected school board is reserved for a non-Nisga'a resident.

The Nisga'a also operate a post-secondary college in conjunction with the University of Northern British Columbia. It offers degree programs, life skills training, culture and language programs.

They also operate their own health board and again provide for non-Nisga'a representation.

Like other aboriginal people in Canada, the Nisga'a have struggled with the effects of the reserve and Indian Act system, residential schools and the lack of opportunities. However, they have taken up every available opportunity to take over education, health care, social and family services and other government programs seeking wherever they could to strengthen their families and communities.

They have also worked co-operatively with their neighbours. They participate in regional district government where a Nisga'a elder, Harry Nyce, who visited the House on the day this legislation was introduced, sits on the board. They also have for a number of years played a role in the Pacific Salmon Commission and its northern panel.

The Nisga'a have pursued a settlement of what they describe as the land question since at least 1887 when, as members of this place have heard, Nisga'a chiefs first travelled to the legislature in British Columbia to seek recognition of the aboriginal title, a treaty settlement and a measure of self-government. Their trip to Victoria was unsuccessful. In 1890 they established their first land committee and in 1913 that committee sent a petition to the privy council in England seeking to resolve the land question. Again, they were unsuccessful.

From the 1920s to the 1950s, the Nisga'a and other first nations' efforts to have their rights recognized and practise their culture were restricted. Legislation outlawed traditional practices such as the potlatch and made it illegal to raise money to advance land claims.

● (1350)

Following repeal of this legislation in 1955, the Nisga'a re-established their land committee. Under the leadership of Mr. Frank Calder, the tribal council took the land question to the courts. This was a bold decision and a mark of the Nisga'a commitment to seek a resolution of their rights. Many other first nations were concerned that this court case might be unsuccessful, but in the face of unfavourable lower court decisions, the Nisga'a pursued their case to the Supreme Court of Canada.

In 1973, the supreme court issued the Calder decision. Although the court split evenly on whether the Nisga'a continued to hold aboriginal title, it recognized the possibility of aboriginal rights and title continuing to exist in Canada. This decision was a major factor in prompting the government of the day to adopt a policy of

negotiating land claims where they had not already been settled in Canada.

The Nisga'a were one of earliest groups to take up negotiations as part of this new process. They commenced in 1976. However, without the participation of the Government of British Columbia, progress on issues related to land could not be made. In 1990, the provincial government joined the process, and after that the pace of the negotiations began pick up.

Five years after signing an agreement on how to proceed with negotiations, the two governments and the Nisga'a signed an agreement in principle, which set out the main elements of the agreement which is before us today. Two and a half years later, the parties initialled the final agreement, a great achievement and culmination of over 100 years of perseverance by the Nisga'a.

The members of the House have heard a good deal about the consultations by the governments which accompanied the negotiations, consultations which included resource and other business interests, labour, local government and many interested Canadians. What has not been said is how the Nisga'a consulted with their own people throughout the negotiations. Every year the Nisga'a negotiating team met with a special assembly of all their members. These special assemblies were well attended and included information sessions on every aspect of negotiations. Strategies were reviewed and directions given to the negotiators.

Not only that, the Nisga'a brought many of their people, elders, band councillors and others to observe negotiations and report back to their communities. Prior to ratifying the final agreement, they conducted extensive briefings in every one of their communities and their Terrace, Prince Rupert and Vancouver urban locals, and they have also maintained an excellent website.

In these and many other ways, the Nisga'a negotiators have provided detailed information to every interested Nisga'a person on this proposed treaty.

In the face of this history, it is disturbing to hear from the official opposition members that Nisga'a cannot know for themselves whether this final agreement is good for them or not. I think the history of the negotiations of the Nisga'a land question shows very clearly that the Nisga'a are quite capable of making up their own minds, as they have.

I will end by pointing out to all members of the House that in the process of negotiating the land question, the Nisga'a developed a philosophy they call the ''common bowl''. The common bowl is their pledge to work in concert to settle their claim and to share among all their people the benefits of that settlement.

It is time the House moved forward in the ratification of the final agreement. It is time for the Nisga'a to finally benefit from their common bowl.

I am very honoured to be able to speak to the Nisga'a treaty. I certainly urge all members to vote on the agreement because we all know that the Nisga'a have decided that it is good for their people.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1355)

[*English*]

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was born, raised and still live on the family farm and, along with my constituents, feel strongly about cruelty to animals.

Canadians across the country have joined animal welfare organizations in condemning incidents of mistreatment of pets and other animals. People are making it clear that they expect the government to respond to the seriousness of this cruelty. Early intervention is imperative.

Police studies confirm that the motivating factors of animal abuse are related to anger, control and power. This is totally unacceptable.

Therefore, specific changes to the criminal code should ensure that we make it illegal to brutally treat or viciously kill an animal, raise the maximum penalty for intentional cruelty, give judges the authority to order anyone convicted of cruelty to animals to pay restitution for shelter and veterinarian costs, and finally, prohibit anyone convicted of cruelty to animals from owning another animal.

We must and we will protect our animals from such heinous acts. People all across Canada have indicated that they will not tolerate cruelty to animals. Accordingly, the government will act decisively in this matter.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the auditor general's report on the west coast fishery makes it clear that the fishery is headed for disaster unless DFO makes significant changes to improve the management and conservation of Pacific salmon.

The auditor general raises serious concerns regarding DFO's strategic planning record and calls for salmon management based on sound science. He calls for improved data quality and changes in reporting on the status of stock and habitat, and catch reporting. He also calls for mandatory recovery plans on threatened stocks and an independent allocation board for fish.

The situation is critical. The auditor general says that it may be necessary for the fishery to close for five years to recoup stocks unless immediate change is implemented.

Last week the fisheries minister denied the auditor general's criticism. It is time for the minister to read the report and face the facts. The minister must take control before Pacific salmon disappear, much like the Atlantic cod.

* * *

[*Translation*]

VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, although all of us were affected by the tragedy at École Polytechnique de Montréal, the real pain was, and always will be, that felt by the families and friends of the victims.

We must salute the courage of all the men and women who are working to break down the wall of indifference to violence. This includes the courageous Heidi Rathjen, Wendy Cukier and Suzanne Laplante-Edward who, through the Coalition for Gun Control, made a major contribution to the passage of an act in Canada aimed at doing away with violence.

Our appreciation goes out also to the Fondation de Polytechnique, which offers help to those who have lost loved ones and who would otherwise be left to cope alone with their despair.

All of us can make a contribution to making our society a healthier one by supporting activities in our community that are focused on doing away with violence.

* * *

[*English*]

DIABETES

Mr. John Maloney (Erie—Lincoln, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, between one million and two million Canadians are affected by diabetes and it exacts a serious toll on them and their families. I know because it has had an impact on my family.

I applaud the Minister of Health's recent announcement that funding to the Canadian diabetes strategy be increased by $60 million to $115 million over five years. These funds will help inform Canadians, help prevent diabetes where possible and help people better manage the disease and its complications.

There are approximately 60,000 new cases of diabetes diagnosed in Canada each and every year. Approximately one-third of persons with diabetes are undiagnosed.

There are two major types diabetes. Approximately 90% of people with diabetes have type II diabetes which usually occurs after age 40. Two major risk factors for type t are obesity and inactivity, which are modifiable. The strategy will link with healthy eating, nutrition and active living programs to deliver messages and education to target audiences on how to eat better and become more active. A sustained national focus on prevention and public education will aim to reduce the costs and harm associated with type II diabetes.

Congratulations to the minister for his foresight and strategy of prevention.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, day after day the solicitor general gives us shallow, unbelievable assurances that there is an internal investigation by RCMP top brass into allegations of cover-up and criminal misconduct in the Hong Kong visa scam, allegations levelled by Corporal Read.

I have in hand a letter to Commissioner Murray dated February 11, 1998 from the RCMP Public Complaints Commission that details Read's allegations. So we know that he has it. Unfortunately, however, the only action since then has been an attempt by Read's superiors to discredit him.

• (1400)

The issue is the infiltration of organized crime into Canadian society. The allegations include visas and citizenship for sale, including the compromise of Canada's security system.

Read's allegations do not stand alone. There are binders full of documents that cry out for an aggressive, independent investigation, not just into the original Hong Kong complaint, but the allegations of cover up in both the RCMP and CSIS.

The solicitor general must appoint a special prosecutor to investigate these allegations.

* * *

[*Translation*]

VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE

Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Shefford, PC): Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, a woman-hating killer took the lives of 13 students and one secretary at the École Polytechnique. Since then, the 13 have become the symbols of violence against women.

The President of the December 6 Victims Foundation Against Violence, Claire Roberge, described the deaths of these women as occurring on a battlefield they did not know existed, the battlefield of equal opportunity. At that time, we thought that battle had long been won, but it appears that nothing has been gained.

It is a mistake to believe that the battle to combat violence against women is over. Across this country, women and children are still being killed by men.

In memory of these young victims, including Annie Turcotte, who was from my riding, and of all women victims of violence, we must not forget this tragedy. It must make us think about the ways we can improve male-female relations.

* * *

[*English*]

ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on December 6, 1989, 14 women at École Polytechnique were killed on a battlefield they did not know existed. They were killed solely because they were women.

On the 10th anniversary of this tragedy each and every one of us should recommit to work to end sexism and violence against women and to effect real change.

The government has begun to work for change. We now have one of the toughest gun control laws in the world. Intoxication as a defence for violent crime has been eliminated, and this year we have passed three key laws improving the rights of victims of violent crimes, promoting personal security of women and children and making the justice system more responsive to the needs of those who experience violence.

This day gives us the opportunity to stop and think about those 14 young women as well as all women who live daily with the threat of violence or have lost their lives as a result of deliberate acts of violence. There is no way to make sense of their deaths. Our duty is to make sure that these women did not die in vain. The work to prevent another tragedy must continue.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE LATE CLAUDE HARDY

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the world of sports in Quebec has just lost one of its foremost representatives. Claude Hardy passed away yesterday as the result of an illness he had fought valiantly to the end.

For 45 years, Claude Hardy worked in amateur sport. He was first a national and international athlete in weightlifting, he then became a trainer and later on he became a sport adviser.

He was formerly the head of the Quebec delegation to the Canada Games. He was also a member of the Commonwealth Games Association and of the Canadian Olympic Association, from which he resigned following the delay in the decision on Quebec City's application for the 2010 Olympics.

The Bloc Quebecois shares in the sadness of the family and friends of Mr. Hardy and offers to them its sincere condolences.

S. O. 31

FARÈS BOUEZ

Mr. Yvon Charbonneau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canada-Lebanon parliamentary friendship group is honoured to welcome to Ottawa and to parliament the new chair of the Canada-Lebanon parliamentary group, Farès Bouez, a member of the Lebanon national assembly representing Kesrouan.

Having spent a number of years as his country's minister of foreign affairs, Mr. Bouez has solid political experience in his own country and internationally.

In his meetings with our Minister of Foreign Affairs, with the members of our friendship group and with the Canadian Lebanese community, Mr. Bouez will stress the importance of strengthening co-operation between our two countries, the importance of finding a longstanding and fair solution to the situation in the middle east and the importance of implementing UN resolution 425 on Israel's occupation of southern Lebanon.

We welcome Mr. Bouez and wish him much success in this mission.

* * *

[*English*]

AMATEUR BOXING

Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a serious injustice has occurred in this great nation of ours which traditionally values the principle of freedom of religion.

Pardeep Nagra, who is deeply involved in many community associations, has had his liberty suppressed.

The Ontario and British Columbia Human Rights Commissions and the Ontario superior court all agree that Pardeep has the right to box in the national competition and should not be prevented from doing so just because he is a bearded Sikh.

• (1405)

I request that the Secretary of State for Amateur Sport withhold any funding to the Canadian Amateur Boxing Association immediately as its rules are contrary to Canadian fundamental freedoms.

* * *

VIOLENCE

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this 10th anniversary of the horrible and tragic murder of 14 young women at the École Polytechnique in Montreal compels all of us again to work toward ending violence against each other.

Life is indeed our most precious gift from our Creator. What a tragic thing it is whenever someone is out to get somebody else. It might be inconceivable hatred against women or men. It might be violence in our homes against moms, dads, spouses or our children.

It might be gang violence against young people in our schools or parks. It might be criminal acts against our police officers serving on our streets. Whenever the evil of violence rears its ugly head we must repel it will all our might.

In memory of all those who have fallen as a result of violence or who continue to live daily in its dark shadow, let each of us rededicate ourselves today to attitudes and actions that will end this curse and allow us to live free from evil.

* * *

VIOLENCE

Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is a day for Canadians to reflect on the pervasive problem of violence against women in our society. There is a probability that we each know someone who has either committed an act of violence or is its victim.

Today we can ask ourselves: Have we identified this person or persons in our lives? Have we taken the time to become aware of violence, to recognize it when we see it? Have we listened to what others say? Have we heard when they ask for help? Have we acted to end violence? Have we changed our own ideas and behaviours in ways that prevent violence and promote safety?

Each of us must take personal inventory of how we have contributed to the public campaign to end violence against women and to make the commitment to change our attitudes and actions in the coming year. We must stand up to sexist and violent behaviour.

In my riding of Kitchener Centre the local community will be participating in a memorial to commemorate the 14 Canadian women who lost their lives 10 years ago today. We must not forget this anniversary and, as a society, we must take responsibility to eliminate violence.

* * *

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill (Bras d'Or—Cape Breton, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today all parties of the House stand in solidarity in the fight to end male violence against women. Today we remember the 14 people who were killed for being women. We also remember the hundreds of women, young and old alike, across Canada who have been hurt or killed.

Violence against women knows no boundaries. It affects women of all regions of the country, of all cultures and all ages. Too many women in this country live with some degree of fear in their daily lives. Until women can live without fearing violence at home and in our communities we have not achieved equality.

Yesterday in Montreal a monument was unveiled in memory of the 14 women killed at the École Polytechnique. The monument is designed to present a shock wave to those who see it because there are those who fear we are forgetting.

Today all of us in the House and all Canadians need to feel that shock wave because 10 years after that violent tragedy violence against women still exists. We must all renew the pledge made eight years ago to remember and to act in solidarity and create policies in the House that work toward ending the root causes of violence against women.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ANGLOPHONE COMMUNITY IN QUEBEC

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, the member for Rimouski—Mitis referred to certain remarks I made as disgraceful.

What is disgraceful is the manner in which the PQ government has always treated the anglophone community in Quebec. What is disgraceful is that the PQ government has driven almost one-quarter of the anglophone population out of the province.

Members of the BQ and the PQ are forever talking about assimilation, but we have them to thank for a shameful example of forced exodus.

Was Lucien Bouchard acting in good faith in 1988 when he proposed the first Canada-Quebec agreement? Was he really acting in good faith in his so-called reconciliation speech on March 11, 1996?

If so, it is never too late to keep his promise and to say yes to anglophones and—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Longueuil.

* * *

VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, December 6, 1989, is a date now engraved in our collective memory.

Ten years ago today, just after 5 p.m., a seriously disturbed individual entered the École polytechnique and took the lives of 14 young women.

• (1410)

Never before had Quebec witnessed such carnage and the reaction to the killer's reasons, when they became known, was complete shock. The only thing he held against these 14 victims was that they were women seeking to practise a non-traditional profession.

One result of this terrible tragedy has clearly been that society as a whole has taken a closer look at violence against women. Unfortunately, violence still persists, but it is my belief that awareness, education and law enforcement will help reverse the trend. We must continue to repeat that violence is unacceptable.

May the 14 victims of the tragedy at the Polytechnique never let us forget. Together, let us remember Geneviève, Annie, Hélène, Barbara, Anne-Marie, Maud, Maryse, Annie, Sonia, Barbara, Anne-Marie, Michèle, Maryse and Nathalie.

Today, let us take a moment to give special thought to all victims of violence.

* * *

[*English*]

DRINKING AND DRIVING

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mothers Against Drunk Driving, MADD, I remind Canadians to be responsible and not to drink and drive this holiday season.

In Canada impaired driving is still the single largest criminal cause of death and injury. Over 83,000 charges of impaired driving are made each year in the country. On average, 4.5 Canadians are killed and over 125 injured daily in alcohol related crashes.

Approximately 40% of all traffic fatalities are alcohol related. This is simply not acceptable in modern society. The price tag for alcohol related accidents is estimated to be $7.2 billion each year. This year I implore Canadians to step back and think about the devastating consequences if they take the wheel under the influence.

As we celebrate the holiday season, let us adopt MADD's philosophies, adopt its ribbon campaign and tie one on for safety.

* * *

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO

Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Kitchener—Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, congratulations to the University of Waterloo and its co-op education program.

According to this year's *Maclean*'s university issue, in Canada the University of Waterloo pioneered experiential learning. It developed the country's first co-op program in 1957 and has now become an innovative and global leader, with 9,000 students in 80 co-op programs in partnership with 2,500 employers.

Co-op education is the educational model that combines and alternates formal academic learning in the classroom with practical learning received on the job. This type of program has nothing but winners. The students win since they get related work experience and the employer gets an enthusiastic and educated employee full of new ideas and a tremendous willingness to work.

University of Waterloo co-op students are placed in each and every province in the country and over 200 of them are employed internationally each year. Co-op education has been adopted by other Canadian universities and most high schools.

To all of the people involved in co-operative education in Canada, I say ''well done''.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 26 Mr. Dan Edwards, a Ucluelet west coast fisherman, began a hunger strike to protest the unwillingness of the federal government to negotiate a fair and transparent process to deal with the 1999 Fraser River sockeye crisis.

This desperate action was initiated after two months of due process when one of the largest alliances in the B.C. fishing community tried to move the federal government to establish a proper consultative process to deal with the disaster surrounding the worst collapse of the Fraser River sockeye in its 100 years of recorded history.

Mr. Edwards' concerns are consistent with the recent report of the auditor general and they are consistent with native and non-native fishermen in Nova Scotia. His concerns are founded on the fundamental struggle to achieve a fair, inclusive and accountable process for multi-stakeholder decision making.

The people in the communities he represents are already suffering from massive unemployment, almost total disenfranchisement from the nearby resources, and social and economic infrastructure collapse. Much of it is caused by—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Calgary East.

* * *

TRADE

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the suspension of WTO talks in Seattle represents a severe blow to Canadian farmers demanding the elimination of export and domestic subsidies.

Subsidies by countries like France, Korea and Japan have dramatically lowered the world price of grain and devastated our farmers. The U.S. anti-dumping laws also remain a crucial barrier to farmers in western Canada. Talks scheduled to resume at WTO headquarters in Geneva this January give our negotiators one more chance to end the log jam. However, there is little evidence to believe that anything immediate will occur.

It is time for Canada to take a leading role on this issue and enter into tough bilateral negotiations with the United States and partners in the Cairns group to force France, Korea and Japan to open up their markets. The time has come for the government to play hardball on behalf of Canadian farmers.

● (1415)

The Speaker: We are going to do things a little differently today because of the statements that will be made after question period.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in our gallery of a group of very talented Canadians. They are the members of the world renowned National Arts Centre Orchestra, under the leadership of Mr. Zucherman. They are celebrating their 30th anniversary and we invited them here to be with us today.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: Members wishing to meet with our guests are invited to join us in Room 216 after Oral Question Period.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

TAXATION

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a man whose family immigrated to Canada many years ago. He wrote to object to the Liberal government's high tax policies, which have confiscated over a third of his income over the last 10 years despite the fact that he is not in a high income bracket. He said that before coming to Canada he lived under an oppressive communist regime, but then he said—and these are his words, not mine—''These days I am living under an oppressive Liberal tax burden and at times I find it difficult to differentiate between the two''.

Does the government not think it has gone too far when getting a tax bill reminds immigrants of the wealth confiscating regimes they have fled?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a result of Friday's numbers I will provide some further quotes. A headline in the *Globe and Mail* of December 4 read: ''Good fiscal policy is now starting to pay for all Canadians''. The Toronto-Dominion Bank was quoted as saying: ''The headline increase in new jobs conceals an even stronger picture below the surface''. ''All signs point to a further decline in the unemployment rate''.

I am sure I will have the occasion to provide more citations in the questions to follow.

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the minister quotes newspapers and the banks. Why does he not listen to what the taxpayers are saying?

Here is a letter from an oil patch worker in Alberta who said: ''I am working very long days away from my family just trying to get a bit ahead while not seeing my four-year old baby girl or wife for extended periods of time. I don't mind working hard or the sacrifices for now, but I would like to keep more of my hard earned money. My money is being stolen from me twice a month and wasted on Liberal''—

The Speaker: Order, please. Notwithstanding the fact that the word ''stolen'' is no doubt in the letter, I would prefer that members not use words like that.

Mr. Preston Manning: Mr. Speaker, that is the taxpayer's sentiment.

Why does the government continue to hurt families by confiscating so much of their hard earned income every month?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the reason the leader of the Reform Party quotes Canadian taxpayers is because last month 60,000 new taxpayers were created. In the last three months over 200,000 new taxpayers were created. Since this government has taken office close to two million new taxpayers have been created. That is what is happening in this economy and we are going to keep on doing it because they have jobs.

● (1420)

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, now the finance minister is taking credit for creating taxpayers.

I have another tax statement from a pensioner in Ontario. He sent in his pension pay stub dated September 30, 1999. The total federal tax he paid was $4,434. Last year for the same period he paid $3,465. That is a $1,000 increase. His pension stayed the same but his tax bill rose by that amount.

Why does the government hurt pensioners by clawing back so much of their income each year?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous for the Reform Party to quote pensioners because the fact is at the time that we were cutting the deficit, the Reform Party said we were not cutting it early enough. The Reform Party recommended that Canadian pensions be cut. For the member to stand up now and talk about that is simply nonsense.

We did not cut pensions. We will not cut pensions. That is the basic difference between us and the Reform Party.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, they have been cut already.

Bernard is another dissatisfied customer. He wrote, ''Along with my letter to the finance minister and the Prime Minister, I enclosed

a copy of our family budget to show exactly how difficult it is. The response I got from the government was a list of the dollars the Liberals have given to low income families. I do not want charity. I do not want government programs. I just want my money so I can choose what is best for my family''.

Why does the finance minister hurt Bernard's family by confiscating so much of his hard-earned money?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party knows that not only did we eliminate the deficit two years before Reform said it would, but we cut taxes three years before the Reform Party said it would cut taxes. Those are the facts. I understand why Reform members want to quote pay stubs. The reason is after the next election there will be a lot less of them collecting paycheques.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, at least we are not collecting pensions like some others.

The government's taxation tentacles are unable to reach the finance minister in Liberia but by Jove, they are reaching John in Oshawa. Fifty-three per cent of John's income was gobbled up by the tax man. To put that another way, the government made more from John's work than he did. Let me quote John and ask, ''Why is the government entitled to more of my money than I am?'' How could that be?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, members of the Reform Party just cannot live with good news. The fact is that taxes are going down. The national debt is going down. Taxes are going down and the national unemployment rate is at its lowest level in the last 18 or 19 years. The real problem is they just cannot stand good news. And there is a lot more of it coming.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, according to the papers, the government will be going ahead with a constitutional amendment with the province of Newfoundland to change the name of the province to Newfoundland and Labrador.

Will the Prime Minister confirm in this House his government's intention to make this constitutional change?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in April the Newfoundland House of Assembly sent to us here in parliament a resolution it had approved unanimously, asking us to make a constitutional change, which requires that a resolution be introduced in the House of Commons.

The government has not yet found the time to do so, but I know that we will do it one day, just as we changed the constitution to help the education system in Quebec and as we changed the constitution recently in connection with the school system in Newfoundland.

When the changes are bilateral, the government usually acts, but it is not a priority at the moment.

• (1425)

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this question arises after last week's announcement by the Prime Minister of his intention to control the rules of another referendum in Quebec by questioning the rule of 50% plus one.

Could the Prime Minister tell us why he is going after Quebec so deliberately at the end of this session?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, some like to be victims.

I have just said the Newfoundland House of Assembly has asked us to act. We are not talking about the federal government. We acted a few months ago for the Government of Quebec when we resolved a constitutional problem that had existed, I believe, for 50 years. We do this from time to time.

The Premier of Quebec was advised by Mr. Tobin a few months ago. In the documents that Quebec and Newfoundland have signed in recent years, Premier Tobin has always insisted on having Newfoundland and Labrador, and Mr. Bouchard has always signed the documents.

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, after stirring things up by threatening Quebec with changing the 50% plus one vote rule, the Prime Minister is adding fuel to the fire by bringing up the issue of Labrador, knowing full well the political dispute that exists between Quebec and Newfoundland.

Is the Prime Minister not once again indicating that the true objective of his actions is to stir up confrontation and discord with Quebec?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the astonishment of the Premier of Quebec is a source of astonishment to us.

As the Premier of Newfoundland has confirmed in a statement, he has kept the Premier of Quebec informed throughout the entire process, which began last April.

What is astonishing is why the Premier of Quebec yesterday complained of provocation and why he is making a huge fuss about something he was already totally aware of. That is what is astonishing.

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, what is astonishing is that this resolution was passed April 27, not referred to in the throne speech, and now turns up in this House when there is a dispute over the referendum.

With his desire to stir up confrontation and discord, is the Prime Minister not showing that he plans to win the next election at the expense of Quebec, by winning over votes in the west, and now in the east as well?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the resolution is not before the House. They are the ones bringing this up. It is not before the House at this time. The Prime Minister has said that we have other priorities for the moment.

Why then all these theatrics? And, an even more fundamental question, why are they always looking for trouble? Why are they always questioning motives—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Why are they always questioning motives? Could not the request made by the Government of Newfoundland and the House of Assembly of Newfoundland, unanimously, be judged on its merits, without attempting to stir up trouble between the two provinces?

This is an internal Newfoundland matter. It should not be perceived as a threat by anyone. This could be discussed calmly, it seems to me.

* * *

[*English*]

TRADE

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade.

I would like to welcome him back from the battle in Seattle. I hope that the only walls he has to climb from now on are the walls he has erected in his own mind preventing him from being more critical of the WTO.

In that respect, I want to ask him why it was, in respect of the text that was being developed on services—of course, there was no final text—but in the text that was being developed before the meeting, we now have proof that Canada was asking for shorter and less precise language and wanting to suppress certain language because of the sensitivities of cultural industries at home. Why was Canada, given the rhetoric on transparency, conspiring to hide its position?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to express my thanks to the Canadian delegation for its extraordinary contribution at the WTO ministerial conference last week. I want to thank my provincial colleagues who accompanied us. We benefited a great deal from their advice. I was extremely pleased that the Canadian delegation engaged in a very healthy dialogue with the NGOs.

• (1430)

As for the question on services, Canada did exactly what it said it would do, it did not take up on health and education.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a memo from David Hartridge, the director of WTO services, in which he refers to the fact that Canada along with the EU asked for the suppression of certain language and for shorter and less precise language in order to respond to cultural sensitivities at home.

Perhaps the minister could explain what these cultural sensitivities were. Why, given all the rhetoric about transparency, was Canada attempting to suppress the reality of what was being agreed to in this text?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not know what memo the member is referring to.

I can say that Canada stands for transparency. We believe in transparency. Of the 135 delegations in Seattle, the one that most engaged in a dialogue with the NGOs was the Canadian one. We engaged in a dialogue with the provincial ministers.

On services we will fight for a bottom up approach as we said. The services we do not want to take we will not take up. That is what Canada did. I am extremely proud of Canada's engagement in Seattle last week.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, France has been granted drilling rights on the Laurentian sub-basin, costing jobs and benefits for Atlantic Canadians. This occurred because the Liberal government poured cold water on the negotiation of an interim arrangement between the provinces of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland to allow drilling in Canadian territory.

Will the Minister of Natural Resources assure this House that he will allow an interim arrangement to be negotiated between Nova Scotia and Newfoundland so that the benefits of this resource go to Canadians first?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the dispute that exists with respect to the offshore boundary between two particular Atlantic provinces is a matter that is entirely within the control of those two provinces to resolve.

It has become evident over the last number of months that they are not in a position to resolve that matter. Accordingly, I have appointed my own official agent to work with them to see if there is a way to resolve this matter. Failing that, the Government of Canada will put the matter to arbitration in order to ensure that

Canadians can enjoy the benefits of those resources at the earliest possible time.

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, the federal negotiator needs to work harder.

On September 3 the premier of Nova Scotia wrote to the Minister of Natural Resources to express his disappointment with the federal government's decision on this issue. Last year the premier of Newfoundland and Labrador expressed his willingness to co-operate. Everyone wants to co-operate except the federal Liberals.

How many jobs and economic benefits need to go to France before the minister drops this Ottawa knows best attitude and allows an interim arrangement to proceed?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the questioner refers to the rhetorical positions that have been taken by certain provincial governments indicating a willingness to resolve all matters. Quite frankly, if that willingness were there, they would have resolved it a long time ago.

It is because the provinces have not been able to resolve their differences that the Government of Canada has become involved in order to find a settlement so that this matter can be resolved at the earliest possible date. The Government of Canada is not delaying this matter. The delay rests with the provinces involved.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Canadian farmers' worst fears were realized at the WTO talks in Seattle. The Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food failed to get any movement on foreign subsidies. Even the Minister for International Trade has been quoted as saying that there was a lack of leadership at those talks.

Now that the minister has failed at the WTO, what is he going to do to help farmers suffering from foreign subsidies?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for his presence in Seattle last week and for his input in discussions, along with those of a number of other MPs, members of provincial legislatures, and the farm and industry organization representatives that were there.

I am sure the hon. member has seen the text and if not, it is available to him, where it was frozen when the talks were suspended. There was a clear reference in that to the elimination of export subsidies. Unfortunately some of the countries could not agree to that and we did not get it. But it certainly was not because Canada was not pushing for it.

• (1435)

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government seems to be saying ''We tried. Better luck next time''. This does not help farmers who cannot afford to wait for the deadlocked WTO talks to succeed.

Given the failure in Seattle, Canada must pursue bilateral agreements on agriculture and provide urgently needed short term assistance. Will the Prime Minister immediately enter into negotiations with the members of the Cairns group and the U.S. to create a trading zone free of agriculture subsidies?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the hon. member does not understand what happened last week.

It was very clear last week that the Cairns group, of which Canada is a very important and key member, and the United States stood firm and stood together in the six hour marathon negotiations on agriculture. Unfortunately the European Union could not agree after it went back to consult with its member states. It was not because we caved in. It was because they could not and refused to come our way.

* * *

[*Translation*]

GLOBALIZATION

Mr. Stéphan Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I tabled in this House a motion calling for the creation of a special committee to look into the effects of globalization on social cohesiveness.

My question, which involves a number of departments, will therefore be directed to the Prime Minister. Does the Prime Minister not believe that he must set an example and establish this parliamentary committee as quickly as possible?

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, consideration of private members' business in the House of Commons is decided by a free vote in this House. This position was adopted by our government in 1993.

Mr. Stéphan Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, so long as parliament does not play its democratic role, more and more people will be trying to debate the issue in any way possible, including in the streets.

Why is the Prime Minister not assuming leadership, calling on parliamentarians and establishing a dialogue with the public to permit a debate on the social impact of globalization?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Lac-Saint-Jean for his considerable concern about globalization and its effect on social cohesiveness.

I can tell him that we are very attuned to these concerns and that, last week in Seattle, Canada strongly supported a concept of cohesiveness so that trade policies would reflect labour standards and environmental issues and so that they would all be more closely related.

I can tell him that, as far as Canada is concerned, we will continue to work very closely with the NGOs and with the business community to make sure we humanize globalization. We will also continue to support cultural diversity, which is very important.

* * *

[*English*]

RCMP

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the solicitor general has assured the House that the RCMP are looking into allegations of corruption in the Hong Kong visa office and allegations of cover-up in the RCMP investigation.

I have an RCMP briefing note which says the investigation was to be concluded in October. This being December 6, I would like to know what is the truth. Is the solicitor general being kept in the dark by his officials again? Is he sitting on the report? Or did the police get results they did not like?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are two investigations taking place. There is a criminal investigation taking place on which I will not receive a report. There is an internal investigation on which I will receive a report.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a question of confidence on the part of Canadians. I read from the briefing note ''With respect to the other allegations pertaining to CAIPS and corruption, our investigation is in its final stages and is expected to be concluded this October''.

I repeat my question. This being December 6, the RCMP said it would be reporting on this in October. Has the minister received the report, yes or no? What is holding things up? How can we have any confidence in this minister?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, quite simply, I have to wait for the report. The report has not been sent to me. The RCMP has senior members of the force conducting the investigation. When they complete the investigation, I will receive a report.

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the auditor general is asking the government to increase the transparency of the criteria used for determining contribution rates and that of the surplus in the employment insurance fund as well.

● (1440)

My question is for the Minister of Finance. In response to the repeated requests from the auditor general, what does the minister intend to do with respect to the employment insurance criteria, since the lack of transparency has reduced parliament and the public to having to speculate on what factors lie behind decisions made relating to the employment insurance program?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the method used is totally transparent. In fact, this year, like last year, the commission has made recommendations, which the Minister of Human Resources Development and myself have followed to the letter.

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if the process is all that transparent, why is the auditor general repeating year after year that it lacks transparency?

Can the minister confirm, as I think he just has, that he has decided to ignore the auditor general's recommendations and to continue to accumulate surpluses in the fund, without being accountable for its administration?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are following the recommendations of the auditor general.

In 1986, the auditor general asked the previous government to put these funds in the government's consolidated revenue fund, and that is exactly what we are doing.

* * *

[*English*]

AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport or his parliamentary secretary.

Last night on national TV the minister stated that he would be proposing more regulations to govern the monopoly airline. Rather than more regulations, why will the transport minister not protect consumers by opening up the industry to more competition?

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has a clear image of the kind of proposal that the Minister of Transport has made, that is, the five principles of the policy framework that were introduced

here October 26, the very same principles that you and I and other hon. members have been dealing with on the transport committee ever since.

The Speaker: I remind members to please address their answers to the Chair.

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last night, also on television, the transport minister was proposing a watchdog group or watchdog agency to oversee this new monopoly airline.

The minister should know that consumers make the best watchdogs. Why does the minister not create an environment for competition in the airlines instead and we would have better service and lower prices?

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as far as competition is concerned, the guidelines that have been followed by the transport committee are being adhered to.

We will see legislation early in the new year. The five principles of the policy framework will be adhered to. Competition is a very key factor. We have the Competition Bureau, the Canadian Transportation Agency, the House of Commons and all the members who will address some of these issues.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS REFORM

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last June, the Minister of Finance responded to the MacKay report on the reform of financial institutions by promising a series of bills to strengthen his positions in the fall.

Can the Minister of Finance tell us whether these bills will address the issue of the ownership of small and medium cap banks, and when he intends to introduce them?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is yes, with respect to chartered banks, and to the second, as soon as possible.

* * *

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION

Mr. John McKay (Scarborough East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on any given night between 800 and 1,100 people seek shelter in my riding of Scarborough East because they are homeless. Approximately 400 are refugee claimants.

There is an enormous burden on my community, the food banks, the shelters, the schools and churches. Frankly, my community is suffering from compassion fatigue. After 10 years of coping, my community is turning to the federal government.

Can the minister of immigration tell the House about any new initiatives which will help with the number of refugee claimants relying on municipal health and housing services?

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge the member's interest and advocacy on behalf of his riding.

• (1445)

The government is committed to ensuring that newcomers have the access to the essential services that they need as quickly as possible. As a result, a pilot project in Ontario has been started.

As of December 1, all refugee claimants will receive documentation at the ports of entry. This should ensure and speed access to the important public services that they need, be they the federal interim health plan, rental housing or other social services.

This is good for refugee claimants. It is also good for the people in our municipalities—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Nisga'a treaty is a template for all future settlements in British Columbia. That is a quote from the then premier of British Columbia who signed on behalf of the NDP government.

Recently, at a standing committee on aboriginal affairs meeting, the minister admitted that there are flaws in the agreement but that he will not accept amendments.

Why is the minister allowing this precedent setting treaty to go through unamended when he acknowledges there are problems with it?

Hon. Robert D. Nault (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have acknowledged no such thing and it is not a template.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, those are the words of the premier of British Columbia.

Let us go to the words of Liberal cabinet ministers. The Secretary of State for the Status of Women acknowledged that there are in fact problems in the Nisga'a treaty regarding the absence of rights for women. On Friday, the minister also agreed with her that the rights of women are left out of the agreement.

Why is he in such a rush to shut down debate on a treaty that does not ensure the rights of Nisga'a women?

Hon. Robert D. Nault (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there he goes again. If he had read the agreement he would know that I did not say that.

I said that the Nisga'a agreement is outside the Indian Act and therefore the provincial law as it relates to women applies in the same way as it does to other women in British Columbia.

What I also said was that the Indian Act is silent on women's rights and it is an issue we will be dealing with. I wish the member would get his facts right.

* * *

HEALTH

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the thalidomide situation in Canada brought to our attention in tragic terms the inadequacy of our health protection system.

In order that the experience never be repeated again, the health protection branch was set up under the auspices of the Food and Drugs Act to ensure that only drugs that have been proven safe and effective could be sold in Canada.

Now we learn that the government has not only shut down its drug research lab but it is allowing drugs on to the market that do not meet the basic standards of safety and efficacy.

Can the minister assure Canadians that any new drugs allowed on to the market will not be approved at the expense of—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in May 1998, Health Canada approved a new policy for approving drugs for the treatment of serious, life threatening diseases where there is promising evidence that the potential benefits of the drug outweigh its risks, where the risks can be monitored and where the company agrees to continue to study the drug.

This policy was developed to help those who are seriously ill and dying. It is about compassion, and we make no apologies for that. I observe as well that the drug referred to in the report today has already been approved in 30 countries around the world.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the issue we are raising today is not compassion. The minister already has the ability to allow drugs for emergency access relief or to speed up his own drug approval process and still operate within the law and according to safety standards. The question is why does the minister proceed with a policy without any basis in law and without meeting safety standards?

Where are the regulations that he promised in April 1998 when he unilaterally and arbitrarily changed the law or, in the words of his own staff, where is the legal opinion to show that this government is operating according to the spirit and the letter of the Food and Drugs Act?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it sometimes occurs that there are new drugs under consideration that might help those who are dying or are very seriously ill. If the conclusion is reached that the benefits of those drugs outweigh their risks, where the company that is proposing it agrees to continue studying it and we monitor the performance of that drug, then is the member saying that she would deny access to that drug to those who might otherwise die? Would she turn them down when these drugs might improve their condition or indeed even save their lives?

That is at the basis of this policy.

* * *

● (1450)

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Gilles Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac, PC): Mr. Speaker, well over a year ago, the Minister of Public Works knew that four out of five untendered government contracts failed to meet the criteria for sole sourcing. This year the auditor general said that over 90% of untendered contracts do not meet the government's own rules and will not even stand up to public scrutiny.

My question is very simple. Why did the minister not fix the problem?

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the hon. member said, if he reads the auditor general's report he will see that the auditor general congratulated us for the way in which we handle publicly tendered contracts. For example, we handled a major publicly tendered contract for maintenance. All federally owned buildings are now being maintained by the private sector. This was done with absolute transparency. The member should read the auditor general's report.

Mr. Gilles Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac, PC): Mr. Speaker, the auditor general congratulated the government for one contract out of four. The auditor general said that over $1 billion in contracts are handed out each year without tender and with no justification. In the 1993 red book the Liberals promised to cut sole source contracts, but instead they are skyrocketing.

When will the minister follow his own department's rules and put an end to this abuse of the public purse?

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since we have been in government the number of contracts given by public tender have

increased drastically. Over 80% of the contracts have been given through the public tender system.

Because of decentralization, some of the smaller contracts in a department are direct and some may be given on a sole source basis or call-up source. However, the policy is there and we are definitely implementing it.

* * *

VIOLENCE

Ms. Carolyn Bennett (St. Paul's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it was 10 years ago that Canada was stunned by the senseless, violent murder of 14 of our most promising young women.

My question is for the Secretary of State for the Status of Women. What has the government done since then to prevent tragedies such as the Montreal massacre and the ongoing violence in women's daily lives here in Canada?

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that was an extremely good question and I want to thank the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

The government has taken a number of initiatives specifically targeting violence against women. These include many important criminal law reforms.

[*English*]

These include the gun control act, the witness protection program, the SIN de-linking and the laws that strengthen anti-stalking initiatives.

[*Translation*]

We know that legislation alone will not change society.

[*English*]

We have a $32 million initiative each year for crime prevention that specifically targets women and girls.

* * *

GRANTS

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Christmas season is coming a little early in the Prime Minister's riding this year. Old Saint Nick has dropped another $2.28 million in grants and no interest loans into the riding of Saint-Maurice. It reminds us of the headline in the Montreal *Gazette* during the 1993 campaign that said ''I'm Santa Claus, promises the Prime Minister''.

Does the Prime Minister even check out who is naughty and who is nice or do the grants just go to his riding because it is in his riding?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Saint-Maurice, I am very happy that the entrepreneurs in the riding are putting forward programs that qualify and that unemployment is going down. It is an area where unemployment is very high, well above others. As the member of parliament, I am happy when entrepreneurs in my riding take initiatives for which the federal, provincial and municipal governments can help them.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AIR TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there is major concern in several areas of Quebec following the suspension of InterCanadian's operations. Stakeholders are worried about the potential negative effects on regional carriers and the economic impact Air Canada's monopoly will have on fares, and on frequency and quality of service.

My question is for the secretary of state responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the region of Quebec. Can he reassure the House that he will do everything in his power to ensure that Air Canada signs agreements with all the regional carriers, including InterCanadian, so that regional air transportation continues to be competitive?

• (1455)

[*English*]

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will be very pleased to know that yesterday, Sunday, while many of us were lulling around, our Minister of Transport and the Quebec minister of transportation were seriously discussing the situation regarding regional carriers in Quebec, especially InterCanadian.

I am letting the opposition know that our minister has reiterated his commitment to assist the InterCanadian employees by asking the Canadian—

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

* * *

RCMP

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the solicitor general who will be aware that two constituents in British Columbia were recently swindled out of $700,000 in a very clear stock market scam.

The spokesperson for the RCMP in E Division, Peter Montague, wrote to my constituents saying ''You have a valid complaint but due to the shortage of resources in the RCMP, we regret we are unable to continue with your investigation''. That was followed up by a letter from Phil Murray, the commissioner of the RCMP, who

essentially agrees by saying ''The current RCMP's position workload makes it difficult to investigate your complaint further''.

My question is—

The Speaker: I think the solicitor general has the idea, if he would like to address the preamble.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague brought this information forward before. He is well aware that the RCMP investigates those situations.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

Mr. David Price (Compton—Stanstead, PC): Mr. Speaker, at the dawn of the third millennium immigrants and refugees still pay a head tax of close to $1,000. In 1997, the now Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, a seemingly more compassionate and understanding man back then, put forth a private member's bill to eliminate this financial burden on destitute refugees.

Has the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, with the support of the fisheries minister, been able to convince cabinet to remove this unnecessary debt on newcomers to Canada?

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no head tax in Canada today. What the member is referring to was a dark day in Canadian history when there was a head tax imposed on Chinese immigrants to this country. That has long since been gone.

* * *

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Walt Lastewka (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, many Canadians are very concerned about the protection of our children. Canadians want strong, no tolerance laws against child pornography and we want proactive safety checks for those who teach, care for and lead our children.

Can the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice please explain what is being to make sure our children are safe?

Mr. John Maloney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is committed to our children. When this horrendous decision came down we quickly sought intervener status to go before the British Columbia Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of Canada.

This has limited application. It applies only in one province. In nine provinces and three territories, the law is fully enforced. Investigations and prosecutions go on.

I also point out that the other provisions of child pornography, such as production, distribution, importation and sale are still illegal in all provinces of Canada. The government stands firmly against child pornography.

* * *

GRANTS

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a follow up question for the member for St. Nick or Saint-Maurice.

He says that he really is not Santa Claus, although he said as much in the 1993 campaign. Maybe he will remember this quote. When the Prime Minister was campaigning at that time he said ''When a dossier from Saint-Maurice lands on a cabinet minister's desk, need I say any more''.

It appears to be working. I wonder though, instead of just looking after the unemployment in his riding, why does he not give tax breaks so that all Canadians can get back to work and get a tax break this Christmas.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are doing that and at the same time unemployment is going down. It is at its lowest since 1981. Two million jobs have been created since we formed the government just six years ago. At the same time, the people of Saint-Maurice are very happy with their member of parliament.

* * *

● (1500)

[*Translation*]

CHIAPAS

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the international civilian commission observing human rights reminds the Minister of Foreign Affairs that the situation in Chiapas is deteriorating increasingly.

The Mexican government is continuing, according to foreign observers, to seriously infringe on human rights and manifestly lacks the political will to reach a peaceful solution.

Can the minister tell us what specific action he intends to take to bring Mexico, one of Canada's principal trading partners, back in line?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I will be meeting with a civic group from Quebec on this subject, and I would like to get a commitment, particularly from this group. After the meeting, I will share the information I receive with members.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

[*Translation*]

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF TRAGEDY AT ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are gathered here today in the memory of 14 young women who should be getting ready to celebrate a new millennium with us. They should be feeling the pride of building promising careers. They should be starting new families. But they will be enjoying none of these personal milestones.

Why? Because fate, tragically, chose otherwise. Because they were women, and because they were in the wrong place on December 6, 1989, at the École Polytechnique de Montréal.

Time stood still in Canada on that day. For the families and friends of the 14 who were taken by this act of insane rage it has never fully started again.

[*English*]

It is true that we learned something from this horror. We had to acknowledge that these murders revealed, as never before in Canada, the terrible reality of violence against women. And we took action with one of the toughest gun control laws in the world and by making the justice system more responsive to the needs of women who experience violence.

But the cold fact is that nothing we have done, or will do, can ever bring back those young lives. That is why my thoughts today are first and foremost with their families and loved ones who have graciously allowed us to share in their private grief in this very public way. Today we join them in reflecting what might have been but never will be.

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with the Prime Minister and other members to remember the victims of that tragic day 10 years ago.

On that day 14 promising young women lost their lives in a malevolent outburst of violence by a man with a gun.

[*Translation*]

I offer my deepest sympathy to the families and friends of these young women and to the young women who were wounded in this tragedy.

I do so on behalf of all the members of the official opposition.

• (1505)

[*English*]

My wife Sandra and I have raised five children in our home. They are now young adults, two young men and three young women. On the day this tragedy occurred two of our daughters were attending classes at the University of Alberta. As a parent, your heart sinks when you even hear about things like this and your mind races to two questions: How safe are our daughters, any of our daughters, from similar acts of violence? And, what can we do as parents, what in particular should we be teaching or providing at home in order to protect our children from violence, in particular violence directed toward women?

Later the news came out concerning the young man who had perpetrated these terrible acts, of the troubled life and background from which grew his pathological hatred of women. I found myself asking a third question of particular relevance to parents with boys at home: What can we do as parents, what in particular should we be teaching or providing our young men at home in order to deal with attitudes or conditions that might lead them to disrespect or discriminate against or to verbally or physically abuse anyone, but in particular those of the opposite sex?

All three of those questions are as relevant today as they were on this day 10 years ago. They demand responses particularly in our homes and personal relations where the attitudes of young men toward women and vice versa are shaped far more than they are by public policy.

Perhaps today the greatest tribute we can pay to those victims whom we remember and honour today would be to rededicate ourselves not just as legislators but as parents, grandparents, aunts and uncles to the prevention of violence in our society and in our homes, in particular the violence of men toward women epitomized by the tragedy of December 6, 1989.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, 14 young women paid with their lives for the frustrations of a mad gunman.

Quebec society had considered itself sheltered from such things, but it learned to its sorrow that the culture of violence was still far too present in our everyday lives. Unfortunately, that lesson was learned at the cost of 14 innocent lives.

Lessons have been learned, yes, but the situation is still very precarious. Since December 6, 1989, 858 women have fallen

victim to family violence in Quebec and Canada. In 1998 alone, there were 67 such tragic deaths. Although the homicide figures may now be dropping, the number of women using shelters for abused women is constantly on the rise.

This is proof that we, as a society and as individuals, must continue to fight against violence, particularly violence against women.

But what have we done to make violence toward women unacceptable? Not enough. We obviously still have a long way to go.

We must keep up the fight so that women will be able to feel secure and no longer afraid. We must stop seeing violence as commonplace.

Sadly, December 6, 1989 was not an isolated example. Every day, women are being battered, being hurt by partners, other family members, or people they work with.

Let us, as a society, examine our consciences and take action against the violence we see on our television screens every day. Let us denounce violence in our schools, in our media, in our day-to-day lives. Let us condemn violence. Let us act to teach respect, tolerance and fairness.

I call upon the federal government to organize a violence awareness campaign. The cuts it has imposed on women's groups are aberrant, when one considers that this affects the safety of the women of Quebec and of Canada. These decisions must be re-examined for the safety of societies in Quebec and in Canada.

To the parents and friends of the 14 women killed at École Polytechnique, I express my sympathies, and those of all members of the Bloc Quebecois. We share the memory of that terrible day, and it will remain with us for a long time.

Let us ensure that the 14 did not die in vain. Let us keep their memory fresh to galvanize our actions.

● (1510)

[*English*]

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill (Bras d'Or—Cape Breton, NDP): Mr. Speaker, following the unthinkable tragedy in Montreal 10 years ago today, Dawn Black, then NDP member of parliament for New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby dedicated her energy to the passing of the bill that would ensure that the people of Canada would never forget and would be active in any violence against women.

Women who are victims of violence are left with lifelong physical and emotional scars. The remembrance ceremonies in communities across the country serve to highlight the fact that for some women the physical scars may heal while the emotional scars that violence leaves on these women will take a lifetime to mend and will require change in our society.

The tragedy in Montreal only heightened our fear. Women's groups today have called again for a funding commitment to the women of Canada aimed at curbing violence against women. A commitment from the government would be a fitting memorial to all of the women of Canada who have been victims of violence and it would be a promise for change.

Today we must reaffirm and recommit ourselves to the essence of Dawn Black's private member's bill that named December 6 as the day of remembrance and action on violence against women. We cannot stop now. We must counteract the feeling of vulnerability and insecurity that women face which hit the Canadian public like a shock wave 10 years ago today. As a society, we must not only be intolerant but stand united in addressing the causes of violence against women so that women feel safe in their daily lives.

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today with tears in my eyes and a heavy heart, as I am sure many of our colleagues in the House also do today, for 10 years ago Canada was changed. We in this country have always been blessed with the ability to say that we live in a nation better than all others.

Ten years ago one man armed with his hatred forced us to view a darker version of ourselves, a Canada no different than the foreign societies we fear. He did this by taking from us the lives of 14 young beautiful women in their prime from our own backyard. It defined us as a country that no longer has to look outside its borders to find an example of malicious and senseless violence.

It changed us as a people. We could no longer say that horrors such as these did not happen in our Canada. Although I did not know these brave little souls, I came to know of their innocence and their courage. We as a country came to know them to be no different from our daughters, our sisters, our neighbours and our friends.

We remember them not only as the only victims of violence against women, but as those whose story was so tragic that it forced the nation to turn its attention to the violent cruelty faced by women across the land at the hands of others.

It is not enough to merely remember these brave women and mourn their loss, without taking the steps necessary to ensure that a horror of this kind does not take place again.

Today across the country the spirit of these young women will serve as a call to action. Whether from Saint John, Saskatoon, Medicine Hat or Montreal, Canadians will stand together and condemn violence against women. They will gather to pray and to comfort. They will gather to harness strength and initiative. They

will acknowledge the good that has been done in the name of those slain and focus on the challenges that lie before us.

On behalf of the Right Hon. Joe Clark, our leader of the PC Party of Canada, and all of our colleagues in the House, we wish to convey our deepest, heartfelt sympathies, unchanged by the passage of time to the families and loved ones of the 14 women. They will, as will their families, remain in our hearts, our thoughts and our prayers always, en souvenir de leurs vies.

The Speaker: My colleagues, in memory of the 14 young Canadian women who were murdered, would you please stand with me for one minute's silence.

[Editor's Note: The House stood in silence]

* * *

● (1515)

PETITIONS

CULTURAL INDUSTRIES

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to present a petition signed by tens of thousands of Canadians.

The petitioners are calling upon the government to take appropriate steps to enhance the cultural industries of Canada, particularly the growing film industry. They lay out a number of recommendations for the government to consider. The petitioners are calling upon the government to take appropriate action to give strength to our dynamic cultural sector.

EQUALITY

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.): Madam Speaker, today I take great pride in presenting a petition put forth by many concerned Canadians mostly from the province of Quebec. These petitioners ask for the government to affirm that all Canadians are equal under all circumstances and without exception in the province of Quebec and throughout Canada. They wish to remind the government to enact only legislation that affirms the equality of each and every individual under the laws of Canada.

CHILD CUSTODY

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I am pleased to present a petition on behalf of many of my constituents as well as people from Humboldt, Saskatchewan, Zehner, Saskatchewan, Lake Lenore, Moose Jaw, Sintaluta, Saskatoon, Green Lake, La Loche, Prince Albert, Kelowna, Yorkton and other parts of the country. These people are very concerned. They are asking the House of Commons on behalf of children of separation and divorce that no parent should ever lose legal custody of their child or children, or by legal process be denied equal time shared parenting to maintain a meaningful relationship with their child or children unless found by due process to be unfit under the laws of Canada.

● (1520)

The petitioners also believe that no parent should be allowed to obstruct the child's relationship with the other parent or with other close family members, unless that other parent or family member has been found by due process to be unfit under the laws of Canada.

Finally, they believe that adversarial procedures should be avoided in favour of more co-operative approaches to divorce, such as mediation and education on co-parenting.

They are asking the House of Commons to pass legislation incorporating these rights of children and principles of equity between and among parents.

MANITOBA WATERWAYS

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition from residents of my riding of Selkirk—Interlake.

They are concerned that the dredging that has been discontinued by the federal government, the Canadian Coast Guard and public works on our navigable waters of the Red River and Lake Winnipeg is seriously hampering both commercial fishing and pleasure boating. As a result, these 900 plus petitioners would like the federal government to reinstate dredging on the Red River and Lake Winnipeg and the harbours associated with these waterways, which will help Manitobans to a great extent.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, Question No. 22 will be answered today.

[*Text*]

Question No. 22—**Mr. Jim Pankiw:**

For each of the fiscal years from 1994 to 1998 inclusively, and with respect to French language broadcasting stations operating outside Quebec and English language broadcasting stations operating within Quebec, what has the government determined to be: (*a*) the total amount of federal tax dollars spent in each province to provide these services; and (*b*) the total amount of advertising revenue generated by each of these stations?

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): The government provides the CBC with a parliamentary appropriation to provide a national public television and radio broadcasting service for all Canadians in both official languages. This service is primarily Canadian in content and character.

As a crown corporation operating independently from government, the CBC is not required to provide details of its annual

revenues and expenditures beyond those which are contained in its audited financial statements of its annual reports.

The following financial information on expenditures and revenues for fiscal years 1994-95 to 1998-99 is contained in the CBC's annual report.

Annex A describes total expenditures for CBC English and French services before taxes and Annex B describes revenues.

Annex A

Breakdown of CBC Expenditures before taxes
(includes parliamentary appropriations and revenues)
(in $1,000s)

	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99
English Television	580,667	572,311	543,790	680,371	513,820
% of total	49.2%	43.5%	44.6%	48.2%	35.9%
French Television	318,231	302,601	293,842	393,825	317,738
% of total	27.0%	23.0%	24.1%	27.9%	22.2%
English Radio	175,265	165,773	167,039	194,795	144,557
% of total	14.9%	12.6%	13.7%	13.8%	10.1%
French Radio	104,864	101,306	101,199	122,806	98,757
% of total	8.9%	7.7%	8.3%	8.7%	6.9%
Other[1]	—	173,667	113,391	19,762	356,382
		13.2%	9.3%	1.4%	24.9%
Total	1,179,027	1,315,658	1,219,261	1,411,559	1,431,254

[1] Depending on the presentation of the fiscal year in the annual report, ''other'' may include expenditures such as specialty services, Radio Canada International, transmission, distribution and collection, amortization of capital assets, and corporate management.

Annex B

Revenues before expenses
(in $1,000s)

	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99
Advertising	291,800	305,508	364,834	383,306	329,735
Other	—	158,672	139,013	141,986	154,331
Total	291,800	464,180	503,847	525,292	484,066

[*English*]

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

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I wish to inform the House that because of the ministerial statement, Government Orders will be extended by 12 minutes.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

NISGA'A FINAL AGREEMENT ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-9, an act to give effect to the Nisga'a Final Agreement, as reported (without amendment) from the committee; and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise again today. It is probably the lowest point in parliament so far.

We are talking about the Nisga'a agreement and the amendments to it at report stage. The NDP and the Liberals would like to muzzle Reform. They have said so previously in the debate. The Liberals used the phrase ''the Canadian way'' and it became obvious as we listened that it is really the Liberal way that they were talking about.

I cannot figure out why closure is being invoked on this bill. Is it because the public might raise concerns, or that the concerns with the bill might become more public and opposition to it would continue to grow across Canada, the same kind of opposition that is now present within B.C. among the majority of the people there?

All the people of B.C. have not had input. I have heard one of the members from Vancouver talk about all the consultation and meetings that have been held. The problem is the people of B.C. in their majority have not been allowed to address all of the concerns they have.

One of the Liberals who spoke said he voted but with an expressed caveat. He had reservations about this. What a joke. What a joke to say, ''I am going to vote yes to this agreement''. Does that member think that the minister of Indian affairs will listen once the vote is over, that anybody will take into account any of the concerns he expressed? No, because once it is passed, it is a done deal. People will just laugh at him when he says, ''I raised this and I voted yes, but I want to have it understood that I have these concerns''. Does that member think any court will listen to him after this is implemented because he made a speech here raising some of these concerns?

• (1525)

The Liberal member is playing pure politics if he is afraid to stand up now and be counted. It will be too late after this bill is implemented. Mark my words, this sets a precedent for which there will be no turning back. The courts will take this and run with it.

I just finished a speech a couple of hours ago on property rights. The Liberals claim that the charter will protect the aboriginal

people and all Canadians. In my speech on a bill which the Liberals did not even allow to be votable, I said that there is no protection in the charter for property rights. The court has said so itself. Their appeal to the charter to protect aboriginal property rights is not based on any fact. As my colleague said, it is valueless. It is useless.

We have not had time to debate some of these things. I have raised this issue but it will not be dealt with here. Yet the Liberals claim that the charter will protect them. I have pointed out areas where the charter cannot protect them and the court has said so.

The process has been flawed from the beginning. The negotiations were secret for many years. When other Reformers and I became aware of this in 1994 and 1995 there was a refusal on the part of the government to even have any public disclosure as to what was happening. Any objections we raised were belittled. We were portrayed as being evil people. Nothing could be further from the truth. We are the only political party right now that is standing up and asking the serious questions about this treaty. None of the other opposition parties are doing that, nor are any of the backbench Liberals doing this in any serious way.

In B.C. the debate was cut off even before half of the treaty was debated. The consultation is not just with four or five chiefs. I have heard the government say that there were three parties involved in the agreement, but they were all the tops. It was a top heavy thing. The rank and file people have basically been shut out of this whole process and that is really a concern. Opposition parties should express the concern of all Canadians and only Reform is doing that.

This is a change in the social contract. We are not focusing upon the cost. We realize the cost could be unbelievable. Some estimates run as high as $30 billion or $40 billion. We have to look at how this is going to change the dynamics within Canada. The democratic rights of all B.C. are being thumbed by not having it fully debated and a referendum held.

One of the points that has been raised is that we do not hold referendums on this kind of thing because there is no precedent. How ridiculous an argument can one have? If it is this important and if it is going to involve a change that is this fundamental, we have to have input by all people.

What about the Charlottetown accord? The people spoke very clearly on the relationship of aboriginals to the rest of the country. We are ignoring that and we are going ahead with this without having another referendum.

I do not know what excuse one could come up with for not having a process that includes everybody. The government ministers talk about listening to all sides but they have created the sides in this. They have created the divisions that will get even wider as we continue along. If it is so good, as the government claims it is, why not put it to all the people of B.C.?

One person has asked, is there any place on reserve where the conditions are as good as off reserve? The government has not answered that question. People have said that they want to get out from under the Indian Act. With this thing they are ending up with the very same thing. They are not getting out from under the oppression that they are feeling at this time.

Canadians are concerned that the courts are going to be dictating this legislation. Do the courts have the right to tell members of parliament how they should speak? That is what one Liberal asked. I would like to ask that question.

● (1530)

With respect to aboriginals before the law, a former minister of justice stated clearly ''We have one law for all, but it is flexible in its application''. Only a Liberal could come up with that forked tongue type of speaking.

One hon. member said there are no legitimate concerns being voiced by grassroots people in B.C. I would beg to differ. There are major concerns being voiced by grassroots people.

It has been said that this is a template for scores of other treaties. Does this not warrant more careful scrutiny? Unfortunately, we are standing alone in asking for this.

Quite some time ago when the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples brought in its report I made a speech. In the context of the Nisga'a agreement, I would like to bring up some of the key points that were raised at that time, which are still valid today.

At that point an editorial in the *Globe and Mail* stated that if those recommendations were to be implemented, and they are being implemented today, they would lead to separation, both political and economic.

We have said that we need to move toward equality. Here are some of the key, crucial steps that we need to take to move toward the goal of equality. The Indian Act must be repealed and replaced with legislation that will move closer to true equality. This bill does not do that.

We need to agree on a definition of self-government. I believe that the majority of Canadians, including grassroots Indian people, would support aboriginal self-government as long as the federal government's relationship with Indian reserves was similar to that of the relationship between provinces and municipalities.

Most of Canada's aboriginal people, and there are about 500,000, already live in municipalities under provincial jurisdiction. The federal government retains responsibility for about 350,000 people.

For self-government to work, Canadian law, including the charter of rights and freedoms, must apply equally to all aboriginal people. Local Indian governments will never be truly democratic or financially accountable until and unless a normal local government

to taxpayer relationship is established. The federal government must make treaty entitlements payable, in part at least, directly to individual treaty Indians living on reserve. I emphasize that. They should have the same rights as the rest of us. They will not get that through this agreement and they should have that. We need to move toward equality that will be of benefit to all.

Every treaty Indian is entitled to compensation benefits or services promised by the treaty and they should have a choice of receiving those benefits directly from the federal government or through their local Indian government. They should be able to exercise that option at any time.

Land claims settlements should be negotiated publicly, not behind closed doors, and they should outline all of these things.

Mr. Bill Matthews (Burin—St. George's, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I take great pleasure in rising today to participate in the debate on Bill C-9, the Nisga'a treaty.

I could not help but reflect on the mood of the House and how it changed from the very partisan thrust of question period to just a few minutes ago when we took a few moments to remember the terrible tragedy which happened at the École Polytechnique 10 years ago. I think that says something about us as Canadians and as parliamentarians, how our moods change, how we understand, how we can be tolerant and of course how we remember.

That brings me to today's debate. The first and most important thing to say is that we acknowledge and appreciate the overwhelming support for the Nisga'a treaty from members of three of the four opposition parties represented in the House of Commons.

We have heard criticism often repeated by the official opposition. Now we see hundreds of amendments aimed at dismantling, undermining and changing this agreement, which has been entered into honourably by different parties. We have to be very clear that Reform amendments seek to tear up the Nisga'a final agreement. In this effort Reform members stand alone. They are isolated. They are wrong.

● (1535)

Support from political parties as diverse in their views as the Bloc Quebecois, the New Democratic Party and the Progressive Conservative Party vindicates our view that the Nisga'a treaty is truly a non-partisan issue. What the Nisga'a treaty demonstrates is the government's commitment to aboriginal peoples in this country.

Just this past weekend there was an agreement signed in my riding of Burin—St. George's among the Miawpukek First Nation, the Federation of Newfoundland Indians and Human Resources Development Canada for some $12.3 million, which will enable those people to address the needs of youth and equal access for people with disabilities, as well as the child care initiative that has been built into the Conne River agreement. That demonstrates very clearly this government's commitment to the aboriginal peoples of this great country.

The Nisga'a treaty, as with other modern treaties, should rise above the ordinary back and forth and thrust of partisan debate. The amendments which have been proposed by the Reform Party relate more to its make believe treaty than to the bill before the House and to what the treaty would give effect. In many cases, as we shall see during the course of the debate, the amendments do not relate to the actual document that has been negotiated among the parties. Additionally, they do not relate to the specific provisions of the final agreement which have been restated in Bill C-9.

The first treaty, the real treaty that was negotiated, has been ratified by the Nisga'a and Her Majesty in right of British Columbia. It is this treaty that has been tabled before parliament, which will be ratified with the passage of Bill C-9. It is the treaty referred to by the government and the three opposition parties other than the official opposition.

The official opposition is trying to impress its make believe treaty upon members of the House. The official opposition, the Liberal Party of British Columbia and a minority of editorialists seem determined to misrepresent the real treaty's elements. Among the many myths the official opposition seems bent on perpetrating are that the treaty undermines the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and that it creates uncertainty. Of course, that could not be further from the truth.

Let me start by debunking the first myth. Since 1982 the Nisga'a have agreed that their treaty would be subject to the charter. Accordingly, the treaty clearly states that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms applies to the Nisga'a government in respect of all matters within its authority.

Still the Reform Party attempts to tinker with the wording of this bill which reflects the final agreement. Its Motion No. 25 would delete the reference to the charter of rights and freedoms from the preamble of Bill C-9. It is not its objective to make constructive amendments, but rather to tear them down and raise contradictions between the bill before the House and the Nisga'a final agreement.

What we are seeing here once again, and what I have observed in the House of Commons since I have been here, is more of the same old Reform Party that Canadians have come to know. The same old divisive nature and the same old obstructionist tactics and manoeuvres are being used by this official opposition known as the Reform Party. Canadians are finally starting to see what really is behind the motives of the Reform Party. Polling results across the country are starting to show that.

The end result of its tactics, if accepted, would be a bill of contradictions, surprises, misstatements and errors. Rather than building upon certainty and understanding, lawyers would have a field day trying to comprehend how the Reform bill would actually accord with the final agreement. I ask once again, does the Reform Party want a final agreement with the Nisga'a nation or not? Is there something it does not want to be final? I think all members of the House, after being engaged in this debate for a period of time, know the answer to these questions. The answer is no.

• (1540)

Being the kind of people we are in Canada, being parliamentarians in the House of Commons representing Canadians, I wonder what the true motives of the official opposition are.

We are a country of tolerance. We are a country of goodwill. We want to rectify injustices in the country. One of the reasons we were sent to parliament was to deal with these issues. What better opportunity to rectify some of the injustices of the past, to correct some of the wrongs of the past, to show compassion and to lend support where it is so badly needed than the Nisga'a treaty, Bill C-9?

There is overwhelming support across Canada to ratify this agreement. Why is the official opposition being obstructionist in its tactics? That party will try to keep us in the House for the next 48 or 72 hours, with amendment after amendment, trying to obstruct and delay the implementation and approval of an agreement which will benefit many people in this country.

I would ask members of the Reform Party—and I see there are a couple present—if any of them see the inherent contradictions in some of the amendments they have proposed. There are some startling contradictions in the amendments.

The best way to learn about the Nisga'a treaty is to understand it. In addition, numerous summaries and academic articles are available which support the treaty. The Reform Party's arguments and amendments ignore hours of very valuable testimony setting out how this final agreement operates, the meaning of the final agreement and its constitutional status. As the House carries on with its deliberations it will be necessary for all members to consider whether members of the official opposition are describing the actual Nisga'a treaty or their own make believe treaty.

The Nisga'a have bargained with the federal and provincial governments peacefully and in good faith. They have every right to expect that the treaty will be upheld and the agreement will come to fruition. All Canadians can be proud that the Nisga'a final agreement is a fair, affordable and honourable settlement which puts to rest historic frustrations that have divided British Columbians for more than 100 years. I say that the amendments proposed by the Reform Party, in motion after motion before us today, undermine that very objective. The consequence is to separate Canadians, to deny what the Nisga'a have honourably negotiated and to weaken the treaty process in British Columbia.

The Nisga'a treaty should be celebrated as a national achievement, proof that people working in good faith can resolve their differences without confrontation or litigation. The Nisga'a have waited long enough. This agreement has been studied and debated extensively and it must be ratified. Then and only then can we go forward into the next millennium ready to face the challenges of the future.

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Ref.): Madam Speaker, there is one very simple reason for which members of the official opposition oppose this treaty, which is that we are representing the views of the vast majority of our constituents in British Columbia.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak to the amendments proposed in Group No. 1 concerning Bill C-9, an act to give effect to the Nisga'a final agreement.

The government calls this a debate, but we all know that it has no intention of listening. We all know of the government's commitment to pass the Nisga'a final agreement before we break for Christmas. We all know that the government has made a commitment to refuse to even entertain any amendment to the Nisga'a final agreement. In effect, the government is making parliament superfluous. In this instance parliament no longer has power over its own legislation. The government in power is forcing the passage of an agreement over which this place has absolutely no input or control. It is indeed unfortunate that the other opposition parties are permitting this action to occur without a whisper of condemnation.

• (1545)

All members of this place must at many times wonder whether we have become redundant when we continually witness the Prime Minister, his office and the Privy Council office dictate what legislation passes through this place and in what manner.

Bill C-9 is a prime example of the complete abdication of democratic principles. Sure, we are being provided with the opportunity to speak, the opportunity to challenge the actions of the government and the opportunity even to vote on this legislation, but the government members are given their marching orders and the government is not open to any alteration of the bill. It is all just a charade. There is no democracy in the legislation.

The minister has been put in a position of accepting an agreement entered into by his predecessor and he has been told to get it through parliament without any changes. It is a tough job because

he has been given a Volkswagen and has been told to sell a Cadillac, with all due respect to the folks at Volkswagen.

He has an agreement that creates a third order of government and he tries to suggest that the constitution is not being thwarted. He has an agreement that creates inequalities and he tries to suggest that equality of all citizens is being upheld. He has a clause in the legislation that clearly states that if there is a conflict between provincial and federal laws and the agreement, then the agreement reigns supreme, but he argues that this is not the case.

I would certainly like somebody to explain to me paragraph 13 of the general provisions of the agreement. It states:

> In the event of an inconsistency or conflict between this Agreement and the provisions of any federal or provincial law, this Agreement will prevail to the extent of the inconsistency or conflict.

That quotation certainly appears to state that the agreement is paramount even to federal and provincial laws. In fact, it sounds suspiciously like a constitutional document, but it has not been added to our constitution through the amending formula. It has been undertaken by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and we are merely rubber stamping it.

I received quite an extensive e-mail from one of my constituents. She is a 17 year old student who has taken the initiative to study the Nisga'a final agreement. She is strongly opposed to the treaty.

She is concerned about the land of the agreement being handed over to the Nisga'a people when the Gitksan and Gitanyow people also have claims to some of the same parcels of land. What does the minister say about this issue and the concern? He maintains that he is working on it and these other bands will be looked after in future negotiations and agreements.

I have great difficulty in accepting these proposals. First, if the land is already allotted to the Nisga'a and it actually belongs to these other bands, how can justice really be done to rectify the situation in the future? Second, will Canadians have to pay a premium to these other bands should it be determined that they have been deprived of ancestral lands? While I certainly do not suggest civil disobedience or illegal activity, my 17 year old constituent is certainly concerned that these other native bands might be forced to take the law into their own hands in order to obtain their rightful lands. Is this what we are bringing forth with this legislation?

I have expressed my displeasure and disappointment over the complete disregard for democracy with Bill C-9. I would now like to discuss a recent poll taken from the citizens of my home province of British Columbia. It significantly supports the amendments as proposed by Group No. 1 in the report stage of this legislation. The poll also strongly supports my claims in regard to the failure of the democratic principles to be respected.

Citizens of British Columbia were asked if they had had adequate opportunity to provide input to the Nisga'a treaty. Of no surprise the results were much the same as they are for this place. They have been given a fait accompli and have been told to live with it. The deal is done. The treaty and the legislation will pass unchanged.

Some 91% of the citizens polled from the riding of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans did not feel that they had been provided with adequate opportunity to provide input into the Nisga'a treaty. Will the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans stick up for his constituents? I think we all know the answer to that question.

The citizens of British Columbia were asked if they believed the people of British Columbia should have the right to vote on the principles of the Nisga'a treaty in a provincial referendum. Some 94% of the constituents of the Secretary of State for Multiculturalism and Status of Women stated that they believed that they should have the right to vote in a provincial referendum. What does the government say? It states that the members of this place represent their constituents and vote for them, but that obviously fails to work democratically in situations such as this when members of parliament vote against the wishes of their constituents.

The poll also asked how the people of British Columbia wanted their federal member of parliament to vote on this treaty. Of those polled, 94% wanted the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam to vote against this treaty. Do we really think this member will vote in compliance with the wishes of his constituents? No, he will vote as he is told by the powers to be here in Ottawa. It is a shame: 82% of the constituents of the Secretary of State for Multiculturalism and Status of Women want her to vote against this legislation but she will not do so; 92% of the constituents of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans want him to vote against this legislation but he will not do so; 92% of the constituents of the member for Richmond want him to vote against the legislation, but he will not do so; and 91% of the constituents of Vancouver Quadra want him to vote against this legislation. I will not say that he will not listen to his constituents as he has been known to buck the powers to be in the past. I can only hope that again he will see the light.

• (1550)

I would just like to conclude with a quote from Professor Ehor Boyanowsky who appeared before the panel of my colleagues in Vancouver. Professor Boyanowsky is a professor of criminal psychology at Simon Fraser University in Burnaby, British Columbia. His area of expertise is individual and group violence and inter-group violence and conflict.

Professor Boyanowsky told a compelling story based on an extrapolation into the future of the conditions being set up today under the Nisga'a agreement. I will not go into his story but suggest that members read it for themselves. There is one thing he did say which bears repeating. He stated:

> The psychological literature is very clear. Where you draw a line around people, where you can take an underclass and make them into an overclass, very quickly they become the object of enmity. Where you form the basis of difference between people on an ethnic basis or genealogical basis, you create hatred. This was true in eastern Europe, it is still true in the Balkan countries. We are re-creating, reimposing because our English predecessors who came here knew no better, so they reimposed a British model on Canada. I think what we have to do is say that we have a certain image in our minds of how Canada should function and we do whatever we can to try to preserve that. This does not mean that we do not compensate native peoples for the lands and the injustices they have been the subject of in the past, but what we do is we remain true to certain kinds of principles. And those principles are based on individual ownership, individual opportunity, and the opportunity for redistribution of resources unfettered by genealogical distinctions or ethnic differences. I think that otherwise, what happens is you end up with enmity, with hatred and with people partially frozen in time between an old system and a new system, especially when they, for example, cannot use their lands.

With that I will conclude my remarks.

Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to address a couple of points that I think are fairly key in this debate over this historic treaty.

I am a Canadian from the city of Mississauga in Ontario. People might wonder what interest I could have in a treaty with aboriginal people on the west coast. I think there are some things happening here both as to how this place functions and the significance of the negotiations with the Nisga'a that should concern all Canadians from sea to sea to sea.

I understand that there is no possible way, there are no circumstances, there is no opportunity for us to satisfy the concerns of the official opposition. If there were, we would not be facing some 500 amendments to the bill after it has gone through the extensive process that it has gone through. One would think that a parliamentarian could go through committee, could go through negotiations, could discuss within this place the issues of concern and come to some understanding of it. While the opposition says that the government is unwilling to accept amendments, it continues to put what I think the Canadian people would consider to be either frivolous or dangerous amendments to this legislation.

Mr. John Williams: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have been listening to the hon. member. I am sure that he is aware that we put many amendments forward and they were all rejected at committee.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): This is debate.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Madam Speaker, I know that is the strategy of the Reform Party and that is fine if members want to continue to interrupt me because I will get the point across. The point is that what the Reform members are doing in terms of trying to gum up the wheels of government is, frankly, irresponsible. If they would just admit that there is nothing that could satisfy their concerns because they have failed to put those concerns on the record in this place. They stand and talk about the potential impact to our charter. They say it is creating some new level of government. What they do not say is that the Reform Party is inextricably opposed to self-government and self-determination by aboriginal Canadians. It is absolutely the case. They will not say it but that is fundamentally what they are opposed to.

• (1555)

The bill has had provincial hearings and community hearings. We have had federal negotiators who have met for countless hours. We all know it has been an issue for in excess of 100 years. We all know that the Nisga'a people have attempted to negotiate with the province of British Columbia and the country of Canada and in the past they have failed, so what do we do? Do we simply ignore the injustices? Do we simply ignore the heritage of the Nisga'a people in British Columbia, or do we try to move ahead incrementally and put in place a bill and a treaty that will bring some justice to them?

Reform Party members can be obstructionist if they want to. It is unfortunate that this issue has come down to a debate between our philosophy and theirs when in fact what we should be dealing with are the real issues.

When I talk about frivolous or even potentially dangerous amendments, let me give an example of one that the member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley has put forward. Clause 5 of Bill C-9 states, ''The Nisga'a final agreement is binding on, and can be relied on by all persons''. The amendment being put forward by the member would delete the words ''and can be relied on by''. Therefore the clause would read, ''the Nisga'a final agreement is binding on all persons''. The Reformers would delete the words, ''and can be relied on by all persons''. Why would they want to do that? What is the impact of that?

Let me give an example. During the negotiations the federal negotiator met with a number of third parties to this particular agreement. Those third parties are companies in forestry, mining, fishing, other resource sectors, utility companies, other business interests, environmental groups, local government, Nass Valley residents who are not part of the Nisga'a people and many other groups with legal interests in this particular agreement. The Reform Party amendment would take away any opportunity for any of those groups to be able to challenge anything within the agreement, perhaps in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, or the Supreme Court of Canada. Why would the Reform Party do that?

Members of the Reform Party stand in this place and say that the rights and the protection of women is not in the Nisga'a agreement. The minister has stood in his place as early as today in question period and clearly stated—I do not know why they cannot grasp

this concept—that the rights of Nisga'a women will be protected under provincial laws, the same way as all women in British Columbia and Canada enjoy protection. Why does the Reform Party need to have it specifically addressed in the agreement?

When we put a clause in the bill that says that they can rely on this agreement, by deleting that, if we want to set women up as a specific group, then we are saying that women will not be able to rely on this particular agreement. The forest industry, or the mining industry, or the other groups I have talked about will not be able to rely on it. We have to ask ourselves whether Reform's researchers do not understand the impact because words in this place are so all important.

Words set the future course for the government. Words tell Canadians what the government feels and what the opposition feels. By deleting those few little words in that agreement, we are potentially taking away the rights of so many groups who perhaps are not specifically mentioned in the Nisga'a agreement but who have a substantial interest.

• (1600)

I have another example. This agreement gives Canadians the right to reasonable access to Nisga'a lands. Would the Reform Party's amendment deny that?

In my own province of Ontario, in a place just north of Parry Sound, there was a dispute where the native community blockaded a road and would not allow access to cottagers, who had historic access, to their lakes. If we were to follow and extrapolate the views of the Reform Party, they would lose any protection should that situation occur under the Nisga'a agreement simply because Reform put an amendment that said that those cottagers, to use that example, could not rely on the agreement. They could not rely on their rights as Canadians to cross that particular barricade to access lands that perhaps will be isolated as a result of the redrawing of boundaries through this agreement.

I know many members of the Reform Party. I work with them in committee, whether it is on citizenship and immigration or public accounts. I see the esteemed chair of our public accounts committee in this room and welcome him back after his trials with health problems. We are delighted to see him here. There is a reasonable individual, and there are others over there. Do they not see that by deleting those little words it would take away the rights of all Canadians, interest groups, environmental groups and women to enjoy the access to and benefits of this particular agreement? I think it is a mistake. I can only assume Reformers do not understand it, but it is rather tragic that we have got to this point.

Let me just read another clause, which states:

> The Nisga'a Nation releases Canada, British Columbia and all other persons from all claims, demands, actions, or proceedings, of whatever kind, and whether known or unknown, that the Nisga'a Nation ever had, now has or may have in the future, relating to or arising from any act, or omission, before the effective date that may have affected or infringed any aboriginal rights, including aboriginal title, in Canada of the Nisga'a Nation.

Are members suggesting that there is something wrong with that? We are saying that in return for granting new rights and a new treaty to the Nisga'a people, we are asking that everybody else who could be impacted on in any way whatsoever be relieved of that implication. This agreement is historical. It is a travesty that Reformers are throwing out absolutely false information. They should simply support this agreement and let the Nisga'a people enjoy the many benefits that come with it.

Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I rise to speak to Bill C-9 at report stage, Group No. 1, an act to give effect to the Nisga'a final agreement.

I want to first assure the Nisga'a people, other native groups and all my constituents, despite what the current powerholders say about our questioning of the deal, that my interest in the bill is to address the need for a better future for the Nisga'a people and all those under the Indian Act and in relation to each other and with other Canadians.

We understand that after years of negotiation within a framework dictated by the Indian Act but controlled by the federal government and Indian affairs, most Nisga'a leaders feel that they have no alternative but this agreement. British Columbians have been wrongly told that it is this deal or nothing. Sadly, it is just more of the same that has already failed.

Opposition MPs are not similarly tainted. We question and oppose because we do not believe this agreement, in the long term perspective, is in the best interests of the Nisga'a people, in the long range interests of aboriginals throughout B.C. or in the interests of the people of Canada.

It may be noted that the official parliamentary aboriginal affairs committee shut out many astute witnesses. So with a view to being more responsive to citizens than the traditional parties in the House, Reform conducted additional hearings to let others have a say. For example, one witness was Kerry-Lynne Findlay who was on the constitutional section of the Canadian Bar Association. She was asked for her views. Somewhat in this vein, I said to her that I was sure she had reflected a lot about these matters and of society's relationship with aboriginal people and that it was not just a Canadian problem. I told her how I had discovered during my visit to Taiwan that it has aboriginals who it has to work out a relationship with.

• (1605)

I asked her if she could reflect on society's general relationship with aboriginals, what would be a better way, in general principles,

the main things we must not forget, if we are going to actually ameliorate the situation, raise standards of living, try to modernize democracy and try to get to a situation where we might say that we have one land, one law and one people.

I will paraphrase her comments. She said ''—people really get confused with the notion and the idea of assimilation—People say that if you are treated the same, somehow you will be assimilated if you are being treated equally''. She went on to say:

> Of course, I don't think that's what anybody is talking about, and clearly antiquated policies that try to achieve that hurt everybody and I don't think anybody quarrels with that today. However, that is not the same thing as bringing aboriginal peoples along with other peoples who live here, some of whom have arrived recently, into what we call sort of the mainstream of Canadian society. That means that the opportunities are equal for all, even some recognition, perhaps, for those who need a little help to get where the opportunities are equally applied. But it doesn't have to mean that your culture disappears. It doesn't have to mean that you language disappears. It doesn't have to mean that your traditional ways and points of view and, particularly, your religious beliefs disappear.
>
> Somehow. . .in government circles, the distinction between the two has been entirely lost and, therefore, there's been a buying into this concept that rather than getting rid of separation of peoples we will actually entrench it. Again, most of the problems with the way it was done historically is that we took whole groups of people and said, ''You will live there and please don't cross the line,'' and in some cases even moved them into that place they were going to live.
>
> Yet here we are now putting a (legal) fence up around those places and saying, ''We're going to help you keep the outside world out''. It isn't realistic in modern terms at all and I don't think it will work. Over time I really fear we are headed toward civil unrest and more of the standoffs of the kind we saw at Oka.
>
> These occurrences will happen again. . .when people feel left out and that's what we are talking about. My solution is to bring people on board. Bring everyone on board and have everyone part of the process. So many of these decisions aren't even being made by the minister or the politicians, they're being made by the bureaucratic system in Ottawa and by faceless and nameless bureaucrats who do not have to stand up before the people and be accountable for their decisions, and that's a shame.

Those are some of the comments she made. Certainly, Ms. Findlay ought to know as she was part of the Liberal policy development machine in times past.

A Reform member on the committee put it to her further and said that often in the development of the treaty process we have a problem with government policy toward aboriginals and that it was very difficult at the beginning to get people to understand what the issues were because they simply were not involved. He went on to say ''I think that has been a problem, to a large extent, with some of the treaty process, that until it hits you directly''—such as the fishermen, many who are aboriginals, who will, as a result of this deal, lose their share of the catch—''it is merely an academic problem that you may or may not become interested in. I think that's a pretty fair statement of the situation in the real world''.

In response to the member, Ms. Findlay, the lawyer, responded this way about the political legitimacy and the broad community consent and awareness. She said:

> I think it is, but I believe it is changing, I really feel, because I think finally, now, for whatever reason, linkages are being made right across the country, and I am certainly experiencing that. When I send out an e-mail now, it goes all across the country, because I have people from across the country contacting me and saying, ''We want to link with you and we think that the fishermen who are affected, and the loggers who are affected, and the non-native leaseholders who are affected, and the other people in the resource-based economies who are affected, we want to know you, and we want to support you and be part of this.''
>
> So you see groups springing up, the United Canadians for Democracy, that is a group that the leaseholders are part of forming, but it is based out of Ontario. CanFree is a new group that has been set up right here in British Columbia. I think that you are seeing this more and more now, and certainly that's why I know who Phil Eidsvik is now, and he knows who I am. This is why, when I was back in Halifax, I contacted fishers back there because of the Marshall decision that had just come down. So I think it's changing. Again, though these processes take time, and time is something we don't have with the Nisga'a treaty, but it may be something we have with other treaties coming up and maybe so with this one.
>
> I think the government, the federal and the provincial government, are being, themselves, very naive now if they feel that they can continue to use that divide and conquer approach and that Canadians are not linking, because they are.

● (1610)

Our effort today in the House is to do our constitutional duty, to require the government to make its case to the electorate. The point is that the Liberals are out of date. When failed policies, wrong ideas and false assumptions narrow the range of choices, the shape of destiny will always be sadly lacking if not bringing deep sorrow.

The mandate to negotiate and the manner in which it was done by B.C. politicians is discredited. The arrangement will not bring about lasting reconciliation, and it is just one treaty down and fifty to go. The legal expectations are there now and the template is set.

Much is to be worked out in the future and so much is written in vague terms. Fairness guarantees are very elusive in the package. Its emphasis is to separate rather than bring together. Legal equality principles have been sometimes abandoned. In such experiments, we must support equality, democracy, accountability and the coupling of entitlement with responsibility. Tolerance and diversity and mobility rights are there entwined in the settlements with Canadian natives. It is of grave importance when we assess the proposal for embedding by treaty small closed societies in a large, complex and open society, that is itself struggling to keep its place in a changing world.

We can ask how the treaty will help to engage the peoples in the World Trade Organization. It is because I care about my neighbour that I serve. It is because I know we can do so much better as a country, for all not just a few, that I speak to the mistake parliament is making today. For where there is injustice we must right it, where there is discrimination we must denounce it, where there is violence we must stand against it and where there are wounds we must heal them. May we be generous, be fair and be honest in our

deliberation and learn to be guided as we go forward determined not to reflect the mistakes of the past.

Nothing informs the public mind to understand and evaluate an issue like a public referendum. First, let us have one. Second, the government needs to ensure in better terms that we are not amending the constitution and that all of it applies to us. Third, the government needs to ensure all Canadians that the competing overlapping claims will be accommodated and properly dealt with.

At this late hour, I call the government to at least do these three things and the next time to be guided to negotiate more honourably.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am proud to be taking part in this debate, which is a very important one for the Nisga'a and the Government of Canada.

I think it is important for all members to understand how the Nisga'a final agreement was negotiated within the Canadian legal context.

The Nisga'a final agreement was negotiated with an eye to the rights and interests of all Canadians and, as recommended by the courts in recent cases such as Delgamuukw, is intended to reconcile the rights of the Nisga'a with the title and sovereignty of the crown.

Although all components of the Nisga'a final agreement fully reflect the Canadian legal context, it must be linked to the Canadian constitution, Canadian laws and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

First, let us look at how the Nisga'a final agreement relates to the Canadian constitution. In fact, the Nisga'a final agreement recognizes the constitution as the supreme law of Canada. No amendment to the constitution is therefore necessary to give effect to the Nisga'a final agreement, and the agreement does not alter the Canadian constitution.

Although this agreement includes self-government provisions, the legislative authority of the Nisga'a will be exercised simultaneously with existing authority.

The following are a few examples of how the Nisga'a final agreement was negotiated with a view to the Canadian constitutional framework.

The Nisga'a final agreement states clearly that it does not alter the constitution. The intention of the parties was for the Nisga'a final agreement to be interpreted in a manner consistent with the constitution.

The preamble to the Nisga'a Final Agreement Act states that the constitution is the supreme law of Canada and reaffirms that the Nisga'a final agreement does not alter the constitution. The courts may refer to this preamble when interpreting the Nisga'a final agreement act.

Reform Party members have proposed that we delete from the bill the clear and unequivocal statement by all parties that ''the Nisga'a Final Agreement states that the Agreement does not alter the Constitution of Canada''.

• (1615)

What problems do they want to create? What confusion are they stirring up with this amendment? What is more, they are also proposing an amendment to the wording of the preamble as it relates to application of the constitution. It is certain that Reform Party members cannot have it both ways.

The proposed preamble makes the intentions of the parties clear and will assist the courts in their interpretation of the Nisga'a final agreement.

Let us touch on the charter of rights and freedoms as it applies to the Nisga'a final agreement. I want to point out that one of the general provisions of the final agreement calls for the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms to apply to the Nisga'a government in respect of all matters within its authority, bearing in mind the free and democratic character of the Nisga'a government as set out in the agreement.

It is therefore clear that the charter will apply to all activities of the Nisga'a government. Consequently, the charter will apply not only to legislation enacted by the Nisga'a government but also to other activities, such as the decision to hire someone or to issue licences. The charter will protect all individuals who might be affected by the decisions of the Nisga'a government, not just the Nisga'a people.

The last part of this article—''bearing in mind the free and democratic nature of Nisga'a Government''—is similar to the terms used in section 1 of the charter, which indicate clearly that the rights conferred by the charter are not absolute.

Governments, including the Nisga'a government, must justify any limits to be imposed on the rights guaranteed under the charter. This expression shows therefore that the Nisga'a final agreement provides for the establishment of a government of a free and democratic nature. A Nisga'a government established in accordance with these provisions could invoke section 1 of the charter like any other government in Canada.

The Nisga'a have supported the application of the charter since the conclusion of the agreement in principle in 1996. The language

of the final agreement, as I have said, follows the wording of the charter to facilitate its application.

In closing, the Reform Party has proposed an amendment under which the Nisga'a government would be treated differently from other governments in Canada. Does that make sense? Does this further the integration of the Nisga'a into Canadian society which we are all seeking?

The Reform amendments run contrary to the desire of all of us here to see the Nisga'a government integrated with the other governments in Canada. Is that really what they want?

[*English*]

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to speak this afternoon on behalf of the constituents of Calgary East in the debate on Bill C-9, an act to give effect to the Nisga'a final agreement.

Like many of my colleagues speaking here today, I am not from British Columbia, but that does not diminish our resolve to see an agreement that is in the best interests of British Columbians, Canadians, and the Nisga'a people. That is why I am speaking to this bill today.

Bill C-9 is not an ordinary piece of legislation. The agreement that is before the House is an arrangement providing for the government of the Nisga'a people, the government of the local economy and the government of the relations with each other and with non-aboriginals. The bill seeks to replace a terribly flawed system that has existed for 130 years. It is a system with a track record of bringing poverty, family breakdown, violence, illness, shortened lifespan, unemployment and suicide to the aboriginal people of this country. It is a system established and mismanaged for over 100 years by successive Tory and Liberal governments. The system as it exists today simply does not work. Its record speaks for itself.

An effort to change the system has led to a series of land claims, court cases and court actions which are further straining the relationships between aboriginal and non-aboriginal Canadians. In addition to the billions and billions of dollars that Canadian taxpayers commit to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development every year, the Canadian taxpayer is on the hook for a potential $200 billion price tag as an estimate of the cost of all aboriginal demands. This is an absolutely staggering figure.

It is clear that tensions between aboriginals and non-aboriginals are perhaps higher than they have been in years.

● (1620)

Many are looking at the Nisga'a agreement as a framework that will miraculously solve all our immediate problems and provide a template for the future. However, this government does nothing to redress the key components of aboriginal governance and economic development.

If this agreement sought to give the Nisga'a people a chartered municipal government similar to the form of local government enjoyed by most Canadians, this would be a step in the right direction, a removal from special status and a step toward equality. However, Nisga'a laws according to this agreement will override provincial and federal laws in a multitude of areas. It will give the municipality paramount power over 14 areas of exclusive jurisdiction and shared powers in another 16 fields of federal and provincial jurisdictions.

The Nisga'a government will be exempt from a range of provincial taxes and stumpage fees and will not have to pay the GST. Individual Nisga'a citizens will be permanently exempt from having to hold or pay federal and provincial licences, fees, charges and royalties on fish and wildlife entitlements provided under this agreement.

At first glance the above points may seem almost trivial. However, we must remember that this agreement is supposed to provide a template for 50 similar agreements in British Columbia. The precedent is being set for race based tax exemptions throughout British Columbia and indeed throughout Canada.

I would like to address the lack of physical and democratic accountability in the Nisga'a agreement. The Nisga'a treaty effectively centralizes power in the hands of governments on aboriginal lands and not in the hands of the people. Individual Nisga'a will depend on the government in a variety of areas, including housing, social assistance and employment. In fact, most of the employment on Nisga'a lands will be either with the Nisga'a government or with corporations owned by the Nisga'a government.

Similarly the model of economic development proposed in this agreement is one in which nearly all revenues flow from the federal and provincial governments to the Nisga'a government. It does not flow to the Nisga'a entrepreneurs, workers, taxpayers or citizens. It flows to the Nisga'a government to generate economic activity.

This agreement in fact continues to deny aboriginals many of the political and economic tools available to other Canadians. From responsible self-government to all the tools of the marketplace and private enterprise for economic development, this agreement in essence denies aboriginal people access to tools that the vast majority of Canadians take for granted.

Let me look for a moment at property rights. There is an absence on reserves of the most basic of property rights, just as there is an absence of contract rights. There is an absence of free markets in housing, labour and capital. Because these fundamental rights do not exist on reserves, many aboriginal people have had to leave the

reserve in order to get the tools that other Canadians take for granted.

I look to the many small business owners in my riding of Calgary East. Many of them use their properties or homes to secure capital from the banks to get their businesses off the ground. This is a luxury that has been denied to the native entrepreneurs because of the system of socialist economics that exists on reserves. The reserve system has not only had a negative impact on the aboriginal people, but it has been poisoning the relationship between aboriginals and non-aboriginals.

The fact is that investors and business people thinking of doing business in areas contained in aboriginal lands and treaties are thinking twice about making these investments.

I would like to talk now about what the official opposition proposes as a solution to a system that has proven itself to be ineffective and in fact harmful to aboriginals and non-aboriginals alike.

● (1625)

First, the official opposition believes in equality for all Canadians. Aboriginals and non-aboriginals alike should be entitled to the same rights, entitlements and powers in law with the freedom to use the law in different ways to give expression to their uniqueness and diversity.

Second, the official opposition believes that all Canadians are entitled to the services of a local government that is fiscally and democratically accountable to the people it serves.

Third, the official opposition believes strongly that the department of Indian affairs should begin the process of funding aboriginal persons on reserves directly, then allowing local aboriginal government to tax its own people to get access to it. This measure would go a long way to enhance the process of fiscal and democratic responsibility.

Finally, we believe that private property and contract rights must be established on reserves. We must develop real housing and labour markets on reserves, including equal economic rights for men and women.

To conclude my comments today, Bill C-9 does nothing to repair the damage caused by the 100 plus years of the reserve system. The bill does nothing to provide to aboriginals the basic rights that the vast majority of Canadians enjoy. The bill does nothing to satisfy the principles of equality under the law, fiscal and democratic accountability, private enterprise and free market.

The bill fails even the most basic of democratic principles. It fails to take into consideration the democratic rights of people living in the federal riding of Skeena, who will be most impacted by the bill. It fails to fulfill the democratic interests of British Columbians who continue to be denied adequate representation. It fails to take into account the interests of Canadians in general who have been denied full debate and disclosure of a bill that will have a tremendous impact far beyond the Nass Valley and British Columbia.

I would like to thank the member for Skeena and my Reform colleagues for standing in the House and fighting for what they believe is right, and for what I believe the vast majority of Canadians believe is right.

The bill is unfortunate for the Nisga'a people, British Columbians and Canadians.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, Gasoline Pricing; the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester, Airline Industry.

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to participate in today's debate on the final stages of the Nisga'a treaty through the House of Commons.

I have been listening to the speeches this afternoon by my friends in the Reform Party. I use the term advisedly; they are my friends. I consider many of them my personal friends and I respect their views but they are totally different from mine.

I have had an image come to me. It is an image of Colonel Custer standing on the plains in the west completely surrounded by aboriginal warriors. In his last gasping breath, shooting wildly in all directions, he and his band of soldiers are wiped out. That is what I thought when I listened to my friend make his speech just a few moments ago. He does not have blond curly hair, but if he had, he would be the typical picture of Colonel Custer in his last stand.

Today and tomorrow as we vote, it will once again be a version of the last stand. I say that with all due respect but that is how I feel. The Reform members feel very strongly on certain sides of the issue. I feel equally strong on the other. I had this image of Colonel Custer shooting wildly in all directions, knowing that this was it and finally succumbing to the bands of Indian warriors on that very fateful day which changed history in terms of the plains and aboriginal peoples. Today we are at a similar kind of crossroads.

Once again the people of the Nisga'a nation were consulted after their negotiators had gone through a very long and painful process of negotiation. I cannot imagine the tolerance that lasted over 100 years.

• (1630)

Madam Speaker, you know this story and I will not repeat it in detail, but I will give a brief history of the Nisga'a. They paddled their canoes almost from the Alaska boundary to Victoria over a hundred years ago, which is a long canoe paddle for anyone, to bring their grievances to the governing officials of the time. They said that they had never agreed to cede their territory and they wanted to negotiate a deal. We all know the terrible impact of the reaction when they were essentially told to turn around and paddle their canoes back home, which they did, but they never gave up.

Over 100 years later, after the patience of Job was demonstrated for decades and decades, a deal was negotiated. The Nisga'a people were asked what they thought about the deal. They said that they agreed with it, that it was not a perfect document, that they thought they could get a better deal. Some thought there were some problems with it, but overall they said it was the best deal they could negotiate with the provincial and federal authorities and they would accept it.

That is democracy. That is what life is all about. We negotiate a deal and then we ask people if they support it. They say yes and then we move on. British Columbia said yes and now Canada is saying yes, presumably in the closing stages of this debate. Then it will go off to the other place. I suspect that because it has the support of the two parties represented in the other place it will pass rather expeditiously, having gone through a lot of public consultation.

I know my friends in the Reform Party are saying that there has not been enough consultation. Fair enough. That is debatable. What is enough? I have held many meetings in my constituency. They were all public, open meetings which were well advertised and well attended. The discussion was always very thoughtful and very progressive. Yes, people had some concerns about the deal. I have concerns about the deal. We all have concerns about the deal, but that is the way deals are made. They are not perfect. The people who negotiate them are not perfect. We have come up with an agreement negotiated by individuals, all of whom are imperfect by definition, so yes we have differences.

In the House of Commons we witnessed a small political miracle. It is a small political miracle when Liberals are in agreement with Progressive Conservatives, who in turn are in agreement with people from the Bloc Quebecois, who in turn are supported by members of the New Democratic Party. Four of the five political parties in the House of Commons are agreeing on a major issue. Yes, we agree regularly on minor issues, all kinds of trivial issues, all kinds of minor homework issues and technical questions, but this is not a typical little deal. This is a huge initiative taken by this House that is historic in nature on which four out of the five political parties agree.

We could say that they do not know what they are talking about or that they do not know what they are doing, but let us face it, these are honourable men and women who have obviously given this a lot of thought, who have read the agreement, who have studied it, who have heard the reactions, and who have, in their judgment, decided to agree with it.

Do we all feel that this is a perfect document? No. Nobody does. However, we have looked at it, we have read about it, we have heard from our constituents and we have made a judgment, and four out of five political parties support it. The Reform Party opposes it. Fair enough. It is a free country and it has a right to its position. This must tell us something.

I consulted with Indian bands in my constituency of Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys. I asked if they supported the Nisga'a deal and they all said no. The Indian bands do not support it. They would not sign the deal because they think it is not good enough. Fair enough. That is their view. They say that they think they should do better and when they negotiate one day they will do better. That is their stated position. When my friends in the Reform Party say that this is a template for other agreements, I can say that the people of the Shuswap Nation say it is no template, that they will not agree to it because it is not good enough from their perspective. All right, we will set that aside.

• (1635)

I could not disagree more with some of the points made by my hon. friends in the Reform Party.

I want to say two things. First, there will be a massive transfer of dollars from Ottawa to British Columbia for the first time in history. I am talking about hundreds of millions, perhaps billions of dollars, which Ottawa will put into the economy of British Columbia. If $100 million goes to the first nations of British Columbia, they are not going to invest that money in Hawaii or the Cayman Islands.

An hon. member: Are you sure?

Mr. Nelson Riis: My hon. friend in the Reform Party asks if I am sure. No, I am not sure, but he is not sure either.

These are decent people. These are people who are dedicated Canadian citizens who take pride in their territory. They sure as heck are not going to invest the money in the Cayman Islands or Mexico. The money will stay in British Columbia for British Columbians, both aboriginal and non-aboriginal.

The Kamloops Indian band is one of a number of bands in my constituency which is incredibly progressive, leading the way in

terms of change. It has started a huge housing subdivision on its lands. The houses are selling. The band is building as we speak, in spite of the Musqueam problem which people have identified. I am talking about a huge subdivision being built on Kamloops Indian land, being sold almost exclusively to non-aboriginal people.

There are numerous aboriginal businesses which are thriving and dynamic. They are hiring individuals and doing well. Alongside these businesses are hundreds of non-aboriginal businesses, all adding to the economy of the greater Kamloops area.

The Kamloops Indian band developed industrial parks in co-operation with the city of Kamloops. They agreed to share water and sewer treatment and various infrastructures to make economic development possible.

The Kamloops Indian band, working in co-operation with the city of Kamloops, has put together one of the most progressive industrial parks in British Columbia. It is filled with non-aboriginal and aboriginal businesses and most of them are doing very well. There is all sorts of local economic development, wealth creation and job creation. It can be done. This band will soon be coming forward to negotiate a settlement, not along the lines of the Nisga'a agreement but along its own lines.

I look forward to voting on this issue. Thank goodness we are moving to a new phase in our relations with aboriginal people in Canada.

Mr. Charles Hubbard (Miramichi, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is good to follow a speaker from the party opposite who has had some very bright moments in terms of first nations people in his constituency.

Earlier today we reflected on the terrible event which happened in Montreal 10 years ago with the massacre of young women by a lone gunman. As Canadians we reflect on history. Today if we reflect on our history we could go back some 400 years to the arrival of the Europeans. They came to this continent and met the aboriginal people of this country who had their settlements, their ways of life, their culture, their activities and their civilization.

In 1579 Sir Francis Drake claimed British Columbia for the English crown. Over 200 years later, in 1793, George Vancouver arrived and for the first time met the Nisga'a people of northern British Columbia.

In question period today the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration answered questions concerning the immigration policies of the country. I am not sure what immigration policies the good people of British Columbia had back in the 1700s and 1800s, but certainly the Europeans who came to that area were welcomed and they became a very important part of the British Columbia economy as we know it today.

The people of British Columbia who lived in B.C. prior to the arrival of the Europeans found themselves at a great disadvantage in terms of the relationships which eventually developed between their people and the new arrivals to that colony.

● (1640)

The people of northern British Columbia, the Nisga'a, the people of the Nass River and the people of Fort Simpson, where the Hudson's Bay Company set up trading in 1834, encountered a new way of life. They encountered a people who were very aggressive, who tended to push them back from their civilization and who interfered with their hunting and fishing grounds and their natural resources. As a result, today we find ourselves trying to resolve a final agreement among the peoples of the Nisga'a nation, British Columbia and Canada which will terminate this period of conflict and develop a new arrangement by which all Canadians, especially the Nisga'a people, can live in their territories with some degree of pride and respect for our Canadian nation.

The vote that was held among some 2,500 Nisga'a people living on reserve, with a very small minority of white people present, indicated that most of them supported the agreement that we are looking at today. Some 61% voted in favour of it. Undoubtedly, a few felt that it was not right. Probably more of them felt that the agreement we negotiated with them over some 20 years was not as generous as it might be. In fact, the land settlement encompasses about 2,000 square kilometres and the original demand of the Nisga'a people was for some 20,000 square kilometres.

It is interesting to note that the entire area of the Nass River which the Nisga'a negotiated is an area which is probably about one-quarter of the size of that small island at the mouth of the St. Lawrence River, the island of Anticosti. It is a small area in terms of the overall size of the province of British Columbia. To some it sounds like a lot of territory and natural resources, but without a lot of people. We hope that with this agreement those people will be able to develop an economy, an existence and an area in which they can have pride, show leadership and, above all, sustain their people and enter the economy of our country.

I heard in the House today many statements about what we are and who others might be. I would say that when we try to impose our values on others, whether they be in terms of ownership, how society should operate or our European traditions, we are not doing those people who were here before us much of a favour. They have a civilization that is thousands of years old. It is a civilization that was developed with great pride in terms of housing, artwork and the canoes they use to fish on the rivers and on the coast. Those

people do not need great lessons on how we might see all Canadians fitting into one pattern.

Henry David Thoreau talked about people who listened to different drummers, who listened to different musicians, who had a different way of life. As Canadians we have to realize that there are many people in this country who cannot be made to fit a single mould.

I was very impressed to find that on the Internet there is a tremendous amount of information on the Nisga'a treaty, the Nisga'a nation and the northern British Columbia area. I ask people who are watching to consult the Internet, to look at those web pages to better understand the debate we are having tonight.

The final Nisga'a agreement reflects a different attitude than that which is reflected in the Indian Act, which has been a tremendous problem for many first nations peoples. We find that there are great restrictions under the Indian Act. The new Nisga'a agreement will mean that the people of the Nisga'a nation will develop a new type of arrangement among themselves and with our governments. That arrangement will not only deal with how they develop the fishery, mining and forestry resources. It will also mean that they may develop a system of taxation by which they may tax their own people. In the long run over a period of time, taxes will be applied both by the province of British Columbia and by the federal government in terms of income tax, sales taxes and GST.

• (1645)

Above all, we hope it will develop among our people in that great area of northern British Columbia near the Alaska border a sense of pride and freedom and an opportunity to develop themselves. It will show the other first nations of this country that when agreements are made, wise people sit down at tables to develop understandings and a new sense of arrangements. It might become a lighthouse of great hope by which the people of our many 600 first nations across the country may see themselves being involved in further agreements and attempt to resolve the many issues that have afflicted our country since the time when our two peoples came together.

Some members today have indicated the problems of the American west. As Canadians we can certainly be proud of the fact that in most situations in this country, the big stands like the stand at Little Big Horn never existed in terms of relations with our first nations peoples.

I know there are different opinions in the House. I certainly cannot agree with some of the opinions I have heard. Hopefully as good people we can look to the strength and the goodness in all people and with that, with the development of the best ideas and the best resources, tonight and tomorrow as we look at this treaty we can come to a definite arrangement with the Nisga'a people which will be in the best interests of all of us as great Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this debate on the Nisga'a final agreement.

It was not planned that I would speak but, after listening to all the speeches by members opposite and by members of all parties, particularly the official opposition, I now feel that I must make my humble contribution to the debate.

I lived for several years in close proximity to aboriginals on the north shore, and that is where I got to know them. Canada has some atoning to do when it comes to the native peoples.

I can remember that as recently as 1965 aboriginals were not allowed to have liquor on reserves. Unlike other Canadians, they were not allowed in establishments that served alcohol, such as hotels and taverns. Aboriginals were excluded. I saw this with my own eyes.

Unfortunately, I also lived through the period when, more through ignorance than ill will, Canadians, myself perhaps included in those days, treated aboriginals, our fellow citizens, unfairly. Fortunately, with age comes experience and one gets to know and accept others, and often discover that they have things to teach us.

I would like to speak more specifically about the north shore, the Montagnais in Sept-Îles and the Bersimis, who are now known as Innu, as I learned recently. I have worked closely with these people. I met with some good people who did not necessarily share our values.

Astonishingly, they were not caught up in the idea of making money, an idea that unfortunately we all have developed to some degree, however varying. The aboriginals I knew were not bent on making money at all costs. They were at peace with themselves and with nature, but this did not exempt them from some serious attacks on their dignity. I think that the worst thing that happened to aboriginals was the Indian Act passed by the federal government, in 1876 if memory serves.

• (1650)

They were contained within very clearly defined parameters, rather like animals in a zoo. They were fed, kept clean, housed, as in zoos, and could not leave in favour of an active and happy life without risking the loss of their status. And what was the sense in all this?

The aboriginal people were stripped of their dignity, a dignity they had before we came along, and today they are demanding it back. I am no different from anyone else. I have no stones to throw at my friends across the floor. When the Erasmus-Dussault report came out we were told, and that was not so long ago, maybe two

years, that it would be costly to reintroduce equity for the aboriginal peoples, to restore to them part of what has been taken from them, as well as the dignity they have lost. The Nisga'a agreement is, in my opinion, a step in the right direction.

The Nisga'a have perhaps been had, as far as certain aspects are concerned, and that is always a possibility with the government across the way. Time will tell. I am sure that the Nisga'a did not have the battery of experts, lawyers and so forth to conduct the negotiations as they would have liked, but that is what freedom is all about. It is the ability to make one's own mistakes sometimes and also to fix them.

I support this Nisga'a treaty. These are the first nations. They have been here for at least 20,000 years. Historians do not agree on this, but there is no doubt they were here 20,000 years ago. When the Europeans arrived, they were cavalierly crowded together. There were 50 million of them in what is now Canada and the United States. How many are left? I think there are even fewer of them in the United States than there are here.

We have destroyed them, although perhaps not always intentionally. Diseases against which they had no immunity killed many once the first Europeans appeared in North America.

I wonder if there are many of us, Europeans and their descendants, who would have put up for so long with the treatment we have given the aboriginal peoples, without demanding compensation and without waking one day and saying ''We want a say on the matter. We want to express our opinion, to direct our economic development and to be part of Canada's economic growth''. I do not think many of us would have let ourselves be treated the way these people have.

It is hard to avoid comparisons between the criminal world of the past and the attitude of some aboriginal people now because they have no hope. Someone said to me the other day that young Italian immigrants arriving in the States in the middle of the last century and at the beginning of this one had no chance of settling in the North American context, benefiting from economic growth or enjoying the benefits of it.

They were compartmentalized in a way that put them in the service of others all their lives. They had the right to settle in the United States, but not the right to prosper there, to live in peace, the right to happiness and, in particular, to hope. That is what led to the emergence of gangs, and the same thing is happening here with our aboriginal people.

They have been contained, as I have said, and not allowed the opportunity to contribute to, and to profit from—for there are two sides to every coin—the benefits of the Canadian economy.

• (1655)

Now with this little treaty, a first, we have succeeded in giving the Nisga'a the power to regulate themselves, a kind of self-government, although this will nevertheless be under the authority of the Canadian constitution and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

This may be the start of a better life for them. Perhaps we will begin to see positive effects: far more interest, far more dynamism, far more hope. When a people is deprived of hope, what does it have left? Quebecers know something about that; we have not gone unscathed either. That may be the reason why today the sovereignist forces are so strong in Quebec.

It must be terribly insulting for the Nisga'a to see a newly recognized right challenged by people who were not here 50 years ago, people who are claiming that an injustice is being done because they are losing some of their province's territory. What exactly is going on?

I would ask Reform Party members to give this some serious thought. Most of them were not here 50 years ago, while the Nisga'a have been around for a very long time. Let them learn to live with others.

As early as 1985 the former PQ Premier of Quebec, René Lévesque, recognized the first nations in Quebec and offered them self-government in a future sovereign Quebec. We were 14 years ahead of the Liberal Party of Canada.

I am pleased that my party has approved this Nisga'a treaty and I hope it is the first in a long list that will set the record straight and put a stop to the injustices that have been going on for over 125 years.

[*English*]

Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join in the discussion on the Nisga'a final agreement.

During the debate I have listened to my colleagues in the Reform Party with much dismay. Let me make one thing clear to the people of Etobicoke and all Canadians. The Nisga'a agreement is not a race based policy of the government as charged by my colleagues in the Reform Party. It is an agreement that speaks to the principles of fairness, equity and respect.

The Nisga'a people have spent over 100 years bringing their claim to the attention of governments and their neighbours. They participated in complex and significant negotiations and they are at this point in time in need of our support.

In British Columbia where very few treaties were negotiated at the time of settlement, approximately 50 other first nations are in the process of negotiating land claim settlements and self-government arrangements with the federal and provincial governments.

We hear other members who are from that region speak of those arrangements.

From talking with my constituents I know that the Canadian public in general is supportive of addressing the longstanding grievances of aboriginal people. However, I also know that some have not yet come to terms with the fact that imposed solutions are not good solutions.

The very nature of negotiation means that no one party can have everything it wants. The ultimate goal of negotiations is to come up with solutions that balance all potential issues. At the end of the day this means that certain parts of the agreement will be easily supported by certain sectors of society, while some groups will be more satisfied with other parts of the agreement. This is life and this is what happens in just about every area.

To satisfy my constituents who are deeply interested in the agreement, I had to do my homework. I discovered that throughout the process of the Nisga'a negotiations government representatives consulted with the public, with third parties, with neighbouring communities, keeping them informed through briefings and information sessions. Approximately 500 consultations and public information meetings were held during the Nisga'a treaty negotiations.

● (1700)

In addition, a provincial select standing committee on the agreement in principle held hearings in dozens of communities around the province. All of this is well documented.

Much of the advice from these consultations has found its way into the final agreement. In fact the final agreement contains many provisions that directly reflect the concerns expressed during these consultation meetings. We are encouraged to hold consultation meetings. We are encouraged to hear from everyone in the community, everyone who has an interest in some way, and that has been done.

Those consulted indicated that they wanted the treaty to represent a final settlement with the Nisga'a people. The treaty contains provisions ensuring that the treaty is final. Those consulted told us that they wanted conservation to be a priority in the areas of fisheries and wildlife. The Nisga'a treaty contains provisions to ensure that federal and provincial ministers retain their overall authority to manage fish and wildlife with conservation as a top priority. The treaty also provides harvesting entitlements that give all citizens a share of the resources.

Canadians told us that they did not want treaty lands to be separate from the rest of Canada. The Nisga'a treaty contains provision to ensure that the Nisga'a lands may be registered in the British Columbia land title settlement or land title system. It also contains provisions to ensure that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the criminal code and all other federal and provincial laws continue to apply on Nisga'a lands to protect all Canadians, Nisga'a and others. This is important for my constituents, this notion of fairness, this notion of partnership with Canada, this notion of being a part of the entire system.

Those consulted told us that they wanted all citizens to be subject to the same taxation regimes. As part of this agreement the Nisga'a will pay taxes in the same way that all other British Columbians do after a transition period of eight years for sales tax and twelve years for income taxes.

The final agreement reflects years of negotiation and the give and the take on the part of all parties. I think my colleague from the New Democratic Party spoke quite eloquently about this give and take on the part of all. They negotiated throughout a wide range of views. Their goals were to act fairly, were to act justly, were to balance the range of interest expressed by people who were consulted and we see that this was done.

There were issues that arose in a discussion that I had with constituents when they talked about overlapping claims. What happens with one group of first nations people who are involved in negotiations and who have primary responsibility for resolving issues arising from overlapping claims with other first nations people? That too is consistent with recommendations that have been made.

There is a report of the tripartite British Columbia claims task force that made some recommendations in this regard. One of the things that was said was that first nations resolve issues related to overlapping traditional territories among themselves, that they resolve that among themselves.

Canada has always adopted this approach in its comprehensive claims policy. However, Canada also recognizes that it is not always possible to resolve long standing disputes. But we know that somehow this has to be worked out in a fair way in dealing with overlaps, that progress in addressing the claims of aboriginal people in this country could be very limited unless we allow them to negotiate among themselves.

For this reason Canada is prepared to proceed with treaties in the absence of overlap agreements provided that there are two conditions which must be met.

● (1705)

It is important to set out those two conditions. First, Canada must assure itself that best efforts have been made by the first nations involved to resolve the overlapping issues among themselves. Second, Canada must assure itself that the treaty appropriately provides protection from infringement of any aboriginal rights other first nations may have in the territory covered by the agreement or the treaty rights which they may acquire.

This treaty has been a long time in coming. The Nisga'a people have chosen a peaceful and lawful path to reach their objectives. It

may not have been the easiest or the fastest path but all members in the House should applaud the Nisga'a for choosing it as the best way to maintain strong and respectful relationships with other Canadians.

Now is the time to take action. Now is the time to open the doors so that the Nisga'a first nations can have their proper agreement. Now is the time to put a Canadian framework in place. It is not a Utopian solution that fulfils the needs and dreams of all Canadians. It would be ridiculous to expect any agreement to provide that result. It is, however, a practical and fair agreement that takes into account the broad spectrum of interests and sets out detailed provisions to allow people to live together in the best way that they can. The parties have carefully negotiated, they have agreed on the terms of this treaty, it is time to get on with it.

Let us vote tomorrow to do what is fair, to do what is just for the Nisga'a people.

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to stand on behalf of Selkirk—Interlake and speak on Bill C-9, better known as the Nisga'a treaty, the Nisga'a final agreement act.

There has not been a great deal of information distributed in my riding by the government to inform people about what is actually in the Nisga'a treaty from the government's point of view. This should have been done in a proactive way so that we could have understood. As well, the government has distributed its information to selected entities in British Columbia and I am not sure where else.

I would like to touch for just a moment on the fact that Bill C-9 is a treaty for the Nisga'a people in northwest British Columbia. It has been passed by the British Columbia legislature which used closure in effect to stifle debate in that legislature. There was a referendum in the Nisga'a treaty lands and the people there had a say on it. However, this right of referendum was not extended to the people of British Columbia.

We see in the House also that closure is being used to stop debate in the House where we are attempting to look at all the facts, at all the sections of the treaty and to expose to the government and to the Canadian people parts of the treaty that are not as perfect or as good as they could be. What I am talking about is certainly the role of an opposition member.

The Nisga'a people never received a treaty from the British crown at the time of European colonization. From the late 19th century to the mid-20th century the issue remained on the back burner without resolution. Successive federal governments refused to negotiate or even acknowledge the need for a treaty relationship. To a certain extent we have the Liberals in particular, and the Progressive Conservatives also as johnny-come-latelies recognizing that in fact they have been one of the biggest problems to the aboriginal people of Canada.

In 1996 an agreement in principle was reached between the three parties after some seven years of closed door negotiations. The final agreement was drafted over the next two years and was initialled in August, 1998. Although the Nisga'a people had a referendum on the final agreement, the federal and B.C. governments, as I said earlier, have refused to allow a referendum to consult the people in British Columbia who live outside the Nisga'a reserve and in fact all Canadians through the idea of giving them information so that they could reach some conclusion on their own.

● (1710)

On May 4, prior to the agreement even being introduced in parliament, the three parties concerned signed the final agreement. Then it was presented to parliament. It would seem that perhaps the Canadian people should have had their say first before presenting this bill to parliament for debate and before the final signing was done.

I would like to say that I believe and acknowledge that treaty agreements should be signed and that the treaties signed in the past have to be honoured. In Manitoba full entitlement is being given in lands and money where the original compensation was deemed to be inadequate or was contrary to the treaties that were signed.

This agreement contains both sections that are good and sections that leave some doubt as to whether or not they really serve the needs of Canadians and the Nisga'a people themselves. We have a case of both good and bad in this treaty.

I have a question for the Progressive Conservatives, the NDP and the Bloc. What is their role in this parliament in dealing with legislation put forward by a government? The role of an opposition member of parliament, whether in the official opposition or just another opposition party, is to critically look at legislation the government brings forward and not just to rubber stamp it saying, ''Yes, that must be good. The government brought it forward and it has been working at it a long time''. In fact, it should closely question and monitor what is actually happening.

Ultimately an opposition party may vote in favour of the legislation, but to stand here day after day, as the NDP, the Progressive Conservatives and the Bloc members have, and to simply applaud the Liberal government just does not cut it for an opposition member. It is not doing the job we were sent here to do. As a result—

Mr. Peter Stoffer: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I beg to contradict the hon. member from Selkirk. We do not just applaud the Liberals on every piece of legislation they have.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Nice try, but that sounds like debate to me. The hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake.

Mr. Howard Hilstrom: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the duty of opposition members in the House is to question closely, to hold the feet of the government to the fire, so to speak, and say ''You prove to Canadians that in fact what you are saying is factual, that in fact you have had full disclosure, that in fact you have given all Canadians a full opportunity to understand something that affects them as fully as it does when the country signs an agreement with a people who were sovereign at one time in the British Columbia area''.

The extent of the government information sharing has been a website which is becoming more accessible. Certainly in my riding it is more accessible all the time. However it is still not sufficient to make sure that people are informed. Many people, in particular middle age and older, are not too familiar with computers and as a result do not have the information. They still have to live with the agreement that is signed and their children, on whose behalf they are making decisions, also have to live with it.

It is the duty of the opposition parties to clearly identify the good and bad as I have stated.

To simply stand here and say that they are not doing their job, while it may be the truth, is not sufficient either. The question is whether the other opposition parties are worried that the bill may not go through, even though they would like to see it go through. However, we have repeatedly seen in the House that the Liberal government can quite quickly have its members vote the way it wants and pass the legislation that it wants.

● (1715)

In speaking to why we in the Reform Party want to question the Liberals closely on this, let us look at a couple of facts that have already been demonstrated. The first one that concerns me, and should concern all Canadians, is that in a couple of sections, Nisga'a law, when it is passed by the Nisga'a people, will supersede Canadian law where the two are in conflict. That strikes at the very heart of the supremacy of parliament.

The second obvious thing I find right off the bat is that the land, which has been negotiated on behalf of the Nisga'a people, has overlapping land claims from neighbouring aboriginal peoples who also have a legitimate claim on the land. It would seem that after it is signed, put into law and put into the lands registry office in B.C., it will be too late to have another negotiation later to sort out just what will happen to those Indian people who also deserve a share of the land. It is their land as much as it is Nisga'a land.

Why would we want to create this kind of dissension for our children, our children's children and our children's children after that? That is exactly what is happening.

The other thing that really bothers me is that aboriginal women, who I have spent a lot of time with over the last two years and have spoken on behalf of with regard to their rights under the Indian reservation system in the Indian Act, are not being specifically addressed here, particularly in the area of matrimonial rights.

I conclude by saying that the government has failed to fully inform Canadians and give all Canadians a say in this treaty.

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at last I get to speak on the Nisga'a treaty.

I would like to begin by picking up on something the former speaker, the member for Selkirk—Interlake, said when he pointed out that it was the duty of the opposition to oppose. I noticed that throughout this debate there have been representatives of the Nisga'a people in the gallery. I would like to say to them that the member for Selkirk—Interlake is very correct. Something goes absolutely wrong in parliament when there is no opposition. This place becomes a dangerous place when everyone is on side, Mr. Speaker. I do believe that the Reform Party, which seems to be the sole party that is opposing this legislation, is doing its duty, and quite properly so.

Having said that, I would like to look at some of the arguments the Reform Party has put forward. I have to say that I do find some of the arguments wanting. I would like to just strip away some of the rhetoric of those arguments which seem to fall into three categories.

The first argument is that the Nisga'a treaty is wrong because it transgresses the constitution in some way.

The second argument is that there is great uncertainty about how the laws will be applied by the Nisga'a; those laws that are given to the Nisga'a people as a result of the treaty.

Finally, Madam Speaker, one of the other major concerns expressed by the opposition was that somehow the citizenship that would be applied to the Nisga'a lands is a race-based citizenship.

Firstly, Madam Speaker, on the constitutional question, I followed the debate very, very closely. Quite frankly, there is no substance to the fear that the constitution of Canada is being somehow circumvented through the back door. The reality is that there is nothing in this legislation and in the treaty that does not fully empower this parliament to devolve certain privileges in law to the Nisga'a people. It is no different than when the constitution or the Parliament of Canada gives certain privileges in law to a province, to a municipality or anything like that. I just did not find any substance in the constitutional issue at all.

● (1720)

However, the second problem, the problem that pertains to how the Nisga'a people will manage those laws. Well, there is always

fear and this is where the debate from the Reform Party has had substance, because it is correct to look at what powers the Nisga'a people are going to have and to wonder whether the Nisga'a people are going to apply those powers in a just and equitable manner.

There is some reason for concern in B.C. on this very issue right as we speak, because not long ago the Musqueam Band in Vancouver acquired from the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs the right to manage its properties that were on the reserve. It had a number of rental properties that came up for lease renewal involving some 71 non-native families. This has led to a very unfortunate confrontation between the Musqueam leadership and the tenants on this property.

I have to tell you, Madam Speaker, that I went out there to try to arbitrate and bring the two sides together. It seemed to me that if both sides could sit down and work out their differences in good faith, the situation could be resolved. But, Madam Speaker, I failed in my mission, and as a result I wrote a letter to the minister just summarizing the results of my mission to the Musqueam, shall we say.

I would like to read a few passages, Madam Speaker. I will not take too much time on it. If you are patient, you will see how it does relate to the Nisga'a peoples' agreement. Anyway, I met with the Musqueam Band and its tenants on September 30-October 1. In writing to the minister, I said:

> I met with representatives of the tenants first. Given the acrimony of the current situation, they said they would like nothing better than to leave the reserve but, naturally, want some kind of compensation for the money they have invested in their homes. In some cases that money may have been considerable.
>
> The next day I met with the chief, the band lawyer, and a handful of the band council. The discussion was dominated by the chief, the lawyer and one councillor whom I will refer to as the band leadership. They were adamant that the tenants should either pay up or get out.
>
> In my presentation I stressed that in my opinion while the tenants had long enjoyed an unreasonably low rents and probably did not have any legal basis for compensation, it was in the band's material interest to be conciliatory and offer the tenants something in exchange for the good will that would be engendered. I emphasized that if the tenants are evicted summarily, this could compromise the band's ability to attract new tenants and other investors. The leadership rejected this proposition outright, although I do not know what impression I made on those councillors who did not speak.
>
> Clearly under the influence of their lawyer, who has no other client than the band, the leadership is convinced that the tenant properties are worth the rents decreed by the courts ($22,000 average plus taxes of about $5,000). The leadership contends that it has the full support of the band community in insisting on these rents. I suggested that notwithstanding the court decision, rental properties are only worth what people are willing to pay. This idea was rejected.

I am quite convinced that because of the failure between these two groups to come to terms, and because there is a lawyer involved who is preventing people of goodwill from speaking one on one, that not only will the tenants lose but I believe the band will lose. I believe the band will lose heavily because I think it will have terrible problems getting any kind of income on those properties. Nevertheless, it has become a political issue within the band.

As a matter of fact, the chief said to me that he does not like politicians, and yet he appears to me to be playing politics himself.

Finally, I have one other paragraph. I said to the minister:

> If the band is to learn a hard lesson by its unyielding attitude, then it must do so. Self-government by any community means that the community must bear the consequences of the decisions of its elected leaders. Enough advice has been offered the leadership. In the end the decision is theirs.

What does that have to do with the Reform Party's concern about the Nisga'a? It is simply that when we give people independence, when we give people the right to make their own choices about their future, we also give them the right to make mistakes, and that is democracy.

● (1725)

How many times has the Reform Party—and it really only has been the Reform Party-raised concerns, and very legitimate concerns, about what the Nisga'a will do when they get this right to manage their own affairs. Will they always make the right decision? No, Madam Speaker. They may make many mistakes, just as the provincial government makes many mistakes, just as my own municipality and the city of Hamilton often has made mistakes that are quite contrary to the interests of the people in the region.

So, too, the Nisga'a must be allowed to make their mistakes because, Madam Speaker, that is democracy. When it really comes down to it, what is sovereignty but the ability to make our own mistakes and be responsible for it. So, I say that what we see is democracy in action. Actually, I would hope that the Nisga'a will be tremendously successful, more successful, because if they leave the lawyers alone and if they negotiate and talk with other Canadians, with the spirit of goodwill, their own conscience and their own good judgment, I am sure that the Nisga'a nation will be a wonderful success.

The final question is the race-based citizenship. I want to draw your attention, Madam Speaker, to the fact that what we are really talking about here is not race-based citizenship, what we are talking about is territory. We are talking about territory in the same sense that we talk about Quebec as a territory. I noted that during the debate often the Bloc Quebecois supported the Nisga'a in their aspirations because the Bloc Quebecois saw resonance with the situation with the Quebecois, who wish of course to have a sense of preservation of their identity.

What is it that the Quebecois or the Nisga'a are preserving? Are they trying to preserve the race? I think not in the case of the Quebecois. They would never that they want a province to be based only on the white race. Are they trying to preserve francophones? No, because there are allophones and anglophones in Quebec. Are

they trying to preserve the French language? No, not just the French language because there are people who speak other languages, many other languages in Quebec.

What I suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that they are trying to preserve in the territory of Quebec, and I suggest to you this is the same situation with the Nisga'a people, is they are trying to preserve a culture, a heritage. They do not want that heritage to be lost. When I read the Nisga'a treaty and the legislation, I noticed that the Nisga'a have provided for the fact that ultimately—and maybe it will become that way—anyone could become a Nisga'a. The key thing is to preserve a tradition, a tradition that goes back hundreds of years and goes back before Quebec.

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Madam Speaker, on the surface, the Nisga'a treaty may appear to many Canadians to be an issue that only affects a relatively remote and isolated region of northwest British Columbia.

However, I believe that Canadians are beginning to see that this treaty will have implications for the entire country that will extend beyond northwestern B.C. and well into the next century.

There has been much attention attributed to this treaty, although the official opposition believes that there still has not been enough debate on the issue. Today I intend to focus on a few key aspects of the Nisga'a treaty, and specifically I want to focus on the following questions.

What is the Liberal vision for Canada? What vision are the Liberals offering all Canadians, both aboriginal and non-aboriginal? Where will this vision take us? Will this Liberal vision actually lead to the building of a stronger, more united Canada or will it lead to the fragmenting and polarization of individuals and groups? How does the treaty and others that will flow from it fit within a Canadian cultural reality that is becoming only increasingly diverse rather than singular?

Let us briefly consider some of the key components of the treaty. First, it establishes a Nisga'a government in northwest B.C. with title to 2,000 square kilometres of land plus management rights over another 10,000 square kilometres. It provides that government with $190 million in cash and gives it paramount power in 14 areas, along with shared jurisdiction in another 16.

It requires the Nisga'a to pay income tax in 12 years time but grants them preferential access to the local fishery and exempts them from paying certain other taxes and licence fees in perpetuity.

● (1730)

What is perhaps most alarming is that the Nisga'a treaty is a template. It is a model for more than 50 treaties to come in B.C. There is no way to know precisely how much these treaties will cost but a 1999 study by R.M. Richardson and Associates estimates that the total cost could be as high as $40 billion.

There is little doubt that the creation of more than 50 entrenched ethnic government enclaves in B.C. will usher in a period of tremendous uncertainty in economic development. The cost of settling these claims within the parameters set by the Nisga'a agreement will be staggering.

The Public Accounts of Canada estimated the total known costs of land claims in Canada to be about $200 billion. In addition the public accounts document included the statement: ''The government is aware of an additional 2,000 potential land claims currently being researched by first nations. A reliable estimate of these potential land claims cannot be made at this time''.

Incredibly the Liberals are pursuing this and other treaty making without giving Canadians, especially British Columbians, a fair voice. They have done this without asking what is affordable to the people of Canada. This is hard to believe because it is the Nisga'a and other bands currently negotiating other treaties who will have to live together not only with the people of B.C. but with the rest of Canadian taxpayers as well.

I will now return to a central concern I have with the vision of Canada being offered by the Liberals. Their policy course would be more appropriately referred to as one that is desperately lacking vision.

Fundamentally the Nisga'a debate is about nothing less than the kind of country we want to create for our children and our grandchildren. It is about whether we want to live in a Canada in which the quality of one's citizenship is determined not just by one's race, or whether we want to live in a country where all Canadians have equal rights under the law. It is about whether we are prepared to stand aside and watch the government sow the seeds of perpetual ethnic conflict and division within Canada or whether we are prepared to say no to the failed and bankrupt policies of the past.

Future generations of Canadians, those not yet born and those who are not of voting age, as well as future immigrants to Canada will be asked to assume a huge liability, both fiscal and social, that was never theirs.

It is no exaggeration to state that the Liberal aboriginal policy has completely failed. For one, it does not serve grassroots natives on reserves. Also, the costs of the Liberal solution supported by the Tories, the Bloc and the NDP are completely unaffordable to the people of Canada.

The Nisga'a treaty perpetuates all of the problems inherent in today's reserve system and entrenches them in a modern treaty. The

failed policies of the past centred on the collective ownership of land are continued under the Nisga'a treaty.

We on this side are echoing the concerns of millions of other Canadians who fear these treaties will leave enormous political and economic power concentrated in the hands of the band leadership rather than dispersing it among grassroots Nisga'a by guaranteeing private property rights.

The treaty also grandfathers many special rights for ethnic Nisga'a including a priority commercial fishing allocation on the Nass River and other entitlement programs available to status Indians but unavailable to other Canadians.

While individual Nisga'a will pay income tax after 12 years, the Nisga'a government will be exempt from a range of taxes and fees, including the GST. At the same time, the federal government will be obligated to financially subsidize the Nisga'a government in perpetuity.

The treaty establishes the shocking precedent of denying voting rights on the basis of race. Non-Nisga'a living on Nisga'a lands will have no right to vote in Nisga'a elections even though they will be subject to all Nisga'a laws and regulations.

It is hard to believe that any government in the late 20th century would sign a treaty so grounded in race and special privilege. It is hardly a wonder that British Columbians have been denied the right to vote on this treaty in a referendum.

The impact of Nisga'a does not end at the British Columbia border. Discussions relating to the reinterpretation of treaty 8 in my province of Alberta have already begun. The Nisga'a agreement will be an important precedent for bands seeking to enhance the agreements they made a century ago and which in light of Nisga'a are now modest in comparison.

Although Reform is the only party opposing this treaty in parliament, the debate crosses party lines.

● (1735)

The proponents of the race based approach are the federal Liberals, the Tories and the NDP. They have found it impossible to resist the pressure and inertia generated by the land claims industry in Canada. Even in the face of conflict and division that these policies have so obviously created, they simply do not break with the failed policies of the past.

[*Translation*]

I am surprised and disappointed at the Bloc Quebecois' support for this agreement. I also find it strange that the Bloc Quebecois is opposed to allowing the people of British Columbia to hold a referendum on an agreement that is as important historically and constitutionally as this one.

Their position perplexes me. How can they support a referendum on the sovereignty of Quebec, but be opposed to a referendum on an agreement that will set precedents for other agreements in Canada and even in Quebec, and even jeopardize their own sovereignist agenda?

[*English*]

The opponents of this race based approach recognize that we simply have no choice but to chart a new course. Both Reformers and provincial Liberals in B.C. oppose the Nisga'a treaty. In 1982 former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau stated:

> We do not think that there are different categories of Canadians. We believe that all Canadians should be equal and it would be desirable to attempt to define rights in a way which does not distinguish between ethnic groups.

We agree with this fundamental principle and believe that if we are to ensure future ethnic peace in Canada, parliament must say no to the Nisga'a treaty.

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues as we bring to a conclusion the debate on this very important bill which is long overdue. As I listened to the opposition, it appeared to me that it would not matter how many more days or weeks we debated this bill, I do not think the official opposition could be convinced of the importance and value of passing this legislation. I agree with my minister, with my colleagues on this side of the House and the other parties that this must be done. Bill C-9 must become a law of the land.

My riding is in northern Ontario. Possibly after the minister himself who also represents a northern Ontario riding, I believe my riding has the second greatest number of first nations communities, approximately 25. This does not make me any expert on first nations affairs but it does give me some insight into representing first nations communities with regard to the importance of taking this very important step forward.

In Ontario, as in most provinces, we have treaties with our first nations which provide some framework for negotiating issues of concern in relationships between the federal government, in some cases the provincial government, and our first nations communities. Unfortunately this is not the case in British Columbia for different and valid historical reasons, but that does not mean we cannot find the basis for a treaty today.

As we struggle to interpret treaties of 100 or 150 years ago in today's context, this treaty itself will not be the silver bullet to answer all future problems. Like the treaties in the rest of Canada, it will provide an important framework and foundation upon which to allow our first nations communities to move forward.

I would like to address the allegation being made by the Reform Party that the Nisga'a treaty will form a template for all other agreements in British Columbia. The Nisga'a treaty was not carelessly negotiated and it bears no resemblance to the hodgepodge of poorly conceived and often counterproductive amendments which the Reform Party has put before the House today for our consideration.

The Nisga'a treaty is the result of more than 20 years of intensely adversarial negotiations. The treaty represents a delicate balance of interests and reflects the compromises and trade offs made by all parties through years of these difficult negotiations.

● (1740)

Canadians can be proud of the hardworking individuals who gave their hearts and souls to hammer out the Nisga'a treaty. Negotiators representing the governments of Canada, British Columbia and the Nisga'a Tribal Council deserve enormous praise for their patience and perseverance during the long years of negotiations. Their determination to find a just and lasting solution to the Nisga'a claim has resulted in a landmark settlement that stands as an example of reconciliation and equity.

Much has been learned from this treaty. We have wrestled with some of the most contentious issues surrounding aboriginal self-government and implementation of the inherent right. We have found ways to finally do away with the antiquated Indian Act, replacing its provisions with progressive measures that enable the Nisga'a people to manage their own affairs. Perhaps equally important, we have come to a new understanding of how aboriginal and other governments in Canada can co-exist and bring benefits to all residents living on and adjacent to first nations lands.

This treaty stands as a symbol of how Canadians work things out in a collaborative and honourable manner. It further proves that Canadians can act as peacemakers around the world because they can indeed act as peacemakers at home.

We must acknowledge however that the Nisga'a treaty represents only one step in a much larger process. While this treaty finally and fully addresses the longstanding claims of the Nisga'a first nation, it cannot serve as the standard form to be used in drafting all other treaties.

There has been an assumption on the part of some that the Nisga'a treaty somehow serves as a template for the more than 50 others being negotiated in British Columbia and as a template for other treaty negotiations in Canada. It is important for Canadians to understand that this is simply not possible and for a number of fairly obvious reasons.

First among them is the fact that a one size fits all model could never work. Individual first nations are just that, individual. The James Bay Cree of northern Quebec are as distinct from the Inuit of Nunavut, as they are from the Nisga'a in the Nass Valley. Each first nation has its own unique history, culture and customs, geography, language and political structures.

An equally crucial consideration is location. The issues that must be negotiated in a rural setting are often very different from those in an urban area. Hunting or forestry issues may not be especially relevant to a suburban setting while matters such as ensuring a harmonious relationship with other local governments will deserve greater emphasis.

Most important is the fact that the treaty process revolves around fair negotiation, not unilateral imposition. By their very nature treaties involve give and take. Every fair agreement must strike a reasonable balance between diverse and competing interests in accordance with local circumstances.

Having said that, there is clearly a case to be made for learning from Nisga'a treaty experience. One of the most valuable lessons is that treaties provide a reasonable way to resolve our differences peacefully and productively by working together for the common good.

In British Columbia the absence of treaties has historically resulted in confrontation and lost economic opportunities for aboriginal people and other citizens. This treaty proves that we can resolve those problems through negotiation rather than litigation.

There are also practical reasons to apply lessons learned to the Nisga'a negotiation process. Few people other than the negotiators themselves can fully appreciate the incredibly long hours and years of work that went into drafting the careful, detailed and precise language in this agreement. Much of the time was spent by each of the parties developing their respective positions. From Canada's perspective this entailed extensive third party consultations as well as careful legal and policy analysis. Having gone through this time consuming and costly exercise and having achieved a sound understanding of the issues being addressed, it makes sense for us to build on this knowledge in future negotiations.

● (1745)

There are also advantages to adopting elements from one treaty when they are applicable province-wide. One of the most significant is consistency.

Of particular significance within that framework is the benefit of certainty over land and resource ownership and use, which is critical to providing stability for the business community. This in turn encourages investments that lead to increased job opportunities for all people living in and around the affected areas.

Perhaps the most convincing reason to borrow best practices is that it makes sense. It speeds up the treaty making process. My

hon. colleagues need to appreciate that it can take years to reach a final settlement. This painfully slow process comes at a significant cost for the first nations directly affected and prolongs economic uncertainty within the entire region.

I emphasize that this treaty is not a template, but it will serve as a useful example for other negotiations.

Ratifying the Nisga'a final agreement will enable us to achieve all of the objectives that are good for the country, good for the province and good for the first nation community itself. Bill C-9 is clearly legislation that the House should support and the Nisga'a treaty is clearly the right agreement for the Nisga'a people and for the residents of northwestern British Columbia.

I urge all members, including those in the loyal opposition who might consider changing their minds, to support this legislation.

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.): Madam Speaker, we are debating today report stage of Bill C-9, the Nisga'a land agreement. Last year, after years of closed door debates, talks and consultations, the Nisga'a agreement was signed, but the people of British Columbia had no input, nor were they given any opportunity for input. I think that denial of democracy is one of the main reasons the Reform Party is against the agreement.

My colleague from Wentworth—Burlington gave a very good speech. It was a speech from the heart. It was not one that was simply cranked out in the back rooms and sent over to him to be delivered. This was a speech that he had researched and he spoke from the heart, without notes I noticed. He gave a very good speech.

However, I find it rather ironic that his government has moved closure on this bill every time it has come before the House. If it had not moved closure, other members of his caucus would have been able to speak and we would have been able to debate the question. I naively thought that was how the House should work. It should operate in a manner in which we can have divergent points of view and debate them. We should be able to use our persuasive powers on the government and the government should be able to persuade us that perhaps we are not right and do not have the proper point of view.

In this case I think we have the proper point of view. I refer to the member for Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys. He spoke about the Reform Party being like General Custer. General Custer was massacred. We are not being massacred; we are simply pointing out what is wrong with this agreement. The only possible way that we could compare members of the Reform Party with General Custer is that we stand alone. Reformers are the only ones who have said that this agreement needs to be rejigged or looked at again. We have also said that it needs to go before the people of British Columbia in the form of a referendum. However, the government, taking a page from of its cousins in British Columbia, the B.C. NDP caucus, has decided that no matter what stage this bill comes before the House it will impose closure and ram it through before Christmas. I do not think that is the way things should be done in this place.

• (1750)

Government members on the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development admitted that the only reason they went on the road with the committee was because of pressure brought to bear on them by the Reform Party. I find it appalling that the government would say that it is not in its best interests or it is not one of its priorities to take the standing committee to the people this agreement affects the most, but to do it only because it was embarrassed or forced into it by the official opposition.

Whether we are on that side of the House voting for the bill, in one of the three opposition parties voting for the bill, or in the Reform Party, which intends to vote against the bill, we have to agree that this will have a lot more effect on Canada than simply on the residents of British Columbia. It has a lot more to do with Canada than simply how it will affect the residents of British Columbia. It will affect the people of British Columbia. There is no question about that. However, it will affect everyone else in Canada as well.

We all know that there are at least 50 more of these deals to be negotiated in the province of British Columbia alone, and many more across Canada. I heard from members opposite that they do not think this agreement will be held up as a template for other agreements. I think that anyone who believes that has their head in the sand.

Why is it that every time this comes up we cannot even debate it? The Reform Party carries the debate for the entire day. Occasionally we touch a nerve and a member of one of the other parties will jump up and grace us with some thoughtful and insightful points, as in the case of my colleague from Wentworth—Burlington. Other than that, we have people coming in from that side of the House with predetermined notes which they simply recite. I guess that is allowable in this place, but it is hardly debate. Something that is as groundbreaking as this, something that is as precedent setting as this deserves a lot more debate than we have been giving it. Where are the people? Where are the debaters?

When I go to the schools in my riding I tell them that things are settled in the House of Commons by good, spirited debate, with speeches that are well thought out and well researched. When the students come here they find that is not always the case. They find that the government has a majority. We cannot expect the govern-

ment to be hamstrung by a handful of people who want to completely derail its agenda, but debate should take place and it has not taken place in this case. That is a terrible travesty.

One of the things that we have said we do not like about this deal is that it sets a precedent by which all other agreements will be measured and argued. Therefore, we have to make sure we get this one right. This one above all has to be right. It has to be one that we can live with and that our children's children can live with, one that actually empowers native people and gives them freedom. I do not think, from what I have seen of this bill, that it accomplishes those things.

● (1755)

A couple of summers ago, on one of the Indian reserves in my riding, a group of people had a sit-in in an administration building. Their problem was that they were not being dealt with fairly. They said there was bias in how things were done by their band council. If they were in the in group, they were in; but if they were in the out group, they would never be in. They also said that huge amounts of money were not being accounted for. They wanted to have something done about it.

The member for Wild Rose, I and other members brought those problems to the House. We asked the former minister of Indian affairs if she would cause a forensic audit to be done that would either prove that the people who were making the claims were right or prove that the council had acted properly. The minister said ''No. This is strictly their business. This is entirely up to them''.

There was no recourse for those people at that time. We think that there should be some sort of recourse in here for people who have complaints. My colleague for Wild Rose talked about—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The hon. member for Provencher.

Mr. David Iftody (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join the debate prior to the final votes being taken in the House.

I want to begin with that point and advise Canadians of what we are doing this evening and will probably be doing tomorrow evening. If they tune in again to this well known and famous station, they will notice members of parliament repeatedly getting up and down, again and again, probably for hours on end, voting on 469 amendments proposed by the Reform Party to this treaty.

This is quite interesting in itself, in that it is an unusual, highly irregular practice in the House, what we tend to call the highest court in the land, where 80% of the members will vote for the treaty, but we have an obstructionist group putting forth amendments and pretending to have a legitimate debate. I think it is important to inform the Canadian people about what is happening in the House as we have this discussion.

Having said that, I want to begin by making some primary observations and I would like to go into some discussion about the applications of the charter and the constitutional implications for this particular bill.

It has been said many times that this is an historic treaty which breaks away from the confines, the handcuffs and the shackles, as members of the Reform Party would say, of the Indian Act. That is the same Indian Act that has held first nations people bound to the confines of their reserves and their lands. It is an attempt to break free from that, to move on into the 21st century and to do it with dignity which would be supported by all Canadians.

● (1800)

I found it quite interesting in testimony to hear from our member from Nunavut who talked about her parents not being able to vote until 1960, like Canadian first nations veterans who fought for this country. While living on reserve they nonetheless joined the forces in the second world war and made great contributions to this country. They came back home and were not able to vote. I wonder where those who are opposing the treaty now were to defend them in those important historical moments? They were not there. Their voices were conspicuously silent.

Reform Party members have talked about consultation. We know that we have had a debate in the House. We have had a week long trip in British Columbia. The provincial legislature had the longest debate in recent history in British Columbia, 116 hours of debate. Through an all-party standing committee dealing with these matters, there were 34 meetings.

There were many other meetings conducted even in places like Trinity College in British Columbia, a well known Christian college. I believe Chief Gosnell and others went at their invitation to meet with them and discuss openly with the students and staff what the treaty meant and what they were intending to do.

The Anglican church in British Columbia also invited them, as well as others. Wherever they were asked to go they willingly went to talk about these important features with all Canadians, anyone who was interested in hearing. So we have had consultations.

I want to talk about the constitutional legal framework of this agreement. What is important to understand in the debate with the Reform Party is this. We have heard a lot of this over the past number of months about the protection of women's rights, constitutional third order of government and so on. Let us set out very clearly for the Canadian people the fundamental point of the Reform Party's argument and why it would oppose the legislation.

The fundamental point, Reform Party members argue absolutely wrongly and I think they realize that as well, is that this is a constitutional amendment. In other words, the 14 areas of jurisdiction laid out in that treaty would somehow contravene or spill outside of the constitution or those protections provided in section 35 for existing treaties and new treaties that would be negotiated now, such as this one, and in the 21st century.

They argue that if that is the case this would trigger a referendum both in the House of Commons in Canada under part V of the constitution or those particular provisions in British Columbia where it would trigger a referendum there. This is absolutely not true. This is absolutely false.

The fact of the matter is that there are no powers in that treaty, in that bill that contravene the constitution. There are no new powers. The powers delegated throughout that process in that treaty, those 14 areas, are those that are normally used within the understood provisions of aboriginal self-government for first nations people and they are quite gentle in their application in terms of delivering health services, education, child welfare, to name a few. They are not the kind that are the normal cause of debate in terms of constitutional provisions in this country. These are very everyday kinds of services, such as child welfare, that in fact, quite honestly, through federal-provincial agreements many first nations have been delivering for 20 years.

What do the experts say about this? What do the experts tell the Canadian people about the debate? We have heard from the Liberal Party. The Tories are agreeing with us and the NDP and the Bloc, but the Reform Party is saying no. Let us turn to the experts for a moment and ask them. What did they say in their testimony?

Professor Scott from McGill came under questioning in one of the first rounds of questions from the Liberal side and I had the opportunity to ask him the question. Professor Scott was chosen by the Reform Party as one of the folks it would like to have testify at the committee table. What did he tell us? He said that this is no constitutional amendment. I believed him.

● (1805)

In that same group was Professor Brad Morse, a former vice-dean of the University of Ottawa, and still teaching there, who again reiterated that in his view this was no constitutional amendment. In fact, he went on to discuss the seven years of applications of law where the supreme court of the United States had applied these same kinds of provisions in the U.S. courts recognizing those rights of first nations people and without violating what they call the sacred constitution of the U.S. The same would hold here. This is no violation, no abrogation, no derogation of those provisions that were negotiated in 1982.

We also heard from Professor Hogg and Professor Monahan. Those who are lawyers, either watching this debate, or who might read about it after, or even here in this Chamber, will know that Professor Hogg is the dean of constitutional law in Canada. Any student will know that his written textbook is required reading in first year constitutional studies across Canada. We had him testify before our committee.

I would like to quote from some of his observations, as well as a colleague of his, Professor Monahan, another equally eminent and respected legal scholar who is called upon frequently by the media and others to give his observations on a number of issues affecting Canadians.

Professor Monahan in responding to questions said that ''While I think there are some respectable arguments that can be made,''—I think he was being very generous here—''challenging the agreement on the basis of some older cases''—he is referring to the privy council which was the supreme court at the time—''in the early part of the 20th century, in my view, the better or more persuasive legal conclusion is that the agreement''—the Nisga'a Treaty, Bill C-9—''and the ratifying legislation is valid''—here we go—''and does not constitute an amendment to the Constitution of Canada''.

He also went on to talk about section 35 recognizing both existing treaties and future treaties. That is spelled out very clearly in section 35 of the constitution.

What did Professor Hogg have to say? I am quoting him in his analysis and he said:

> I have very little doubt that the courts will decide that there is an aboriginal right to self-government. So the Nisga'a people have those things now whether or not the treaty is entered into.

I want to conclude by saying that there is no constitutional amendment and, therefore, no referendum. It is clearly within the boundaries of—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Before we resume debate and to make it clear to everybody, debate will go on until 6.27 p.m. Therefore, there are about 15 minutes left.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to finally have an opportunity to debate this bill.

I am disappointed that I have had to wait until debate at report stage for this opportunity on such an important bill which can be construed as constituting a constitutional amendment, according to many of the expert constitutional presenters who appeared before the committee.

According to the official opposition in British Columbia, the Liberal Party there, this treaty constitutes a constitutional amendment. For that reason alone I find it really quite disturbing that the government has rammed the bill through the House with undue

haste, with a fraction of the time taken to consider it at the provincial legislature in British Columbia.

In fact, two weeks ago, as we know, the committee studying the bill travelled through five communities in British Columbia hearing from a hand-picked witness list. Many of the organizations and individuals who applied to appear before the committee to express their concerns were refused the opportunity.

One of those organizations was the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, a large advocacy organization representing some 80,000 Canadians; representing some 20,000 of them in British Columbia.

● (1810)

This organization had prepared a 30-page study, including thoughtful appendices and original research by constitutional and economic experts, and yet it was denied the opportunity to present its views on behalf of its members to the committee.

I will take the opportunity to read part of its submission, which was never heard by the parliamentary committee because of the Liberals' refusal to have a full and complete debate. I will take the opportunity to read some of their analysis into the record.

Before I do so, there has been something of a debate today on whether or not the treaty constitutes a template for future land claims agreements. Indeed, it is not the official opposition in this place who originated that argument, rather it was the then British Columbia premier Glen Clark, one of the principal negotiators of this treaty, who said that it constitutes a template for future lands claims settlements. We are simply taking one of the principal negotiators at his word when he suggests that this treaty will be a template for the future. Obviously it will not be a precise template, but a very important precedent.

I hear my colleagues from the New Democratic Party speaking in caustic tones about the Reform Party's opposition to this treaty, yet they seem to ignore the fact that perhaps the most credible New Democratic attorney general in Canadian history, Alec MacDonald, the former NDP attorney general in British Columbia, has spoken out publicly and vociferously against this agreement. This opposition does, and ought to, cut across partisan lines.

One non-partisan organization that I know something about, the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, was denied a hearing on this treaty. It released a study which called on the minister of aboriginal affairs to read the fine print of the Nisga'a treaty. The Canadian Taxpayers Federation says that the $490 million cost of the Nisga'a settlement for cash, land and resource transfers, is likely understated as it does not include any estimates on mineral, water or fisheries resources to be transferred. It also says that fair party compensation is likely, significantly underestimated.

It goes on to say that ''the $490 million cost quoted by the government does not include taxpayer transfers to the Nisga'a government which will cost taxpayers, according to federal negotiators, a minimum of over $400 million in additional transfers over 15 years for one settlement with one native band. The Nisga'a treaty is not final in a multitude of senses'', according to the CTF. It says that four appendices in its study from constitutional legal expert Mel Smith, a former principal constitutional adviser to three successive B.C. governments, are attached to the review and that they list 49 sections of the treaty where there are explicit requirements to consult or negotiate agreements and a further 22 sections of the agreement where paramountcy is unclear or not stated.

It says there is a ratchet up provision where any favourable tax exemptions granted to other bands over the next 20 years will need to be given to the Nisga'a as well, and that there are 17 instances where the Nisga'a treaty or future Nisga'a laws will prevail over federal or provincial laws in the event of an inconsistency. The Nisga'a government will be anything but municipal as proponents claim.

Municipal governments do not possess power over citizenship, culture, adoption and all levels of education, timber resources and court systems whereas the Nisga'a under this treaty will.

The decision on whether non-Nisga'a will be able to vote in Nisga'a elections is up to the Nisga'a government. Senior levels of government have traded away a core political right, the right of taxpayers to be represented by those who will have the power to tax them in this agreement.

The CTF's B.C. director, Mark Milke, is quoted as saying that the Nisga'a treaty ''is neither fair nor final to taxpayers and it gives powers to one native band similar to powers possessed only by the federal and provincial governments''. He says that ''in addition it trespasses upon the basic political right to vote for those who would set the taxes. Canadians deserve better than a document negotiated by a distrusted B.C. government and rammed through parliament by a federal government afraid of debate''. He says that ''when politicians horse trade core political rights and negotiate open and financial commitments, taxpayers deserve a vote on it''. By that I infer a referendum, which I think something like 80% of British Columbians have expressed a desire for. The CTF's submission goes on to say:

> —the Nisga'a treaty and the B.C. treaty process will involve a substantial reallocation of taxpayer money, Crown-owned resources, and Crown-owned land. Because of federal and British Columbia cost-sharing agreements, every Canadian from St. John's to Victoria will be affected. In addition to the costs to taxpayers, forgone tax revenues (from forestry stumpage for example) will result from land to be transferred. Such land transfers could one day also affect the public treasuries of not only Canada and British Columbia—given the lack of treaties in some provinces and the possible judicial reinterpretation of treaties already signed and thought to be final—but other provinces as well.
>
> Moreover, municipal tax bases within British Columbia may be affected—

● (1815)

It goes on to detail how that is the case. In addition, the Nisga'a treaty in fact removes the long-held political right to taxation with representation, and thus runs counter to the basic principle of liberal democracy. Disenfranchisement for any reason, cultural or in pursuit of justice for past wrongs, can hardly be said to be either responsible or in taxpayers' interest. It goes on to say:

> Moreover, the size and responsiveness of governments to taxpayers is directly related to the powers that such governments possess. The more portfolios that a government possesses, the higher the price tag for such a government is likely to be. . . The Nisga'a government will far more closely resemble provincial and federal governments than municipal governments. That is an important point to remember in the context of taxation, tax transfers, and the disbursements of such tax dollars by the proposed Nisga'a government.

It asked how much the treaty will cost. In 1995 there was $125 million in cash according to government estimates. In 1996 the agreement in principle cost $190 million in cash. At the time, the B.C. government failed to include the value of the crown land and resources transferred in the deal. When pressed, the government reported the land to be worth $107 million. Thus in 1996 government estimates totalled $297 million.

In 1998 leading up to the final agreement, the B.C. government still insisted the cost of the treaty was only $190 million according to press releases. But the opposition Liberals leaked a copy of the treaty, the official estimate jumped to $312 million. When questioned on the breakdown of the costs, Premier Clark admitted it was closer to $382 million. The premier's staff shortly thereafter added items not mentioned by the premier and the cost rose to $459 million. The next day the figure was again revised to $490 million, where it remains.

This does not include any estimate of mineral resources to be transferred, any estimate of water resources to be transferred or any estimate of fisheries resources to be transferred. There are monetary transfers to the Nisga'a of $160 million over five years after implementation of the treaty as well.

The report goes on but unfortunately I have run out of time. A serious concern is being raised by a major taxpayer group about the long term fiscal implications not just of this treaty, but of dozens of other treaties which will be negotiated with this as a template. We should pause because of these concerns rather than rush to the judgment which we see from all four other parties in this place.

On behalf of my constituents I will be voting for these amendments and against the bill.

Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Kitchener—Waterloo, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to take the opportunity to describe how the Nisga'a final agreement deals with private property and land ownership. My comments will be particularly helpful to our Reform Party colleagues. It has become painfully obvious to the rest of us in the House that they have not read the agreement and do not understand it.

Members of the official opposition have suggested that individual Nisga'a citizens will not be able to own private property on Nisga'a land. They also suggested that members of Nisga'a governments will be unable to exert undue influence over Nisga'a citizens because of lack of security over tenure to their homes. This is simply not true. Let me take the opposition through what the final agreement really says.

Through the final agreement the Nisga'a will own their lands in fee simple, the highest estate in land known in law. No longer will the crown hold the Nisga'a land in trust. No longer will the minister of Indian affairs have to approve every use made of their lands. Nisga'a lands will not be lands reserved for Indians. The reserve system and the application of the Indian Act to the Nisga'a will end.

The Nisga'a will own their land and its resources, other than water, submerged lands, and the private properties which were excepted from Nisga'a land. If they choose to do so, the Nisga'a will be able to create private parcels of Nisga'a lands and dispose of them without the consent of either Canada or British Columbia. There is the essence of private property ownership.

● (1820)

As long as the Nisga'a meet the requirements set out in the final agreement, they will also be able to register these parcels in the provincial land registry system. This is something that Nisga'a leaders have indicated they wish to do once they have the legal means to do so, and the political direction from their constituency, the Nisga'a people. The owners of parcels registered in the land title system would realize all the advantages and securities of the system, just as private property landowners enjoy those advantages.

None of this is available to the Nisga'a people under the Indian Act, yet some members opposite would seek to prevent this significant advancement through nonsensical amendments which they have proposed. What is the purpose of this obstructionism? These same members purport to represent the interests of grassroots Indian people. Do they not want private property ownership rights for the Nisga'a people? Do they not want to end the application of the Indian Act and the Indian reserve system for the Nisga'a people?

Maybe the Reform members opposite should take the time to talk to Nisga'a people. The Nisga'a people in a clear and substantial majority strongly supported this agreement and would stand to benefit from being treated like other Canadians for the first time.

What some members opposite have missed is that through this agreement the Nisga'a will finally have responsibility for managing their own land. If their democratically elected government decides to do so, they can create parcels of fee simple land, register them in the land titles system, sell them to anyone they choose and allow them to be mortgaged. None of those opportunities exist

today under the Indian Act. That is but one of the many reasons why the Nisga'a final agreement is such a significant step forward.

The official opposition has suggested that individual Nisga'a will not have private property rights and that Nisga'a governments will own the housing communally. The opposite is true. Appendices C5 and C6 list many hundreds of individual Nisga'a, in fact all the Nisga'a, who now have homes in four villages. Appendix C5 lists those Nisga'a who now have certificates of possession. Appendix C6 lists those Nisga'a whose current band council have allocated housing.

All those names in both appendices will receive the same private property rights to their homes. Those rights will include the right to exclusively possess and use their land, in effect individual ownership of land and improvements. This ownership right can be passed down through their estates and marital property settlements. These rights cannot be expropriated by Nisga'a government.

Therefore, it is not accurate to suggest that the treaty does not provide for individual property rights or that residents will be exposed to arbitrary decisions of Nisga'a government. In fact this agreement provides a new level of security for Nisga'a families and a range of opportunities for economic development of land which are not currently available to the Nisga'a.

The members of the official opposition have their own views of what is best for the Nisga'a people. That is the old way of doing business, to arbitrarily choose for aboriginal people what we think is best for them. The Reform Party is living in the past. This is the past that they claim to condemn but for which in fact they would have future generations condemned to repeat by virtue of a lack of vision and a lack of trust and the strength, spirit and capabilities of the aboriginal people.

The Nisga'a have chosen differently. That is their right. Through peaceful negotiations, patience, dedication and a spirit of co-operation and compromise, all three parties to this agreement have chosen differently. They have chosen to move forward in a responsible positive way that will benefit the Nisga'a people and respect the interests of all other Canadians.

● (1825)

It is time for everyone in the House to uphold this choice for a positive future by rejecting these motions and supporting Bill C-9.

The Reform Party has tabled nearly 500 amendments to the Nisga'a treaty. It is clear that they have no interest in seeing a conclusion to this most important treaty which would allow for self-government of the Nisga'a people. The Reform Party says it wants more time so it can do consultations. Let me remind the Reform Party that the Nisga'a people have been negotiating for 130 years to have the Nisga'a agreement brought to fruition. We see the sons, the grandsons and the great grandsons of the original negotiators that first tried to get justice for their people. One hundred and thirty years is a long time.

It is time for justice to be done. Most members in the House, with the exception of those in the Reform Party, rise to support the final agreement of the Nisga'a people. We will do so with pride. I am very proud to be in the House to partake in this.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): It being 6.27 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier today, the motions are deemed moved, the questions necessary to dispose of the report stage of Bill C-9 are deemed put and the recorded divisions are deemed requested and deferred until Tuesday, December 7, 1999, at the end of the period provided for the consideration of government orders.

[*English*]

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

Motion No. 31

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 2.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 32

That Bill C-9, in Clause 2, be amended by deleting lines 3 to 33 on page 2.

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 33

That Bill C-9, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 5 to 14 on page 2 with the following:

"'Nisga'a Agreement'' means the Agreement reached between the representatives of the Nisga'a people and Her Majesty in right of British Columbia on April 27, 1999 and on behalf of Her Majesty in right of Canada on May 4, 1999 and laid before the House of Commons on October 19, 1999, and as amended by the Parliament of Canada.''

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 34

That Bill C-9, in Clause 2, be amended

(a) by replacing line 7 on page 2 with the following:

''the Nisga'a and Her Majesty in right''

(b) by deleting the word ''Nation'' wherever it occurs within the Bill.

Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 35

That Bill C-9, in Clause 2, be amended

(a) by replacing line 7 on page 2 with the following:

''the Nisga'a Indian Bands and Her majesty in right''

(b) by replacing the word ''Nation'' by the words ''Indian Bands'' wherever it occurs within the Bill.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 36

That Bill C-9, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 12 to 14 on page 2 with the following:

''cludes any amendments which may be made to that Agreement from time to time by the Parliament of Canada and the Legislature of British Columbia.''

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 37

That Bill C-9, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing line 16 on page 2 with the following:

''Parliament and the Acts of the Legislative Assembly''

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 38

That Bill C-9, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing line 18 on page 2 with the following:

''Act and other Acts amending the Agreement and the Nisga'a Final Agreement Act (British Columbia).''

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 39

That Bill C-9, in Clause 2, be amended by deleting lines 34 to 37 on page 2.

Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 40

That Bill C-9, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 36 and 37 on page 2 with the following:

''Agreement.''

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 41

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 37 on page 2 the following new clause:

''2.1 The purpose of this Act is to fulfil the Federal Government's obligations under the Nisga'a Final Agreement.''

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 42

That Bill C-9, in Clause 2, be amended by adding after line 37 on page 2 the following:

''2.1 For greater certainty, it is declared that this Act is enacted without prejudice to the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada, and may, accordingly be amended, repealed, or altered by the Parliament of Canada; but no such Act may take or permit the taking of, or otherwise affect title to or enjoyment of, aboriginal land, in any manner which would not have been lawful had this section not been enacted; this section is inseparable from this Act.''

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 43

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 3.

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 44

That Bill C-9, in Clause 3, be amended by replacing lines 38 to 41 on page 2 with the following:

''3. The Nisga'a Agreement is subordinate to the Constitution of Canada and to the laws and statutes of Canada and British Columbia.''

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 45

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 4.

Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 46

That Bill C-9, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing lines 2 and 3 on page 3 with the following:

''hereby ratified and brought into effect in accordance with its provisions.''

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 47

That Bill C-9, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing line 2 on page 3 with the following:

''approved and''

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 48

That Bill C-9, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing line 2 on page 3 with the following:

''is given effect and declared valid and''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 49

That Bill C-9, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing line 3 on page 3 with the following:

''has the force of law and subject to the Constitution of Canada and to such statutes as the Parliament of Canada and the Legislature of British Columbia may from time to time enact.''

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 50

That Bill C-9, in Clause 4, be amended by deleting lines 4 to 10 on page 3.

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 51

That Bill C-9, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing lines 4 and 5 on page 3 with the following:

''(2) A person or body has the''

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 52

That Bill C-9, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing lines 5 to 10 on page 3 with the following:

''subsection (1), a person has the powers, rights, privileges and benefits conferred on the person by the Nisga'a Final Agreement and shall perform the duties and is subject to the liabilities imposed on the person by that Agreement.''

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 53

That Bill C-9, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing lines 5 to 10 on page 3 with the following:

''subsection (1), the Nisga'a Nation, Nisga'a Villages, Nisga'a Institutions or Nisga'a citizens have the powers, rights, privileges and benefits conferred on the person or body listed by the Nisga'a Final Agreement and shall perform the duties and is subject to the liabilities imposed on the the Nisga'a Nation, Nisga'a Villages, Nisga'a Institutions or Nisga'a citizens by that Agreement.''

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 54

That Bill C-9, in Clause 4, be amended by deleting lines 11 to 14 on page 3.

Motion No. 55

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 5.

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 56

That Bill C-9, in Clause 5, be amended by replacing line 16 on page 3 with the following:

''on all.''

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 57

That Bill C-9, in Clause 5, be amended by replacing line 16 on page 3 with the following:

''on, and can be relied on by, all persons and bodies.''

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 58

That Bill C-9, in Clause 5, be amended by replacing line 16 on page 3 with the following:

''on all persons.''

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 59

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 6.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 60

That Bill C-9, in Clause 6, be amended by replacing lines 17 to 22 on page 3 with the following:

''6. In the event of a conflict between the Nisga'a Final Agreement and the provisions of any federal or provincial law, including this Act, that Agreement prevails to the extent of the conflict.''

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 61

That Bill C-9, in Clause 6, be amended by replacing line 19 on page 3 with the following:

''and the provisions of any present or future federal or provincial''

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 62

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 7.

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 63

That Bill C-9, in Clause 7, be amended by deleting lines 23 to 31 on page 3.

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 64

That Bill C-9, in Clause 7, be amended by replacing lines 23 to 31 on page 3 with the following:

''7. (1) Notwithstanding the common law, the Nisga'a Agreement represents the final settlement of all claims of the Nisga'a nation collectively and individual Nisga'a in British Columbia or Canada. Any rights of the Nisga'a people in Canada or British Columbia, other than as provided in this Agreement, are forever extinguished.''

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 65

That Bill C-9, in Clause 7, be amended by deleting lines 32 to 38 on page 3.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 66

That Bill C-9, in Clause 7, be amended by replacing line 32 on page 3 with the following:

''(2) The aboriginal title''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 67

That Bill C-9, in Clause 7, be amended by deleting lines 39 to 44 on page 3 and lines 1 to 3 on page 4.

Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 68

That Bill C-9, in Clause 7, be amended by replacing lines 40 to 43 on page 3 with the following:

''mon law contained in subsection (1) shall not be construed so as to''

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 69

That Bill C-9, in Clause 7, be amended by replacing lines 41 and 42 on page 3 with the following:

''also contained in paragraph 24 of Chapter 2 of the Nisga'a Final''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 70

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 8.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 71

That Bill C-9, in Clause 8, be amended by replacing lines 7 to 12 on page 4 with the following:

''Chapter of that Lands Agreement.''

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 72

That Bill C-9, in Clause 8, be amended by replacing line 9 on page 4 with the following:

''graphs 1 and 2 of Chapter 3 of that''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 73

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 9.

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 74

That Bill C-9, in Clause 9, be amended

(a) by replacing line 13 on page 4 with the following:

''9. (1) There shall be paid out of the Consoli-''

(b) by adding after line 18 on page 4 the following:

''(2) The Auditor General shall table, for each fiscal year, in the House of Commons an audited report of all sums paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund in accordance with subsection (1).''

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 75

That Bill C-9, in Clause 9, be amended

(a) by replacing line 13 on page 4 with the following:

''9. (1) There shall be paid out of the Consoli-''

(b) by adding after line 18 on page 4 the following:

''(2) For each fiscal year, the Minister of Finance shall table in Parliament a report indicating the sums paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund in accordance with subsection (1).''

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 76

That Bill C-9, in Clause 9, be amended

(a) by replacing line 13 on page 4 with the following:

''9. (1) There shall be paid out of the Consoli-''

(b) by adding after line 18 on page 4 the following:

''(2) The Minister of Finance shall table, for each fiscal year, in the House of Commons a report indicating the sums paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund in accordance with subsection (1).''

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 77

That Bill C-9, in Clause 9, be amended

(a) by replacing line 13 on page 4 with the following:

''9. (1) There shall be paid out of the Consoli-''

(b) by adding after line 18 on page 4 the following:

''(2) For each fiscal year, the Minister of Finance shall table in the House of Commons a report indicating the sums paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund in accordance with subsection (1) and this report shall be deemed referred to the appropriate committee.''

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

Motion No. 78

That Bill C-9, in Clause 9, be amended by replacing lines 16 and 17 on page 4 with the following:

''under Chapter 14 and the Fisheries''

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 79

That Bill C-9, in Clause 9, be amended by replacing lines 16 to 18 on page 4 with the following:

''under the Nisga'a Final Agreement.''

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

Motion No. 80

That Bill C-9, in Clause 9, be amended by replacing lines 17 and 18 on page 4 with the following:

''Loan Repayment Chapter and Chapter 8 of the Nisga'a Final Agreement.''

Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 81

That Bill C-9, in Clause 9, be amended by adding after line 18 on page 4 the following:

''(2) Such sums paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund shall be reviewed by Parliament in accordance with the usual parliamentary financial practice .''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 82

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 10.

Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 83

That Bill C-9, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing line 19 on page 4 with the following:

''10. The Governor in Council may, after consultation by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development with the Nisag'a Nation, make any''

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 84

That Bill C-9, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing lines 19 to 21 on page 4 with the following:

''10. The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development may make any regulations or orders that the Minister considers necessary or advisable for''

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 85

That Bill C-9, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing line 20 on page 4 with the following:

''regulations that the Governor in''

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 86

That Bill C-9, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing line 21 on page 4 with the following:

''Council considers necessary for''

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 87

That Bill C-9, in Clause 10, be amended by adding after line 24 on page 4 the following:

''(2) Such regulations or orders shall be laid before Parliament and referred to the appropriate committee.''

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 88

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 24 on page 4 the following new clause:

''10.1 All negotiated modifications to the Nisga'a Final Agreement shall presented to Parliament for its legislative approval.''

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 89

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 11.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 90

That Bill C-9, in Clause 11, be amended by deleting lines 25 to 27 on page 4.

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 91

That Bill C-9, in Clause 11, be amended by replacing lines 26 and 27 on page 4 with the following:

''Nisga'a Final Agreement.''

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 92

That Bill C-9, in Clause 11, be amended by deleting lines 28 to 30 on page 4.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 93

That Bill C-9, in Clause 11, be amended by deleting lines 31 to 36 on page 4.

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 94

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 12.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 95

That Bill C-9, in Clause 12, be amended by deleting lines 37 and 38 on page 4.

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

Motion No. 96

That Bill C-9, in Clause 12, be amended by deleting lines 39 to 44 on page 4.

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 97

That Bill C-9, in Clause 12, be amended by replacing lines 39 to 42 on page 4 with the following:

''(2) A copy of a Nisga'a law shall be deposited in the public registry of Nisga'a laws and is''

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 98

That Bill C-9, in Clause 12, be amended by replacing lines 41 and 42 on page 4 with the following:

''laws referred to in Chapter 11 of the Nisga'a Final Agreement is''

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 99

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 13.

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

Motion No. 100

That Bill C-9, in Clause 13, be amended by deleting lines 1 to 5 on page 5.

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 101

That Bill C-9, in Clause 13, be amended by deleting lines 6 to 10 on page 5.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 102

That Bill C-9, in Clause 13, be amended by replacing lines 6 to 10 on page 5 with the following:

''(2) Neither the Harvest Agreement nor the Nisga'a Agreement confer any new rights within the meaning of section 25 or 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 103

That Bill C-9, in Clause 13, be amended by replacing lines 9 and 10 on page 5 with the following:

''the meaning of the Constitution Act, 1982.''

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 104

That Bill C-9, in Clause 13, be amended by adding after line 10 on page 5 the following:

''(3) Prior to entering into the Agreement referred to in subsection (1), the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans shall hold public hearings within the Province of British Columbia.''

Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 105

That Bill C-9, in Clause 13, be amended by adding after line 10 on page 5 the following:

''(3) Any agreement to which Her Majesty becomes a partner pursuant to section 13 shall be deemed to be in the interest of the public.''

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 106

That Bill C-9, in Clause 13, be amended by adding after line 10 on page 5 the following:

''(3) Any Agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (1) shall be laid before Parliament and referred to the appropriate committee.''

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 107

That Bill C-9, in Clause 13, be amended by adding after line 10 on page 5 the following:

''(3) An agreement made under section 13 shall terminate five years after the date on which it comes into force or may be terminated earlier by either party giving the other at least three months notice.''

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 108

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 10 on page 5 the following new clause:

''13.1 (1) The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans shall publish any agreement negotiated under section 13 before it is entered into, or give notice of its availability, in the Canada Gazette and in any other manner that the Minister considers appropriate.

(2) Within 60 days after the publication referred to in subsection (1), any person may file with the Minister comments or a notice of objection.

(3) After the end of the sixty day period referred to in subsection (2), the Minister shall publish a report in the Canada Gazette that summarizes how the comments and notices of objections were dealt with.

(4) The Minister may, after publishing the report referred to under subsection 4, enter into an agreement under section 13.

(5) The Minister shall publish the agreement in the Canada Gazette and in any other manner that the Minister considers appropriate.''

Motion No. 109

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 14.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 110

That Bill C-9, in Clause 14, be amended by replacing line 12 on page 5 with the following:

''proved and given effect.''

Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 111

That Bill C-9, in Clause 14, be amended by deleting lines 13 to 16 on page 5.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 112

That Bill C-9, in Clause 14, be amended by replacing lines 15 and 16 on page 5 with the following:

''of law during the period that the Agreement is in force.''

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 113

That Bill C-9, in Clause 14, be amended by deleting lines 17 to 21 on page 5.

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 114

That Bill C-9, in Clause 14, be amended by replacing lines 19 to 21 on page 5 with the following:

''Nation to any benefit available to it under a federal law''

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 115

That Bill C-9, in Clause 14, be amended by replacing line 21 on page 5 with the following:

''under a federal law of general application as any other municipal government or corporation in British Columbia would be entitled to.''

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

Motion No. 116

That Bill C-9, in Clause 14, be amended by deleting lines 28 to 32 on page 5.

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 117

That Bill C-9, in Clause 14, be amended by replacing lines 34 and 35 on page 5 with the following:

''part of the Nisga'a Agreement and neither of them confer any new rights within''

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 118

That Bill C-9, in Clause 14, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 5 with the following:

''not a treaty nor a land claims agreement nor does it confer any new rights within''

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 119

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 15.

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 120

That Bill C-9, in Clause 15, be amended by replacing lines 5 and 6 on page 6 with the following:

''citizens, that law applies in accor-''

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

Motion No. 121

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 16.

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 122

That Bill C-9, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing lines 11 to 17 on page 6 with the following:

''16. Only sections 5 to 14 of the Indian Act apply to the Nisga'a Final Agreement as of the effective date of that Agreement for''

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 123

That Bill C-9, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing lines 11 to 14 on page 6 with the following:

''16. The Indian Act does not apply to the''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 124

That Bill C-9, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing lines 11 and 12 on page 6 with the following:

''16. Subject to Chapter 13 and paragraphs 5 and 6 of the''

Motion No. 125

That Bill C-9, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing lines 12 and 13 on page 6 with the following:

''Chapter and paragraphs 5 and 6 of Chapter 16 of the Nisga'a Final Agree-''

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 126

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 17.

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

Motion No. 127

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 18.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 128

That Bill C-9, in Clause 18, be amended by replacing lines 25 and 26 on page 6 with the following:

''18. Nisga'a laws made under the''

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 129

That Bill C-9, in Clause 18, be amended

(a) by replacing line 25 on page 6 with the following:

''18. (1) For greater certainty, neither Nisga'a''

(b) by adding after line 29 on page 6 the following:

''(2) Clerical errors that occur in the framing or copying of any instrument drawn by an officer or an employee of the Nisga'a government shall not be construed as invalidating that instrument, but when discovered they may be corrected under the authority of the Nisga'a government.''

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 130

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 19.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 131

That Bill C-9, in Clause 19, be amended by replacing line 33 on page 6 with the following:

''exercising jurisdic-''

Motion No. 132

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 20.

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 133

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20, be amended by deleting lines 38 to 43 on page 6 and lines 1 to 5 on page 7.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 134

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing line 40 on page 6 with the following:

''(a) the interpretation of the''

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

Motion No. 135

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing line 42 on page 6 with the following:

''(b) the validity of any''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 136

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing, in the English version, line 8 on page 7 with the following:

''(a) describe the''

Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 137

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20, be amended by deleting lines 10 to 12 on page 7.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 138

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing, in the English version, lines 11 and 12 on page 7 with the following:

''of the matters referred to in subsection (1).''

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 139

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20, be amended by deleting lines 6 to 19 on page 7.

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 140

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing line 17 on page 7 with the following:

''(e) be served at least ten days before''

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 141

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing line 17 on page 7 with the following:

''(e) be served at least nine working days before''

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 142

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing line 17 on page 7 with the following:

''(e) be served at least seven days before''

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 143

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20, be amended by deleting lines 20 to 26 on page 7.

Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 144

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing line 24 on page 7 with the following:

''Lisms Government shall appear and partici-''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 145

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20, be amended by deleting lines 27 to 29 on page 7.

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

Motion No. 146

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing line 29 on page 7 with the following:

''held.''

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 147

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20, be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following:

''(5) When the Attorney General for Canada has been served notice under subsection (1) and has appeared and participated under subsection (3), the Attorney General for Canada shall lay upon the Table of the House of Commons a report of such proceedings and this report shall be referred to the appropriate committee of the House.''

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 148

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20, be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following:

''(5) When the Attorney General for Canada has been served notice under subsection (1) and has appeared and participated under subsection (3), the Attorney General for Canada shall lay before Parliament a report of such proceedings.''

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 149

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 Every year, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development shall table in the House of Commons a report on the state of the Nisga'a Final Agreement.''

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 150

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 Every two years, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development shall table in each House of Parliament a report on the state of the Nisga'a Final Agreement.''

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 151

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 Every seven years, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development shall table in the House of Commons a report on the state of the Nisga'a Final Agreement.''

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 152

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 Every third year, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development shall table in the House of Commons a report on the state of the Nisga'a Final Agreement.''

Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 153

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 Every four years, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development shall table in each House of Parliament a report on the state of the Nisga'a Final Agreement.''

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 154

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 Every fifth year, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development shall table in the House of Commons a report on the state of the Nisga'a Final Agreement.''

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Wanuskewin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 155

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 Every six years, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development shall table in each House of Parliament a report on the state of the Nisga'a Final Agreement.''

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 156

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding before line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 Every eight years, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development shall table in each House of Parliament a report on the state of the Nisga'a Final Agreement.''

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 157

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 Every ninth year, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development shall table in the House of Commons a report on the state of the Nisga'a Final Agreement.''

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 158

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 Every ten years, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development shall table in each House of Parliament a report on the state of the Nisga'a Final Agreement.''

Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 159

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 Every eleventh year, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development shall table in the House of Commons a report on the state of the Nisga'a Final Agreement.''

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 160

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding before line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development shall prepare an annual report with respect to the implementation of this Act.

(2) The Minister shall cause a copy of this report to be laid before each House of Parliament on any of the first fifteen days on which that House is sitting after the Minister has prepared his report.''

Motion No. 161

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of four years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 162

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development shall, within fifteen days after the termination of the fiscal year or, if Parliament is not then in session, within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing session, lay before Parliament a report setting out the activities of the Nisga'a Final Agreement in that fiscal year.''

Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 163

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of one year after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 164

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 165

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

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

Motion No. 166

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of four years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 167

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 168

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Motion No. 169

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of eight years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 170

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of ten years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 171

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of ten years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 172

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of ten years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 173

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 174

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 175

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of eight years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 176

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of ten years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 177

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of six years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 178

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of nine years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 179

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of eight years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 180

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 181

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 182

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 183

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of ten years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 184

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

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

Motion No. 185

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of one year after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 186

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20.1, be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of ten years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 187

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of one year after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 188

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Wanuskewin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 189

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 190

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of four years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 191

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 192

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of four years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within five yeas after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 193

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 194

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of eight years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within one year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.) moved

Motion No. 195

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 196

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of eight years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 197

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20, be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 198

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of nine years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 199

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20, be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within five years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Motion No. 200

That Bill C-9, in Clause 20, be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Motion No. 201

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of nine years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 202

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of nine years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 203

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 204

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Motion No. 205

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of six years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 206

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 207

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of eight years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 208

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 209

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of four years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 210

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of ten years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 211

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of one year after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Motion No. 212

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Motion No. 213

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 214

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of eight years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Motion No. 215

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Motion No. 216

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of one year after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 217

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of one year after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within five years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Motion No. 218

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of one year after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 219

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of one year after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 220

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of one year after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 221

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of one year after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 222

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of ten years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within five years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 223

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of eight years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 224

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of ten years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 225

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of ten years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 226

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of ten years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Motion No. 227

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of four years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Motion No. 228

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of eight years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Motion No. 229

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of eight years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 230

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of eight years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Motion No. 231

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of six years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 232

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within five years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Motion No. 233

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of eight years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within five years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Motion No. 234

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of ten years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Senate.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 235

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 236

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of four years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within five years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 237

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of ten years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 238

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within five years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Motion No. 239

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of nine years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 240

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 241

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of ten years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Motion No. 242

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 243

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 244

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Motion No. 245

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of four years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 246

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause: ''20.1 (1) On the expiration of four years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 247

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within five years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 248

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 249

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Motion No. 250

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Motion No. 251

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 252

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 253

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 254

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of ten years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Motion No. 255

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of ten years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Motion No. 256

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of nine years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 257

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of eight years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 258

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of eight years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 259

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of six years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 260

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of six years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Motion No. 261

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 262

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 263

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Motion No. 264

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 265

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Motion No. 266

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament, as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 267

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament, as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 268

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of nine years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and, shall within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 269

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 270

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within five years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 271

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Motion No. 272

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of four years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 273

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, he provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within five years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 274

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 275

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the Senate as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three year after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the Senate.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 276

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of four years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 277

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, of the Senate, or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established by Parliament for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within five years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to Parliament.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 278

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 7 the following new clause:

''20.1 (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons, as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken, submit a report to the House of Commons.''

Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 279

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 21.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 280

That Bill C-9, in Clause 21, be amended by replacing line 36 on page 7 with the following:

''(e) Nisga'a Government.''

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 281

That Bill C-9, in Clause 21, be amended by deleting lines 37 and 38 on page 7 and lines 1 to 5 on page 8.

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 282

That Bill C-9, in Clause 21, be amended by replacing lines 2 to 5 on page 8 with the following:

''ment''in paragraph (1)(e) means any delegated government authority created pursuant to a land claims settlement.''

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 283

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 22.

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

Motion No. 284

That Bill C-9, in Clause 22, be amended by replacing lines 15 and 16 on page 8 with the following:

''laws made under the''

Motion No. 285

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 23.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 286

That Bill C-9, in Clause 23, be amended by replacing lines 21 to 23 on page 8 with the following:

''means a Nisga'a annual fishing plan, as defined by the Nisga'a''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 287

That Bill C-9, in Clause 23, be amended by deleting lines 35 to 39 on page 8.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 288

That Bill C-9, in Clause 23, be amended by replacing lines 36 and 37 on page 8 with the following:

''ment, made under paragraph 93 of Chapter 8 of the Nisga'a Final''

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 289

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 24.

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

Motion No. 290

That Bill C-9, in Clause 24, be amended by replacing lines 4 to 10 on page 9 with the following:

''(d.2) members of the Nisga'a Government persons on the staff of those members or employees of the Nisga'a Nation, a Nisga'a Village or Nisga'a Institution as defined in the Nisga'a Final Agreement.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 291

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 25.

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

Motion No. 292

That Bill C-9, in Clause 25, be amended by replacing lines 19 to 24 on page 9 with the following:

''Village if it levies and collects a real property tax or a frontage or area tax in respect of Nisga'a Lands as defined in the Nisga'a Final Agreement.''

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 293

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 26.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 294

That Bill C-9, in Clause 26, be amended by deleting lines 36 and 37 on page 9 and lines 1 to 5 on page 10.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 295

That Bill C-9, in Clause 26, be amended by replacing lines 2 to 5 on page 10 with the following:

''ment'' in paragraph (2)(k) means any delegated government authority created pursuant to a land claims settlement.''

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

Motion No. 296

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 27.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 297

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 14 and 20 come into force on September 1, 2005 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 298

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4 and 5 come into force on January 1, 2005 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 299

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 6 and 7 come into force on June 1, 2004 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 300

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 6 to 8 on page 10 with the following:

''27. This Act comes into force six years after the day on which it receives Royal Assent.''

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 301

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 4, 9 and 14 come into force on January 1, 2004 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 302

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Section 13 comes into force on January 1, 2003 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 303

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 9, 10 and 13 come into force on January 1, 2002 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

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

Motion No. 304

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Section 8 comes into force on November 15, 2006 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 305

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 8 on page 10 with the following:

''of the Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 306

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4 and 5 come into force on February 22, 2001 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 307

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4 and 5 come into force on February 6, 2002 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 308

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4 and 5 come into force on February 08, 2003 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 309

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4 and 5 come into force on February 09, 2005 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 310

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4 and 5 come into force on January 5, 2006 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 311

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4 and 5 come into force on February 10, 2006 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.: moved:

Motion No. 312

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4 and 5 come into force on January 6, 2007 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 313

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4 and 5 come into force on January 7, 2008 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 314

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4 and 5 come into force on February 10, 2008 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 315

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4 and 5 come into force on January 8, 2009 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 316

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4 and 5 come into force on February 10, 2009 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 317

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4 and 5 come into force on January 9, 2010 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 318

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4 and 5 come into force on February 10, 2010 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 319

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4 and 5 come into force on February 13, 2022 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 320

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 6 and 7 come into force on April 20, 2002 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 321

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 6 and 7 come into force on April 18, 2003 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 322

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 6 et 7 come into force on April 6, 2004 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 323

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Section 2, 4, 6 and 7 come into force on April 4, 2005 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 324

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 6 and 7 come into force on June 5, 2005 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 325

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 6 and 7 come into force on April 3, 2006 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 326

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 6 and 7 come into force on June 7, 2006 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 327

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 6 and 7 come into force on April 2, 2007 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 328

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 6 and 7 come into force on April 25, 2007 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 329

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 6 and 7 come into force on June 8, 2007 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 330

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 6 and 7 come into force on April 1, 2008 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 331

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 6, and 7 come into force on June 10, 2008 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 332

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 6 and 7 come into force on April 1, 2009 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 333

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 6 and 7 come into force on June 10, 2009 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 334

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 14 and 20 come into force on March 22, 2002 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 335

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 14 and 20 come into force on March 17, 2004 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 336

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 14 et 20 come into force on March 18, 2005 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 337

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Section 2, 4, 14 and 20 come into force on March 19, 2006 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 338

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 14 and 20 come into force on September 3, 2006 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 339

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 14 and 20 come into force on March 20, 2007 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 340

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 14 and 20 come into force on September 5, 2007 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 341

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 14 and 20 come into force on March 21, 2008 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 342

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 14 and 20 come into force on September 7, 2008 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 343

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 14 and 20 come into force on March 20, 2009 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 344

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 14 and 20 come into force on September 8, 2009 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 345

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 14 and 20 come into force on March 20, 2010 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 346

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 2, 4, 14 and 20 come into force on September 8, 2010 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 347

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 4, 9 and 14 come into force on February 22, 2001 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 348

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 4, 9 and 14 come into force on February 2, 2002 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 349

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 4, 9, and 14 come into force on February 05, 2003 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 350

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 4, 9 and 14 come into force on February 07, 2004 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 351

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 4, 9 and 14 come into force on January 5, 2005 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 352

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 4, 9 and 14 come into force on January 6, 2006 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 353

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 4, 9 and 14 come into force on February 9, 2006 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 354

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 4, 9 and 14 come into force on January 9, 2007 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 355

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 4, 9 and 14 come into force on February 10, 2007 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 356

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 4, 9 and 14 come into force on January 10, 2008 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 357

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 4, 9 and 14 come into force on February 11, 2008 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 358

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 4, 9 and 14 come into force on January 11, 2009 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 359

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 4, 9 and 14 come into force on February 20, 2011 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 360

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 9, 10 and 13 come into force on March 21, 2001 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 361

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 9, 10 and 13 come into force on March 5, 2002 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 362

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 9, 10 and 13 come into force on January 2, 2003 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 363

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 9, 10 and 13 come into force on March 07, 2003 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 364

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 9, 10 and 13 come into force on January 3, 2004 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 365

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 9, 10 and 13 come into force on March 08, 2004 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 366

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 9, 10 and 13 come into force on January 5, 2005 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 367

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 9, 10 and 13 come into force on March 9, 2005 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 368

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 9, 10 and 13 come into force on March 10, 2006 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 369

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 9, 10 and 13 come into force on January 6, 2007 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 370

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 9, 10 and 13 come into force on March 12, 2007 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 371

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 9, 10 and 13 come into force on January 6, 2008 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 372

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 9, 10 and 13 come into force on March 12, 2008 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 373

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Sections 9, 10 and 13 come into force on March 20, 2010 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 374

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Section 13 comes into force on February 22, 2001 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 375

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Section 13 comes into force on February 4, 2002 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 376

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Section 13 comes into force on January 6, 2004 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 377

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Section 13 comes into force on February 06, 2004 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 378

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Section 13 comes into force on January 8, 2005 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 379

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Section 13 comes into force on February 09, 2005 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 380

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Section 13 comes into force on January 10, 2006 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 381

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Section 13 comes into force on January 11, 2007 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 382

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Section 13 comes into force on February 10, 2007 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 383

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Section 13 comes into force on January 12, 2008 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 384

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Section 13 comes into force on February 11, 2008 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 385

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Section 13 comes into force on February 12, 2008 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 386

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Section 13 comes into force on February 12, 2009 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 387

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 10 with the following:

''27. Section 13 comes into force on February 11, 2012 and the remaining provisions of this Act come into''

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 388

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on January 1, 2005''

Motion No. 389

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on February 1, 2005''

Motion No. 390

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on March 1, 2005''

Motion No. 391

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on April 1, 2005''

Motion No. 392

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on May 1, 2005''

Motion No. 393

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on June 1, 2005''

Motion No. 394

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on July 1, 2005''

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 395

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on August 1, 2005.''

Motion No. 396

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on September 1, 2005.''

Motion No. 397

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on October 1, 2005.''

Motion No. 398

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on November 1, 2005.''

Motion No. 399

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on December 1, 2005.''

Motion No. 400

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on January 1, 2006.''

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 401

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on February 1, 2006.''

Motion No. 402

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on March 1, 2006.''

Motion No. 403

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on April 1, 2006.''

Motion No. 404

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on May 1, 2006.''

Motion No. 405

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on June 1, 2006.''

Motion No. 406

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on July 1, 2006.''

Motion No. 407

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on August 1, 2006.''

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 408

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on September 1, 2006''

Motion No. 409

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on October 1, 2006''

Motion No. 410

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on November 1, 2006''

Motion No. 411

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on December 1, 2006''

Motion No. 412

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on January 1, 2007''

Motion No. 413

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on February 1, 2007''

Motion No. 414

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on March 1, 2007''

Motion No. 415

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on April 1, 2007''

Motion No. 416

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on May 1, 2007''

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 417

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on June 1, 2007''

Motion No. 418

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on July 1, 2007''

Motion No. 419

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on August 1, 2007''

Motion No. 420

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on September 1, 2007''

Motion No. 421

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on October 1, 2007''

Motion No. 422

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on November 1, 2007''

Motion No. 423

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on December 1, 2007''

Motion No. 424

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on January 1, 2008''

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 425

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on February 1, 2008.''

Motion No. 426

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on March 1, 2008.''

Motion No. 427

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on April 1, 2008.''

Motion No. 428

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on May 1, 2008.''

Motion No. 429

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on June 1, 2008.''

Motion No. 430

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on July 1, 2008.''

Motion No. 431

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on August 1, 2008.''

Motion No. 432

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on September 1, 2008.''

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 433

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on October 1, 2008''

Motion No. 434

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on November 1, 2008''

Motion No. 435

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on December 1, 2008''

Motion No. 436

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on January 1, 2009''

Motion No. 437

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on February 1, 2009''

Motion No. 438

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on March 1, 2009''

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 439

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on April 1, 2009.''

Motion No. 440

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on May 1, 2009.''

Motion No. 441

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on June 1, 2009.''

Motion No. 442

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on July 1, 2009.''

Motion No. 443

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on August 1, 2009.''

Motion No. 444

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on September 1, 2009.''

Motion No. 445

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on October 1, 2009.''

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 446

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on December 1, 2009''

Motion No. 447

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on January 1, 2010''

Motion No. 448

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on February 1, 2010''

Motion No. 449

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on March 1, 2010''

Motion No. 450

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on April 1, 2010''

Motion No. 451

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on May 1, 2010.''

Motion No. 452

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on June 1, 2010.''

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 453

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on July 1, 2010.''

Motion No. 454

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on August 1, 2010.''

Motion No. 455

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on September 1, 2010.''

Motion No. 456

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on October 1, 2010.''

Motion No. 457

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on November 1, 2010.''

Motion No. 458

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on December 1, 2010.''

Motion No. 459

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on January 1, 2011.''

Motion No. 460

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on March 1, 2011.''

Motion No. 461

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on April 1, 2011.''

Motion No. 462

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on May 1, 2011.''

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 463

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on June 1, 2011''

Motion No. 464

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on July 1, 2011''

Motion No. 465

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on August 1, 2011''

Motion No. 466

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on September 1, 2011''

Motion No. 467

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on October 1, 2011''

Motion No. 468

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on November 1, 2011''

Motion No. 469

That Bill C-9, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 10 with the following:

''force on December 1, 2011''

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 470

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 8, on page 10, Sessional Paper No. 8525-362-2, *The Nisga'a Final Agreement and related Appendices*, as Schedule 1.

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 471

That Bill C-9 be amended by adding after line 8, on page 10, Sessional Paper No. 8525-362-3, *The Nisga'a Nation Taxation Agreement*, as Schedule 2.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

GASOLINE PRICING

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, just over a month ago I raised a question in the House about the competition problems in the gasoline industry. I raised it in the context of Statistics Canada saying that energy prices and gasoline prices were ''the major driver of inflation'' in Canada. The inflation rate had just hit 2.6% at that time. This is

significant because the Bank of Canada has an inflation target of between 1% and 3% and when inflation threatens to go higher than 3%, the bank raises the ceiling on its overnight rate and all the banks follow suit and before we know it, interest rates everywhere are going up.

The Bank of Canada mainly looks at increases in the so-called core inflation rate which is the CPI for everything but food and energy. Nevertheless the reason analysts were starting to be concerned last month is because once energy prices go up for a period of time, they start to affect the cost of other goods and services in our economy. Then the core inflation rate goes up, the bank gets worried, it hikes interest rates and we all end up paying higher prices and mortgage rates as well as the higher gas prices and energy costs.

If anything goes up, such as gasoline, another thing goes up is that oil company profits go up. The same week I asked my question, oil refining companies like Suncor and Imperial were posting record profits and the crude price had not even jumped as high as it got a month later.

I asked by question very deliberately about competition problems in the gasoline industry, an issue clearly within the jurisdiction of the federal government and the Minister of Industry.

The minister chose not to hear the question that way for his own reasons. The fact remains that he has done nothing about monopoly pricing in the gasoline retailing industry and now high gas prices are threatening to hike inflation and interest rates which will affect the entire economy.

The minister has done nothing, but others have tried to do something. For example, I led a group of six individuals who asked the Competition Bureau to investigate why prices had gone up after competition was reduced in gasoline retailing in my province of Saskatchewan. I received the bureau's report just last week. It said ''sure there is less competition now''. It said ''sure that can lead to higher prices''. The bureau just did not see that the prices have gone up.

• (1830)

But they did go up. Everyone in Saskatchewan knows they went up. I put out a press release in September 1998, over a year ago, after my office was swamped with phone calls about a four cent a litre gas price increase at the pumps. However, this four cent price hike did not show up in the Competition Bureau's database of prices that it showed me when it tabled its report. So it had to find that there were no competition problems. I am not convinced nor are my constituents.

If Canadians believe there are no problems in gas pricing and that gas prices are lower in Saskatchewan than in seven other jurisdictions, then they can vote Liberal, as I am sure they will, as they did in the Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar byelection where 15% voted Liberal, an amazing increase from the last election.

In any event, the next CPI numbers are due out on December 17. Gas prices remain high and the Minister of Industry remains uninterested in doing anything about them. He is more anxious about hockey than he is in protecting consumers from gas prices. So what else can be done?

Clearly, it is time for a different approach. I am convinced more than ever that we need an energy price review commission to hold oil companies accountable to justify their price increases in this country and to take a more active role in bringing the oil companies to account.

That is why I am moving now to update and table my private member's bill calling for an energy price review commission, which I hope can accomplish those very objectives in the near future.

In the meantime, I wonder if the parliamentary secretary will actually speak to the question I posed last month or whether he will repeat the industry's mantra that there is no problem, it is all in our imagination, just relax and trust the oil companies, and if Canadians believe gas prices are lower than they have ever been, they should vote Liberal, don't worry, be happy.

What is the answer from the parliamentary secretary?

Mr. John Cannis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the question today is just as confusing as it was last week, simply because the hon. member goes from pricing to competition.

Let me point out that the Competition Act contains all the necessary tools to investigate and prosecute offences in the gasoline industry. I can assure the hon. member that where allegations are made to the bureau that companies or individuals have crossed the line of appropriate business behaviour by fixing prices or engaging in anti-competitive conduct, the Competition Bureau will act appropriately.

When the bureau finds evidence supporting allegations made it will actively pursue these matters through the competition enforcement of the Competition Act. For example, criminal charges were laid in September of this year against a refiner and two retailers of gasoline for price maintenance.

Where the bureau's investigation finds that the allegations are not sustained or do not support the conclusion drawn by the complainant, the bureau will discontinue its investigation. It is important to realize that when an investigation is discontinued due to lack of evidence, it does not mean that the act is deficient or requires amendment. It means that there is no sufficient evidence of anti-competitive activity.

I will also point out to the hon. member that the authority to regulate retail gasoline prices falls within the purview of the

provincial government not the federal government. Therefore, the hon. member's suggestion to have the federal government establish an energy price review commission that would have as its mandate to review and regulate gasoline prices, could not be undertaken by the federal government.

If the hon. member, my good friend, wants to achieve this, he should take this case to his colleagues in the Government of Saskatchewan. The hon. member should realize that price regulation usually results in increased costs, higher prices and distorts the normal operations of the markets. Reliance on market forces and not regulations is in the best interest of Canadians.

With respect to hockey, I think Saskatchewan needs a hockey team too.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6.34 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Monday, December 6, 1999

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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://www.parl.gc.ca
