



# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 124

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Wednesday, November 16, 1994**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, November 16, 1994

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

### COMPUTERS FOR SCHOOLS

**Mr. Guy H. Arseneault (Restigouche—Chaleur, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the students of my riding of Restigouche—Chaleur have benefited from a unique partnership of the government and three of North America's multinational software firms.

Organized by Industry Canada the computers for schools program is allocating hundreds of pieces of used government computer equipment to schools all over Canada.

[Translation]

My riding of Restigouche—Chaleur has already received 20 new computers. This is recycling in the 1990s. In addition, the major computer companies allow old computer programs to be transferred in order to benefit students. This is understanding in the 1990s.

[English]

A partnership between the public and private sectors is benefiting New Brunswick students and helping nurture a culture of learning and innovation. I would like to congratulate all those involved.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### LOUIS RIEL

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, 109 years ago today, Louis David Riel, the Métis hero, was hanged, an event that caused turmoil and indignation among French Canadians. A crowd of fifty thousand gathered on the Champ-de-Mars, in Montreal, to hear Honoré Mercier speak his now famous words of tribute.

The prime minister of the day, John A. Macdonald, was careful not to have Riel tried in his native province, where he had led the struggle to have the fundamental rights of Canadian Métis respected.

In order to redress this historic injustice, the Bloc Québécois is today tabling a bill to revoke the conviction of Louis Riel.

Louis Riel was hanged because he was a Métis, because he was a francophone, because he went to the defence of his nation. His execution by hanging is one of the darkest moments in our history. A refusal to acknowledge it is a refusal to understand the present and a refusal to build a future.

\* \* \*

[English]

### BARRIE'S NORTH COLLEGIATE SKI TEAM

**Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in this House today to congratulate the student athletes of Barrie's North Collegiate.

The junior boys Nordic ski team has been awarded the prestigious honour of representing Canada at the 1995 International Schoolsport Federation ski event. They will be travelling to Italy in February to compete with other student athletes from around the world.

It is encouraging that these young people have chosen to channel their energy and pursue athletic endeavours. They are a source of pride to their parents, their classmates, their teachers and their community.

I believe it is important to recognize that the vast majority of our young people are hard working and want to be involved and committed citizens of Canada.

The team is raising \$15,000 for this trip from private sources and I encourage their efforts.

I congratulate the team members: Clayton Parent, Joe Tuck, Matt Goodman, Doug Smith, Chris Hogan, and Jason Van Noortwyk, and their coaches Ann Scully and Cathy Cudmore on receiving this honour. I wish them all the very best in Italy.

\* \* \*

### LOUIS RIEL

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, many Manitobans and Canadians remember Louis Riel today.

*S. O. 31*

This morning in my riding the Manitoba Metis Federation held a ceremony to mark the 109th anniversary of his death, to recognize Metis Week and proclaim November 16 as Louis Riel Day.

[Translation]

On March 10, 1992, in response to a government petition, I applauded the government's gesture of recognizing Louis Riel as the founder of Manitoba and his contribution to Canada. That same day, I requested that we go one step further and recognize him as one of the fathers of Confederation. This is still my position.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### PARTNERS IN EXCELLENCE PROJECT

**Mr. John Cannis (Scarborough Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the co-operation that exists between corporations and high schools in Scarborough.

(1405)

Recently Novopharm, a Scarborough based pharmaceutical firm, announced a partners in excellence project with Sir John A. Macdonald Collegiate Institute. The program will promote the study of science at the high school level.

The company will sponsor science related events such as the junior science olympics. It invites students to participate in a corporate environment. Students will gain hands on experience.

The school will have the opportunity to undertake exciting new and bold initiatives. Together Novopharm and Macdonald Collegiate will be able to offer the highest quality educational opportunities.

I would like to take this opportunity to compliment and congratulate Mr. Leslie Dan of Novopharm and Mr. Glen Tarver, principal of Macdonald Collegiate for their initiative in establishing this program.

\* \* \*

#### DEFICIT BONDS

**Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York—Simcoe, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to put forward a proposal to help the Minister of Finance combat the deficit. This idea evolved from a town hall meeting at the Green Briar Senior Citizen Community Centre in Alliston.

These constituents suggested the issuance of a deficit bond which would enable the government to buy back foreign owned

debt. This would be similar to the war bond concept used during World War II.

These senior citizens expressed their concern for the deficit and the impact it will have on future generations. They have also expressed their willingness to help the government in deficit reduction.

I urge the Minister of Finance to seriously consider this constructive suggestion as a means to curtail the deficit.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### SOCIAL PROGRAM REFORM

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, a study commissioned by the Quebec health and social service council shows that the past four years have been particularly hard economic times for Canadians. Everyone suffered from the recession, but the hardest hit were the disadvantaged who were unable to re-enter the labour force.

Commenting on the social reform and emphasizing the fiscal restraints imposed by governments, Pierre Fortin, an economist, sums up the situation as follows: "There is no need to turn everything upside down on account of a temporary slump. The danger is that a system that our parents and grandparents took 40 years to build will be destroyed".

We must not do away with our social security system at the first sign of trouble. In such circumstances, the role of government must be to help the disadvantaged, not to crush them.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### CANADA PENSION PLAN

**Mr. Cliff Breitkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have just completed a series of town hall meetings in my riding about the desperate state of Canada's social programs.

Constituents were dismayed to learn that in just 15 years current social safety nets plus interest may consume 100 per cent of federal spending. But what upset them most was the fact that they are getting ripped off worse than they thought by the federal government.

They thought they were paying into the Canada pension plan as an investment for their retirement. But because of government mismanagement, the CPP fund is short hundreds of billions of dollars which means that contributions are little more than a payroll tax.

Constituents want to know why the Minister of Human Resources Development did not address the CPP problem in his discussion paper. They wonder why the minister is not moving away from the present debt ridden social welfare state.

[Translation]

### MICHEL BELLEMARE

**Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester, Lib.):** It is, as you can no doubt understand, Mr. Speaker, with great pleasure and pride that I rise in this House to announce that, on Monday, my son Michel, a young lawyer aged 27, was elected to the municipal council of Ottawa—Carleton.

With a population of three quarters of a million, the Regional Municipality of Ottawa—Carleton is made up of 11 local municipalities, including the Municipality of Gloucester, where Michel was elected. I join his wife, Nathalie, as well as our entire family and his team in applauding this great victory.

\* \* \*

[English]

### CANADIAN CULTURE

**Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our culture is our identity. It instils in us a pride and enables us as Canadians to define ourselves and our place in the international community. Our arts, sports, languages, natural parks, heritage sites and multicultural heritage all contribute to the diversity of Canadian culture.

With the globalization of trade and the rapid expansion of information technology Canadian culture will play an integral part in driving our economy. Agencies such as the CBC, the Canada Council, the National Library, our museums and archives support the culture of a smaller population living in a vast area of land.

With growing competition from our American neighbours it is now more important than ever for our government to ensure adequate Canadian content in television programming, radio and books. We must continue to develop policies that make our unique culture accessible to Canadians.

\* \* \*

(1410)

### REGINA RAMS FOOTBALL TEAM

**Mr. Bernie Collins (Souris—Moose Mountain, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring this news to the attention of the House of Commons.

The news is that the Regina Rams, our Canadian junior football league team, has captured their 12th Canadian title by a 52 to 6 victory in Saturday's Canada bowl in Montreal. This is the second straight Canadian junior football league title for the Rams who won their first national crown in 1966.

*S. O. 31*

Special recognition should go to coach Frank McCrystal. He has been a part of nine championships, four as head coach, two as an assistant coach, and three as a player.

This team of energetic young Canadians has been outstanding and hard working all season. The fans in Saskatchewan are very proud. I want to congratulate the team and wish them well in their next season as well.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### FOREIGN POLICY

**Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in its majority report tabled yesterday on Canada's foreign policy review, the Liberal majority shows an incomprehensible mistrust towards the United States, which is still our main trading partner. Instead of noting the continentalization of our economy, the Liberal majority has adopted an unhealthy attitude towards the U.S.

The report is very eloquent in this regard. When dealing with Canada's trade relations with the Asia-Pacific region, it talks about challenges, but on the subject of trade with the United States, it talks about problems. These very different terms reflect the Liberals' mental block towards our southern neighbours. The existential problem of Canada, torn by a double identity, will not be solved through this stubborn refusal to accept the American reality. Obviously, the Liberals have not managed to extricate themselves from the vicious circle in which the Canadian establishment has been caught for decades.

\* \* \*

[English]

### 1995 CANADA WINTER GAMES

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, today is an important day in the Peace River country of Alberta. In 95 days, beginning February 19, 1995, the Canada winter games will be held in Grand Prairie.

I along with the people of the Grand Prairie area would like to take this opportunity to welcome everybody across Canada to the 1995 winter games. I would also like to congratulate all the volunteers for all their hard work and dedication to this national celebration of amateur sport.

Grand Prairie is ready to host the best ever Canada Games and is looking forward to welcoming all Canadians from February 19 to March 4, 1995.

\* \* \*

### POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

**Mr. Jag Bhaduria (Markham—Whitchurch—Stouffville, Ind. Lib.):** While the reduction of the deficit remains one of the

*Oral Questions*

most important objectives of the government, it is imperative that it should not be done at the expense of the education of our young people. Today's student demonstration on the Hill underlines this principle.

More than 900,000 full time post-secondary students could be directly affected by the government's proposal to cut back on transfer payments earmarked for post-secondary education to the provinces. The present level of funding for post-secondary education must be maintained to academically and technically equip young Canadians as they head into the 21st century.

As the red book states, the government has a direct interest in ensuring that our young people have the best possible opportunity to gain the skills and knowledge needed to lead productive and self-sufficient lives. This noble principle must be followed through.

\* \* \*

**LAW OF THE SEA**

**Mr. Derek Wells (South Shore, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, 12 years ago the United Nations law of the sea treaty was adopted. Today that treaty comes into force.

This treaty, which took over 10 years to negotiate, provides Canada with sovereign rights for exploring and exploiting the natural resources of approximately 1,500,000 square kilometres of continental shelf off our Arctic, Pacific and Atlantic coasts. The treaty also gives Canada jurisdiction over the living resources within a 200 mile limit.

Although the treaty is now in force and many of its provisions have been implemented in state practice and accepted as customary international law, over 70 countries including Canada have yet to ratify it.

Over the past year Canada has taken steps beyond this treaty to protect its fish stocks. Perhaps now we should consider playing a leading role in calling for and participating in the widespread ratification of this treaty.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]***SOCIAL PROGRAM REFORM**

**Mr. Raymond Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, six weeks have gone by since the green paper on social reform was published. Canadians are fully involved in the debate.

(1415)

The Department of Human Resources Development has received 12,000 telephone inquiries. One hundred and fourteen thousand copies of the green book, including 33,000 in French, and 210,000 summaries have been distributed. Since late October, 190 members of Parliament have held public consultations in their ridings and 80 national organizations have appeared before the parliamentary committee.

Canadians know that changes are needed. They want to get involved and they want to debate ideas. The government is ready to listen to all Canadians.

\* \* \*

*[English]***POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION**

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the federal Liberals' review of social programs is giving every indication that funding to universities and colleges throughout Canada will be cut and the individual cost to post-secondary students will increase.

Saskatchewan Premier Roy Romanow said of the federal government: "From our point of view the federal government is saying that debt is no good for government but it is okay for students".

Yesterday my colleague from Winnipeg Transcona reminded us that as a nation we are expecting Canada's young people to pay off a national debt not of their making and now it seems we encourage them to accumulate personal debt as well in the process.

If education, knowledge and skills are required to provide the basis for a healthy economy, the role of government must include ways to increase accessibility to the institutions that can make education, knowledge and skills available.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD***[Translation]***POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION**

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, there is a big demonstration today of students who are rightly concerned about the impact of social program reform on the funding of post-secondary education. By cutting transfers to the provinces, the federal government will force a substantial rise in tuition fees and seriously restrict access to university education.

My question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development. Since the students' concerns are well founded and given the extent of the criticism of his reform, does the minister promise today to reconsider his government's intention for financing post-secondary education?

*[English]*

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, in the green book we present several options. One is to continue with the existing status quo, a formula that was put in place by a government of which he was a member which reduced transfer

*Oral Questions*

payments to Quebec alone of a quarter of a billion dollars. He was a member of that government. I know the hon. member is well versed in this matter, and that is one of the options.

Another option we are presenting is a way of finding a formula that would add an additional \$10 billion to the funding of higher education, \$10 billion that would go for funding laboratories and libraries and increased accessibility.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this is a government which definitely intends to cut transfers to the provinces for post-secondary education and thinks that it can hide behind a government which I was proud to quit.

Do the minister, the government and the governing party realize that by cutting federal contributions to the provinces, the reform of social programs will add to students' indebtedness and transfer part of the federal debt problem onto them?

[*English*]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition had so much pride that he did not dare open his mouth or leave a government at the time when the Conservative government cut transfer payments to Quebec by a quarter of a billion dollars. That is how much pride he has. Why did he not speak up then if he is so strong now?

I will simply point out one fundamental fact. There is nothing in our proposal that says we will cut the transfer payments to provinces. The provinces today receive over \$6 billion in transfer payments. Ten years from now they will receive \$6 billion in transfer payments. All this talk about a reduction of \$2.6 billion is pure rubbish.

(1420)

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I had so many reasons to leave that government I did not have time to express them all when I left.

How can the minister claim that the acquisition of knowledge is a primary goal of this government and the main method to encourage economic development when at the same time his reform will block access to university for thousands of Canadians and Quebecers?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the first time I have ever been in a agreement with the hon. chief of the opposition is when he said there were so many reasons to leave the past government. The only question I have in return is why did he leave it so late?

I said in my answer to the previous question that we clearly have stated we will continue the transfer payments based on the formula in place now.

What we want to do, and this is why we are simply putting a proposal out for serious discussion and debate, is to find a formula that will add an additional \$10 billion over the next 10 years, an additional \$10 billion that can be used to provide further access for students who cannot get there now.

There are a quarter million Canadians in today's workforce who want to go back to college and university. We have to find a way of funding them. We have to find a way of improving the spaces, the facilities and the services.

That is the reason we have to find more money for the system and we want to do it on the basis of finding a fair allocation between government, the private sector and the students.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

The minister persists in denying the negative impact of his reform on Canadian students' indebtedness and on accessibility to post-secondary education. By cutting transfer payments to provinces for post-secondary education, his reform will have the effect of at least doubling tuition fees in the very first year, according to the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.

How can the minister continue to claim that access to post-secondary education will not be reduced, considering the unprecedented increase in tuition fees triggered by his reform?

[*English*]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have never made those claims. What I have said in fact is that under the system we have now tuition fees have been rising at a rate of 10 per cent a year.

I want to point out, particularly to the member of the Bloc Québécois, that is not our decision. That is a decision taken by provincial governments. They make decisions on education, not the federal government. It is the federal government that transfers the money. Unfortunately a lot of the money we transfer never ends up in the hands of the universities.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the minister says he has never made such claims, but this is what he wrote in his green book.

How can the minister remain so insensitive to the current problem of students getting into debt? Indeed, by triggering a twofold increase in tuition fees, his reform will result in heavier debt loads, to the point where many will no longer dare to pursue

*Oral Questions*

the goal of a post-secondary education, for fear of incurring an uncontrollable personal debt.

[*English*]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member claims that we have been insensitive to students' concerns.

I would remind him that in this year alone we have allocated over \$700 million for student employment strategy which is providing spaces for thousands upon thousands of students to get work experience. We are signing agreements with business to bring new private sector investment into our colleges and universities. We have increased by 20 per cent the amount of money going for student summer employment. We have provided for a youth service corps which will provide employment post-secondary education.

We have substantially increased today's student loan program. We have doubled the loan limit. Today I announced a series of amendments to that program that would enable and allow students to get access to those funds on much easier terms.

(1425)

We listen to students, respond to them and we want to have debate and dialogue. We do not urge them, as the hon. member has done, to go with barricades and protest when what we really need is a serious debate about something that concerns us all.

\* \* \*

**IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE BOARD**

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the minister of immigration spoke in glowing terms about the quality of his recent appointments to the immigration and refugee board.

However, some of these appointments have been high priced advocates of the employees of the immigration industry, people with a vested interest in high immigration and refugee levels and complicated administrative procedures. Coupled with a patronage based appointment system, this creates the potential for continued and systemic conflict of interest.

What if any guidelines are in place to protect the IRB process from conflict of interest on the part of IRB members?

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, not only does the IRB have guidelines with respect to its own board members but it also has the Immigration Act concerning which the chair of the board has recommended certain action to me and on which I will render a decision this week.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear that the board has guidelines.

I would like to follow this up. We are not concerned just about conflict of interest but also whether these guidelines cover influence peddling.

I have a 1992 memo written for Mr. Schelew and other members of the refugee lawyer's association by Greg James in which sitting IRB members are tracked and rated on the basis of the percentage of refugee claims they have accepted. This is the type of raw material required for influence peddling and both Mr. James and Mr. Schelew are now on the board.

What guidelines, if any, are in place to protect the IRB process from influence peddling by immigration insiders?

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Criminal Code of Canada takes care of influence peddling and if you have any information, you should put it to the right authorities.

**The Speaker:** My colleagues, I would remind you to please address your questions and answers to the Chair.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the minister likes dealing in facts. Here are some facts and a question.

The first fact is the minister appointed an illegal immigrant to the IRB. The second fact is the RCMP is investigating influence peddling in immigration. The third fact is the IRB has dissolved into two warring factions based on whether they were Tory patronage appointments or Liberal patronage appointments.

Will the minister face the fact that the IRB is in an absolute mess and order a judicial inquiry into its conduct?

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, those are not facts. Those are rumours and innuendo. That is what you are dealing in.

**The Speaker:** I would ask the hon. minister to please address his answer to the Chair.

**Mr. Marchi:** Mr. Speaker, if the member has any information that anyone on the IRB is influence peddling, then the onus is on him to provide our relevant officials under the Criminal Code with such information.

Second, with respect to the allegations of the conduct of one individual, a process is in place. The chair has given me a report. The person in question has been asked to respond and he has.

We are weighing both sets of documents and under due process this week a decision will be rendered. Those are the facts. They are open and I am afraid to disillusion the member but we do not deal in innuendo and slurs or any other empty attacks.

*Oral Questions**[Translation]***POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION**

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Human Resources Development insists on trivializing the negative impact his social reform will have on all students in Canada.

He is cutting transfers to the provinces for post-secondary education, while suggesting an option that is likely to increase debt levels among Canadian students.

Does the minister realize that what he is offering Canadian students in his reform package is the prospect of leaving university with an average debt of \$50,000 and having to make monthly payments of \$600 for ten years, to pay back a debt that thanks to the minister will have increased 100 per cent?

(1430)

*[English]*

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member accused me of trivializing. I would say, to counter what the hon. member has said, that he has certainly been guilty of seriously misinforming people about what the facts are, more than once. In fact I would say his entire question was based on a totally false premise.

First, we are not cutting the transfers to the provinces. They are being held at the 1993-94 level of about \$6.1 billion. That continues. That is not a cut. Because the hon. member is one of the great exponents in the House of provincial rights, he should know that increasingly the transfer is through tax revenues to the provinces. They make decisions about tuition. They decide what the increases will be. They decide what the curriculum will be. They decide what the universities will do.

If the hon. member has any criticism about what is happening in universities, it would seem to me he should turn around and talk to his counterparts in the provinces and ask them why they do not spend the federal transfer money, which accounts for 50 per cent of all funding for universities, effectively on behalf of higher education.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the minister knows perfectly well that the presidents of universities and community colleges in Canada intend to double tuition fees very shortly, as a result of the minister's reform package. He cannot deny that.

No government in the past has hit students as hard as the Liberal government intends to do now. There is still time for the government to reverse its decision.

Will the minister make a commitment to the thousands of students standing in front of Parliament that he will withdraw these proposals that would doom students to poverty?

*[English]*

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, unlike the hon. member and his colleagues who have from day one taken a totally negative attitude toward any reform at all, we are saying to the students today, as I offered their leaders in the meeting this morning and as I offered student leaders across the country when I met with them: "Let us come together and look at this problem. Let us reform the situation. Let us examine the facts. Let us get the proper things on the table".

*[Translation]*

Let us see what we can achieve by working together to improve the post-secondary education system.

*[English]*

The fact of the matter is that every person in the country except the hon. member in the Bloc Quebecois knows that change or reform is required.

The more we invite our students, our faculty and our administrators to become part of the process of discussion, the better the reform will be, as opposed to the position taken by the hon. member.

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, last month in the House the Minister for Human Resources Development said he supports a system of broader, wider grants for students to use as a way of replacing federal transfers to provinces for post-secondary education.

Will the government adopt yet another Reform Party proposal, namely the advanced education voucher system which would transfer greater control from bureaucrats to individual students?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is a participant in the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development. That committee is now holding hearings across the country and receiving a wide variety of ideas.

If the member has a particular proposal on behalf of her party, certainly I would welcome looking at it as part of the report of the committee. We have an open, democratic, parliamentary process able to enlist all the good ideas and even get some of the bad ones as well.



*Oral Questions*

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Reform has advocated an advanced education voucher system to shift federal transfers for post-secondary education into the hands of those most concerned about educational requirements, the students themselves. This would make educational institutions more responsive to students' needs.

(1435)

Will the government consider providing Canadians with the choices that such a voucher system would provide?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, when we amended the student loans program last spring we brought into the formula a series of grants available for women to go to graduate programs, a remission of loans program, and the ability of students who have income needs to receive certain assistance.

What we have proposed in the green paper, I want to reiterate, are simply proposals. They are not government policy. We suggest that there could be a combination of loans and grants, in effect a voucher system for individual students that would enable them to tailor their financial requirements according to their needs without the same kinds of complication and means test that now apply to student loans. There could be much easier funding not only for students who are presently in educational institutions but for the many Canadians who are in the workplace now and want to go back to school.

If that is in some way complementary to what the Reform Party is proposing, we would certainly be glad to look at it. However I would suggest the hon. member should introduce those ideas into the committee report because the government will take the report very seriously.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]***COLLÈGE MILITAIRE ROYAL DE SAINT-JEAN**

**Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs unfortunately dismissed the constructive proposal made by the mayor of Saint-Jean.

According to this proposal, which is more than just a moratorium, the Collège de Saint-Jean would be allowed a period of transition, during which it would gradually be turned into a civilian institution. The mayor's proposal has the advantage of reducing the negative impact that an immediate shutdown of military training activities at the college would otherwise have, if the federal government were to proceed as planned.

How can the minister be so reluctant to be more open-minded and flexible about considering the proposal made by the mayor of Saint-Jean, a proposal that would meet the objectives of all parties while providing for a gradual transition?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the mayor's proposal contains some very useful clauses which I looked at a few hours ago, and I will certainly give them some thought.

However, it is wrong to say that the proposal meets the conditions set by the Government of Quebec and the Government of Canada. From the financial point of view, in particular, the mayor's proposal would mean that the federal government would have to spend an additional \$23 million over three years to maintain the moratorium, while at the present time we have a compromise solution reached by the Government of Quebec and the federal government, a solution that ensures the survival of the college, maintains a military presence at the college and provides for the transition from a military college to a co-ed civilian university over the next few years.

The present solution, an agreement signed by the Government of Quebec and the federal government, is a far more successful response to the conditions set by the Government of Quebec and by the federal government. Those who want to—

**The Speaker:** Order. The hon. member for Charlesbourg.

**Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see that the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is thinking about the proposal, which means we can expect the situation to evolve.

As my supplementary, I would like to ask the minister how he and the Minister of National Defence can repeatedly maintain their excuse that closing the Collège militaire de Saint-Jean will mean a savings of \$23 million, when it is public knowledge that the real savings will not be more than \$10 million, and that only a few years from now, because of the reduction in the number of cadets?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is an exaggeration, to put it mildly. For months we have known that by closing the Collège de Saint-Jean, we would achieve very substantial savings, because due to military downsizing, we will no longer need as many cadets as we did before.

We now have an agreement that provides for maintaining the Collège de Saint-Jean with a military and a civilian component. We have a compromise solution. We reached a compromise and have an agreement that was signed by the Government of Quebec, under which the objectives of both parties can be met.

*Oral Questions*

Those who want to break this agreement are the people who will be responsible for the college being closed.

\* \* \*

(1440)

[English]

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

Military police notes from the Shidane Arone murder investigation indicate that the order to abuse Somali prisoners came from senior officers. Now Major Barry Armstrong, a senior medical officer with the unit, has revealed that on April 18, 1993 there was a general order at Belet Huen and he was ordered to destroy evidence, specifically all pictures of Somali patients. Major Armstrong says that some of these pictures still exist.

It has now been a year and a half since these events. Would the minister agree that since there are these continued allegations of cover-up at the highest level these allegations and this evidence should be turned over to a public inquiry?

**Hon. David Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the hon. member and members of the House that an inquiry was established by the previous government. However it was suspended once charges were laid against certain individuals.

The judicial process is currently ongoing, the court martials. There is one to go I believe in January or February. After the judicial process is complete I have said publicly that there will be a resumption of the inquiry. The terms of reference for that inquiry will be broad enough to answer any concern raised by members of the opposition about the individual in question who was a military officer and was involved.

With respect to the actual events surrounding the circumstances in Somalia, as I have said they are subject to judicial proceedings at the moment and, as I have said in the House before, it would be inappropriate for me to comment.

**Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

There is an additional allegation on March 4, 1993. Major Armstrong performed an autopsy on Mr. Ahmed Affrah Aresh, another unarmed Somali civilian who was shot in the back and killed execution style. No charges were ever laid and I am told there is no investigation proceeding on the matter.

Will the minister agree that this should be investigated? Will he also agree that the whole process of military justice in this

case should be submitted to an investigation? We have a corporal alone, sitting in jail, the man who provided the initial evidence for the investigation.

**Hon. David Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on the last point first, the military justice system has been upheld as constitutional by the Supreme Court of Canada.

On the second point with respect to the allegations made in print this morning, there are two police investigations ongoing. If the individual in question has evidence which he has a duty to report as a member of the armed forces, he should make that evidence available to the police authorities undertaking the investigation.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development. Wanting to look like Robin Hood, the Minister of Human Resources Development pretends that his reform will attack the wealthy unemployed so that more can be given to the poor, by taking from households earning over \$60,000 the right to collect unemployment insurance benefits while requiring them to continue to pay premiums.

Does the minister recognize that his proposed reform of unemployment insurance will force 2.6 million households earning over \$60,000 to pay UI premiums without being able to collect benefits?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, again I remind the hon. member that the green paper is simply a series of proposals. There is no program; there is no policy. It is out for discussion. It is out for an important dialogue among Canadians.

When the hon. member speaks about the need to help those who are chronically unemployed, I point out that the whole purpose of the paper is to find ways in which we can get the resources to help those who have been unemployed for long periods of time, to get good literacy programs, to retrain, to help self-employment programs, and to develop a variety of ways to give them a chance to get back to a job. It is a way of trying to turn the safety net into a springboard. It gives an awful lot more opportunity and an awful lot more hope to those who have been unemployed.

That is the purpose of the green paper. It is a purpose that I think the hon. member should endorse.

*Oral Questions*

(1445)

*[Translation]*

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ):** I wish to ask a supplementary question. Does the minister realize that his reform making family income a condition of eligibility for unemployment insurance will penalize mainly women, reducing them to unacceptable financial dependence on their husbands?

*[English]*

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member to look more carefully at the technical paper that was presented. I think it does explain.

First, it points out that under the proposal for a two tier system, 70 per cent of those who receive unemployment insurance would not be affected in any kind of way, but those who receive basic insurance would have the same formula attached. It is only those who are basically using unemployment insurance every year.

This is an important difference. What is really happening and has happened is that 40 per cent of UI users are frequent users. That means it is no longer an insurance program. It has become an income benefit program. Perhaps it is very much needed, perhaps it is very much necessary, but it is no longer based on the fundamental insurance principle. It has become an income benefit program. As the hon. member would know, every income benefit program has some test applied to ensure that those who are very wealthy, those who have a lot of money, do not use the system as it is not supposed to be used.

That is simply the proposal to which we are asking Canadians to respond. I will welcome the hon. member's response to that question.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]***POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION**

**Mr. Martin Cauchon (Outremont, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development. All kinds of false rumours are circulating about social program reform and about the green book which, by the way, is a discussion paper. Some say that the federal government wants to cut up to \$2.3 billion in contributions to post-secondary education. Some even claim that the federal government wants to centralize student loan programs.

Can the Minister of Human Resources Development set the record straight on this?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is certainly true that false rumours are circulating, particularly in publications by the members opposite, about the changes we will make to the post-secondary education system.

First of all, we do not want to cut federal assistance; we want to invest it. As I said earlier, if the status quo was maintained, \$61 billion would be spent on education. But, if the federal proposals are adopted, the combination of transfers, taxes and loans would produce \$70 billion for this period, or an additional \$10 billion for the education fund in Canada.

\* \* \*

*[English]***PRIVATE MEDICAL CLINICS**

**Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the health minister has challenged Alberta private medical clinics to a showdown at high noon. Alberta's health minister has given me the authority to refute these allegations. Where would the minister suggest we have this debate?

**Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious issue. I have expressed my concern on numerous occasions. There is no quick solution as the Reform Party would have us believe.

I have been systematically working over this past year to address some of the very serious issues to ensure that Canadians get the kind of care they need when they need it and that we do not create a system that benefits the healthy and wealthy at the expense of the sick and the average Canadian.

**Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I suggest we have this discussion outside in the lobby today. Too busy? Let's do it on "Newsworld". Not ready? Let us debate this in the minister's office with all her bureaucrats—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

(1450)

**The Speaker:** It is a good thing we left our guns at the door today. The hon. member for Macleod, his question please.

**Mr. Hill (Macleod):** The straightforward question is this: Is this health minister afraid to debate me on the issue of private medical clinics?

**Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have been talking about health in this House for a year. I am certainly not afraid to talk about health to anyone in our country.

I know exactly where the members of the Reform Party are coming from. It is not the policy of this government, nor is it the policy of this minister.

## Oral Questions

[Translation]

## FISHERIES

**Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, at the federal-provincial conference of fisheries ministers held in Victoria on November 1, the government of Quebec formally requested jurisdiction over fisheries management. You will recall that, in 1983, the Liberal government had unilaterally decided to centralize fisheries management in Ottawa.

Can the Minister of Fisheries tell us whether or not he intends to make changes to administrative jurisdictions with regard to Canadian fisheries? And, if so, does he intend to do so along the lines of what Quebec is asking for?

[English]

**Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question. Indeed, several governments in Canada in recent weeks and months have expressed an interest in greater responsibility in the area of the administration of the health of the fisheries.

Among those is the Government of Quebec, which made its position clear at a meeting of federal and provincial ministers in Victoria a few weeks ago. The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador expressed an interest in fisheries management in a proposal it calls joint management. The Government of British Columbia expressed an interest in seeing licensing and allocation boards established in the province of British Columbia.

It is good to see that the new Government of Quebec, and on this I congratulate it sincerely, and I have congratulated the minister who is in tune with his fellow colleagues, understands the need to build efficiencies in this country given our fiscal restraint, to find ways to avoid duplication and overlap and to have better administration of fisheries policies by working together, all 10 provinces and the national government.

[Translation]

**Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I thought I had put my question clearly, but I am not sure that the answer I got was clear.

Here is my question: Does the minister intend to reorganize fisheries management in Canada? Information was leaked to the *Globe and Mail* three weeks ago to the effect that cuts would be made. Quebec has come up with a proposal.

I would like to know if the minister is planning to make changes to fisheries management. If so, will these changes be in keeping with Quebec demands?

[English]

**Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I certainly intend working with my colleague, with others in the House interested in fisheries matters and with all of the provinces to respond very directly to reorganizing the fishery. The bottom line is that we look after the resource for conservation and for enforcement. That means sharing greater roles and responsibilities with all of the provinces, including the province of Quebec. I am quite open and willing to take a look at it.

The member is asking me whether or not the proposal of any one province is going to be accepted in its total form without amendment or without discussion. That is not the nature of federalism. Federalism is based on mutual respect, mutual interest, dialogue and discussion.

I look forward to continued good dialogue and discussion with all of the provinces, including Quebec.

\* \* \*

## ALAN EAGLESON

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in March of this year the House was informed that the RCMP was involved in an ongoing investigation into the activities of Hockey Canada and Mr. Alan Eagleson.

Since then a U.S. grand jury has brought down a 34 point indictment and the Law Society of Upper Canada a 41 point complaint against Mr. Eagleson.

The RCMP in this time has not even contacted the primary source of information to the FBI and the Law Society of Upper Canada, Mr. Russ Conway of Lawrence, Massachusetts.

(1455)

My question is for the Solicitor General. Why has the RCMP not even interviewed Mr. Conway and why is the RCMP not pursuing this investigation with vigour and commitment?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is not customary for a Solicitor General to comment on ongoing investigations. However, I can confirm that the investigation continues. I am sure it will be carried out with the professionalism that we associate with the RCMP.

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the House has been hearing the same answer to that exact question from this Solicitor General and previous Solicitors General since 1992.

There is a concern that the minute U.S. authorities request extradition the RCMP will lay a charge of jaywalking or some

*Oral Questions*

other charge to prevent or preclude the extradition of Mr. Eagleson to face United States authorities.

When American authorities request the extradition of Mr. Eagleson to face charges in the United States for racketeering and embezzlement, will the minister allow those proceedings to have priority over any charges laid by the RCMP subsequent to an extradition request?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member makes an interesting point and it is that the U.S. authorities have not yet sought the extradition of Mr. Eagleson. If and when they do this matter will be for the Minister of Justice to deal with, not the Solicitor General.

\* \* \*

**INGLIS LIMITED**

**Mr. Janko Peric (Cambridge, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry.

Yesterday I was advised by a representative of Inglis Limited that its parent company, Whirlpool Corporation, will be closing its manufacturing facility in my riding of Cambridge.

Given that my riding has had both very good and very bad news in the course of one week, does the minister have any words of advice for those workers at Inglis who will be losing their jobs and of course for my people in Cambridge?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that Inglis has decided to close its facility in Cambridge, Ontario. It is a loss of jobs. It represents a restructuring that is occurring within that corporation as it moves its production to its main plant.

The good news of course is that in the last week or so Toyota Corporation announced that it would be investing \$600 million in a major expansion to its facility in Cambridge, Ontario, creating 1,200 long term jobs in the community.

I think that represents not only a very important endorsement by one of the world's major corporations of Canadian competitiveness but it is also a clear win for Canadian workers in the auto sector who have proven that they can be productive and competitive and that they can make automobiles as good as anyone else in the world.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**IMMIGRATION**

**Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

After pressure was exerted by the Official Opposition, the review of appointments to the IRB has shown that the minister is continuing the same system of patronage as the former govern-

ment. The only difference is that now the open conflict between the various factions is further undermining the board's credibility.

Following the resignation of the executive director and the indefinite suspension of the vice-chairman, when will the minister restore some order to the board?

[English]

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think it would be very unfair to simply take the one person under question this week and draw the conclusion that every one of the IRB members, all 211, are going to be painted by the same brush.

Instead we should recognize that it is an important federal institution. We should be seeking reforms and modifications on how we can build up the institution and not seek to politically exploit the difficulty and tear it down.

It would be unfair to simply say that the appointment process is one that was there years ago.

(1500)

We have gazetted all the appointments, all of them are evaluated under the same standard by the IRB. I think we should continue to seek reforms. We have put some reform proposals before the agency and program review. If the hon. member has additional recommendations we would be more than pleased to entertain them.

\* \* \*

**GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES**

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry will be aware that the government's competition bureau has finished its investigation of the defence department and the way it contracts household moves. The competition bureau has now directed the defence department to open up the bidding process beyond the four big van lines.

Will the minister make public a summary of the report so that parties who want to bid on future projects will know what the new rules are for bidding on household moves?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the director of investigation and research under the Competition Act, as the member indicates, has provided advice to the interdepartmental committee which is responsible for government moves. He has also indicated that from his point of view he is satisfied that letter of advice can be made public.

\* \* \*

**CHINA**

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for Latin America and Africa.

Last week the Prime Minister announced in China his support for the Three Gorges dam and the sale of Candu reactors to China. In view of the strong opposition by this minister and other Liberals to Canadian involvement in Three Gorges, described as an economic, social and environmental disaster, and in view of China's continued nuclear testing and dumping of waste in Tibet, how can the secretary of state justify this massive betrayal of the Liberal government's earlier promises on Three Gorges and Candu reactor sales?

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our Prime Minister was in China and did speak of the Three Gorges dam project with the president of China. China has decided to go ahead with the development of the Three Gorges dam project despite what any of our views were with regard to environmental and human rights issues. We will remain concerned about those issues whether they are in China or anywhere else we are involved.

However, the Chinese government is asking for Canadian co-operation in the development and we hope that in providing our management and technical expertise we can have an influence on those potential negative impacts.

I think it is also important to recognize that the Yangtze River is a very important resource to China and it poses both a threat and an opportunity. The river has caused thousands of deaths but there is great potential in that river for electrical energy formation and the possibility of navigating, allowing ships to get to interior cities, which is important.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### POINT OF ORDER

#### REVIEW OF CANADIAN FOREIGN POLICY

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this point of order follows the tabling in the House yesterday of two documents by one of the co-chairmen of the Special Joint Committee reviewing Canada's foreign policy, the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier.

The first document includes the report of the committee and is signed by the two co-chairmen. The second document includes the dissenting opinions and the appendices to the report. For several reasons, we feel that to include dissenting opinions in a document separate from the report signed by the co-chairmen of the committee goes against the parliamentary rules governing the committee and this House.

First, we want to point out that Standing Order 108.(1)(a) allows committees to report on issues submitted to them. That provision, which is on page 63 of the Standing Orders of the House of Commons, also authorizes committees, and I quote:

#### *Points of Order*

—to print a brief appendix to any report, after the signature of the Chairman, containing such opinions or recommendations, dissenting from the report or supplementary to it, as may be proposed by committee members.

The decision to annex such a statement must be made by way of a motion concurred in by committee members. As confirmed in the minutes of the committee included in the second document tabled yesterday, such a motion was agreed to at the hearing which took place on the evening of November 2, 1994.

(1505)

The text of the motion, which is found on page 102 of the second document, reads as follows: "On motion of Bill Graham, it was agreed,— That the Bloc Québécois, the Reform Party and other members of the Committee, be authorized to append to the report their dissenting or supplementary opinions or recommendations, such opinions or recommendations shall be in the discretion of the dissenting members themselves relevant and proportionate to the length of the report".

Mr. Speaker, we respectfully submit that the documents tabled yesterday do not comply with the terms of Standing Order 108(1)(a), since the dissenting opinions are not presented after the signatures of the joint chairs, which are found at the end of the report in the first document. On the contrary, this statement is in the second document, separate from the first, which contains the report of the committee signed by the joint chairs.

The dissenting opinions are in no case appended to the report as required by Standing Order 108(1)(a) and the motion adopted by the committee on November 2, 1994. Some might be inclined to say that the dissenting opinions follow the joint chairs' signatures in the second document, which is part of the committee's report.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot support such a claim because we think that such a procedure is contrary to the spirit, if not the letter, of Standing Order 108(1)(a). Indeed, what is the point of appending the dissenting opinions of certain members to the committee report, if not to let readers of the report judge the validity of the opinions and recommendations that it contains by comparing them with those of the dissenting members?

The most basic logic requires that these dissenting opinions follow in the same document. At no time should someone be able to refer to this report without immediately having the recommendations of the minority report included therein. That is why Standing Order 108(1)(a) requires appending the dissenting opinions to the report, following the signature of the two joint chairs; otherwise such a statement is quite useless.

Economic or practical reasons cannot be invoked to justify tabling two separate documents in the House, since this was not founded on a committee decision. The committee must adopt a motion consistent with parliamentary rules for the committee

*Points of Order*

report and the statement of dissident opinions to be divided into two documents.

According to citation 552 in *Beauchesne*, every matter is determined in the House of Commons upon a question put by the Speaker on a proposition submitted by a member. Since Standing Order 116 provides that a committee must obey House procedural rules, the committee should, in accordance with parliamentary rules, adopt a motion to publish the dissident report as a separate document, if it decides to do so for economic or practical reasons.

The motion adopted by the committee on November 2, 1994, which authorizes Bloc members on the committee to append their dissident opinions to the report, does not provide in any way for the report to be split into two documents. In fact, the committee minutes reproduced in the second document do not reflect such a decision.

Therefore, it cannot be argued that the committee had full discretion to include dissident opinions in a second document. Again, such a decision should have been the subject of a motion duly adopted by the committee, but the minutes do not contain such a motion.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, we respectfully submit to you that tabling the report and the statement of dissident opinions in two separate documents, as was done yesterday, goes against the rules of parliamentary procedure governing the House of Commons and the committee.

Parliamentary jurisprudence clearly establishes that the Chair is free to rule on a report's admissibility at any time after the report is tabled. Indeed, citation 893 in *Beauchesne*, on page 244, says this: "A committee report may be ruled out of order even though it has been received by the House, and a motion to concur therein cannot then be entertained".

(1510)

On January 28, 1991, the Chair ruled, on page 2824 of *Hansard*, that part of a report previously tabled in the House was inadmissible and even null and void. Therefore, we urge you, Mr. Speaker, to exercise the powers invested in you and rule out of order the reports tabled yesterday in the House by one of the committee joint chairmen, to order that the report of the Special Joint Committee Reviewing Canada's Foreign Policy be reprinted so that the dissident opinions appear after the joint chairmen's signatures within a single document, in accordance with the parliamentary rules governing the House and the committee, and finally to order that the reprinted report be tabled as soon as possible.

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as a co-chairman of the committee which has now been dissolved—still, I feel a responsibility—I would like to explain why the co-chairman from the Senate and myself decided to produce the report in two separate volumes. This was one single

report which was tabled only in this House and the other place, and not two separate reports.

The committee report, dissenting opinions, appendices, position papers, documents and summaries added up to a total of 1,126 pages. This was rather bulky. So, some thinking was required. We sought advice and gave the matter some thought and, finally, decided to publish the report in two volumes, both of which were put in a white folder marked "Committee Report". This is how it was tabled in this House and distributed to the media.

We would have liked the printer to tie them together with something like this to make things easier, but time was short and it would have been too costly. The point is taken, but it is not really fair to say that there are two reports. There is only one report. It was decided to produce the report in two volumes. The first volume is 181 pages long and contains the majority report, while the second volume, with 202 pages, contains the dissenting opinions of the Bloc Québécois and the Reform Party as well as the appendices.

In addition, we have put together in another volume the 250 pages of position papers prepared by experts, experts recognized by the committee that is. A 483-page summary was also made available in loose-leaf format to limit costs. It can be obtained on request. Since it was impossible to tie the volumes with a plastic or paper tape because the printing deadlines were too short, the two volumes that make up the report were distributed yesterday, as I indicated earlier, in a specially designed folder marked "Report of the Special Joint Committee Reviewing Canadian Foreign Policy".

Positions papers and summaries on the other hand are distributed on request. The index of Volume I indicates very clearly that the report has two volumes and lists the contents of Volume II. This is clear proof that the dissenting opinions are part and parcel of the committee report. The Bloc should see in this format nothing more than an effort on the part of both co-chairmen to provide the readers with practical and easy to handle documents.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is clear that none of the parties in this House have tried to do anything to offend members who today, apparently, feel they have been treated unfairly. That was not the case, it was not our purpose, and that is not what happened.

Furthermore, without wishing to get into a debate with hon. members opposite, it is obvious that both volumes are part of one and the same report.

(1515)

Mr. Speaker, as you know, it is perfectly clear from the Standing Orders that if there was only one tabling, of course there was only one report.

*Points of Order**[English]*

Reading from page two of volume one it says: "Volume two contains dissenting opinions, appendices, minutes of proceedings". In other words, Mr. Speaker, when you read the first volume there is reference to the second volume, both of them being part of one report as the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier has described.

On behalf of my colleagues I have offered, and I wish to state this to Mr. Speaker, that in the event there is a reprint or printing of additional copies should members require additional copies for the House, the committee, or indeed for anyone for distribution purposes, I would not object to having both reports joined in one volume, if that is manageable for those who print these kinds of documents.

I would not of course advocate that we destroy the copies that have been printed. As I said previously, nothing wrong was intended and nothing wrong was committed. Therefore there would be no reason to redo the present copies. However, if it would please members across the way I would certainly have no objection should further printings of the report be necessary to join both volumes together.

*[Translation]*

Some say it may be too late. No, it is not too late, although there is nothing wrong with the reports we have here. All I want to say to hon. members opposite is, that if it makes them feel better, if that would satisfy them, we are prepared to co-operate in the event additional copies are needed. It is not too late. There was no malicious intent, and there was no harm done.

Actually, if I am not mistaken, according to informal discussions held yesterday, two of the three parties in this House agreed to keep the report as is.

*[English]*

Finally, in the unlikely event there would still be someone who mistakenly believed these two volumes constituted two reports, the committee chair went out of his way over the weekend to have a special jacket printed. Both volumes are contained inside the one jacket so that no one could possibly even inadvertently consider these two volumes as being two reports.

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, speaking to this point of order I concur with my colleague from the Bloc that this report was not handled or distributed properly.

There are two volumes but there is nothing on the outside of either of the volumes to indicate which is number one and which is number two. You have to look into the contents to find that there is a second volume. Even at that you would have a difficult time knowing whether it was volume one or volume two.

Being concerned about the cost of a complete reprinting of this I would suggest that those copies that have not yet been distributed should be clearly labelled with a stamp or a sticker indicating volume one and that volume two is available with the dissenting reports in it.

It is important to make it very clear to all readers of the report who happen to get volume one that there were two dissenting reports, one by the Bloc Quebecois and one by the Reform Party. If it is not handled properly, the Canadian public and those who receive volume one may never know other options were put on the table.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. Perhaps I may provide some additional clarification. It is clear that the procedure was somewhat less than satisfactory. Considering the size of the report, the committee could have put everything together in a document of about 400 pages, which is common practice, or it could have published a complete report in French and complete English version. That would have been fair to everyone.

It seems to me that the reasons invoked by the government party were entirely unacceptable and the government also failed to prove that the Standing Orders had been observed in this case.

(1520)

I was able to demonstrate, however, that the Standing Orders had been totally ignored, that the report did not meet the requirements of the Standing Orders and that, if the chairman of the committee had wanted to show he was acting in good faith, he could have called a meeting of his committee and put to a vote the requisite proposals for proceeding the way he did.

Consequently, I would ask you to hand down a ruling on the matter as requested earlier.

*[English]*

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think the remarks made by the chief government whip and by the member for Ottawa—Vanier ought to be more than sufficient to put this matter to rest.

They indicate very clearly that while there may be a complaint there is not any basis for a point of order or indeed a question of privilege arising out of the publication of a report in two volumes. I think it is commonplace that reports are published in more than one volume. Here we have a report that with the appendices comes to five volumes as I count them. That is what is available from distribution if members ask.

There is one further technical point I invite Your Honour to consider in reviewing this matter. Standing Order 108(1) which permits dissenting opinions and which was a change in the standing orders made during the last Parliament largely at the behest of members of this party applies only to standing committees.



*Routine Proceedings*

This is the report of a special joint committee. The fact there was a dissenting opinion was thanks to the good graces of the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier and the members of the committee who agreed to apply this rule to the special joint committee because it would not otherwise apply.

The changes to the standing orders were made in respect only of standing committees. It has never been applied beyond that. This was a special benefit, if you like, conferred by the generous hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier and his co-chair of the special joint committee.

I am surprised there would be complaints today when we have very lengthy dissenting opinions. I may say that the dissenting opinions as I see it are almost as long as the report. Here we have a second volume that is thicker than the report itself.

I am not surprised that the report has been divided into two volumes. I think a satisfactory explanation as to why that was done has been given both by the chief government whip in his very able argument and by the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier.

[Translation]

**The Speaker:** I wish to thank the hon. member for Roberval for raising this matter.

[English]

I also thank my hon. friend from Ottawa—Vanier, the government whip and of course the parliamentary secretary, as well as the House leader for the Reform Party. I am sure that you will all agree to give your Speaker some time to review everything that has been put in front of me. If it is deemed necessary I will come back to the House with a decision.

I will review all of the information that has been supplied to me. I will inform myself also of the rules. With your permission I will get back to the House if it is necessary as soon as possible.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, a number of order in council appointments which were made by the government.

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

[Translation]

### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

\* \* \*

[English]

### 40TH COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, to the House a report concerning the 40th Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference which was held in Banff, Alberta, October 4 to 18, 1994.

\* \* \*

(1525)

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS

**Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), your committee has considered the documents entitled: "Draft Amendments to the Criminal Code and the Customs Tariff, Crime Cards and Board Games" and your committee has agreed to report it with three recommendations.

The study was prompted by concerns about the glorification of violence through the format of a board game and trading cards depicting serial killers. Many petitions were received in the House.

The committee studied draft legislation. The committee now recommends a broader scope dealing with the glorification or exploitation of horror, cruelty and violence through expanded obscenity provisions of the Criminal Code as a more inclusive legislative effort. Also suggested were the utilization of a preamble together with appropriate safeguards and special defences.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in a dissenting opinion to the report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, the Bloc Québécois points out that the exploitation of violence cannot fail to be of concern to all of us. There is no doubt that trade cards and board games (black series) fly in the face of our fundamental values and shamefully defile the memory of the battered and murdered victims.

*Routine Proceedings*

Witnesses indicated that they had been unable to have a look at these board games and serial killer cards until the committee gave them samples. The same was true of most MPs who opposed importing and manufacturing serial killer cards. They acknowledged they had never seen any.

Therefore, one must wonder how such a marginal issue could keep committee members occupied for several months. Obviously, this is not very responsible.

We firmly believe that this committee should deal more with issues related to real violence rather than hypothetical violence due to the action of some shady publishers.

\* \* \*

### ACT TO REVOKE THE CONVICTION OF LOUIS DAVID RIEL

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-288, an Act to revoke the conviction of Louis David Riel.

She said: Mr. Speaker, 109 years ago today, Louis David Riel was hanged. On November 22, 1885, in reaction to his execution, a crowd of close to 50,000 people gathered on the Champ-de-Mars in Montreal and heard Honoré Mercier speak his now famous words of tribute.

Today, I am tabling a bill entitled "An Act to revoke the conviction of Louis David Riel". Some facts are worth recalling. In order to ensure a unanimous verdict, Prime Minister Macdonald had Riel tried in Regina rather than in Winnipeg. The jury was composed exclusively of English-speaking Protestants. In order to justify its actions, the Cabinet, in a report to the House, went so far as to falsify Dr. Valade's report, which stated that Riel was not responsible, by reason of insanity.

The trial was marred by irregularities and Riel was sacrificed by Macdonald to the powerful Ontario lobby. Riel was hanged because he was a Métis, because he was a francophone, and because he went to the defence of a distinct society.

It is important to remember—

**The Deputy Speaker:** I hope that the hon. member and indeed all hon. members will respect the Standing Orders and keep it brief. Otherwise, we will be here all afternoon. One more sentence.

**Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata):** A refusal to acknowledge it is a refusal to understand the present and a refusal to build a future.

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

(1530)

[English]

### PETITIONS

#### ETHANOL

**Mr. Rex Crawford (Kent, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions today. The first petition pursuant to Standing Order 36 is on behalf of my constituents who call on our government to say the same thing in power that we said while in opposition, namely that we support a world class domestic ethanol industry that is renewable, sustainable and environmentally friendly, creating jobs and helping our rural areas.

A \$200 million dollar ethanol plant in Chatham awaits a federal decision of support. It would be 20 times larger than any other plant now in Canada.

#### ABORTION

**Mr. Rex Crawford (Kent, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition from my constituents states that human life at the preborn stage is not protected in Canadian society. Your petitioners pray that Parliament act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

My last petition from the constituents of Kent states that whereas human life at the preborn stage is not protected in Canadian society, your petitioners pray that Parliament act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Joe McGuire (Egmont, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions to be presented under Standing Order 36 from my constituents in Egmont.

The first one is on sexual orientation and the petitioners pray and request that Parliament not amend the Human Rights Act or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way that would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the Canadian Human Rights Act to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

#### EUTHANASIA

**Mr. Joe McGuire (Egmont, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition is with regard to euthanasia. The petitioners request that Parliament ensure the present provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide be enforced vigorously and that Parliament make no changes in the law that would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or passive or active euthanasia.

*Routine Proceedings*

## ABORTION

**Mr. Joe McGuire (Egmont, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in the last petition the petitioners pray that Parliament act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

## JUSTICE

**Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present the following petition which comes from all across Canada and contains 2,340 signatures. It is quite a fat document.

The undersigned request that in memory of Dawn Shaw, a 6-year old girl who was murdered in my riding of Comox—Alberni, this petition be brought to the attention of Parliament.

The petitioners request that Parliament enact legislation to change the justice system to provide greater protection for children from sexual assault and to assure conviction of offenders.

## ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am honoured to present a petition on behalf of 51 Albertans, many of whom are my constituents.

These petitioners request that Parliament ensure that the present provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide be enforced vigorously and that Parliament make no changes in the law that would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

Am I pleased not only to present this petition but to endorse it as well.

**Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions today. The first petition contains 61 signatures from citizens and residents of the town of Frankfurt, Ontario.

(1535)

They pray that Parliament ensure that the present provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide be enforced vigorously and that Parliament make no changes in the law which would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

## CRTC

**Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition is from the same community concerning what is being shown on television.

The undersigned pray and call on Parliament to ensure that the CRTC recognizes that Canadians do not need to be shocked to be entertained. Foul language, excessive violence and explicit sex are not necessary to provide quality entertainment.

## ABORTION

**Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the third petition is from Lanark and Perth, Ontario. The petitioners pray that Parliament act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

\* \* \*

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that all questions be allowed to stand.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Shall all questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

## MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the notice of motion for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Shall the notice of motion for the production of papers be allowed to stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## THE LATE HON. EUGÈNE MARQUIS

**Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness yet with serenity that we learned yesterday of the passing of the Hon. Eugène Marquis, who represented the riding of Kamouraska in this House at one time.

Mr. Marquis was born in St. Alexandre, Kamouraska, in 1901. He was the son of Joseph Marquis and Eveline Michaud. Upon completion of his classical studies, Eugène Marquis received his law degree from Laval University. Upon being admitted to the Bar, he was appointed substitute to the Attorney General of Quebec.

In 1931, Eugène Marquis married Véronique Chabot—who happens to be my aunt as she is my mother's sister—in Ste. Claire de Dorchester. Destined for politics, he ran in the 1945 general elections as a candidate for the Liberal Party of Canada, when the Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King was Prime Minister of the country, and the voters of Kamouraska put their trust in him. They did so again in the next election, in 1949, when the Right Hon. Louis Saint-Laurent was Prime Minister of Canada.

*Government Orders*

On August 24, 1949, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister of Canada, the Hon. Eugène Marquis was appointed to the Superior Court of Quebec, of which he would eventually become the associate chief justice.

Mr. Marquis's legal career spanned both criminal and civil law, and whether on the bench or in private practice, whether representing the State or the Attorney General, his great humanity was recognized by all.

I have the honour of having four parishes in common with Mr. Marquis, parishes that were in his riding when he was a member of Parliament and have now become part of the riding of Bellechasse: Saint-Damase-des-Aulnaies, Tourville, Sainte-Perpétue and Saint-Omer. Eugène Marquis was also an active member of the Knights of Columbus, making a valuable contribution to the furtherance of this organization's social mission.

To his children, Monique, Louise, Yves, Michel and Jean, I offer my deepest sympathy, as well as to his colleagues from the Barreau du Québec and all those who worked with him in the judicial system in Quebec and Canada.

(1540)

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I too would like to express the sorrow of members in our party on the death of Mr. Marquis. I do know that the hon. member for Bellechasse is that gentleman's nephew. I am sorry for him, his family and the family of the deceased that this event happened today. I extend to the hon. member all the respect which members of this House have for former members and that certainly applies to this member for Kamouraska who served his country well a long time ago. I offer the sincere condolences of all members on this side of the House to his family.

*[English]*

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on behalf of my colleagues in the Reform caucus to also express our sympathies to the family on the passing of a former member of the House of Commons, Mr. Eugene Marquis.

Although no one from our caucus has known him, I do know that Mr. Marquis was a farmer and those of us who are farmers share a kindred spirit. We do express our sympathies on behalf of our caucus to the members of his family. We also know that he was committed to Canada, a strong united Canada, before we perhaps got entangled in some of the more recent concerns in Canadian history. We all salute the former member for his contribution to the country and his commitment to it.

*[Translation]*

**The Deputy Speaker:** I too would like to convey my deepest sympathy to the family of one of our former colleagues.

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

The House resumed from November 15 consideration of the motion that Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage and to amend and repeal certain other acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to resume debate on Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage.

Although the proposed legislation will officially establish in law this new department, more than a year has gone by since the department was formed from the components of no less than five different federal departments. This exercise we are going through is part of this government's effort to streamline the way the federal system is organized.

That interim period between the practical establishment of the new department and the present regulatory establishment of it has, to say the least, proved to be very interesting and challenging not only for the new department but for the government and for the entire country.

The different sectors of Canadian heritage have had to get used to their new organizational relationships. In many cases this has meant breaking established links with their former organizations and forming new ones with the various entities brought together to create the new Department of Canadian Heritage.

To take one example which interests me, let us look at Parks Canada. Formally a part of Environment Canada, Parks Canada is now a vital and active member of the new ministry. Parks Canada is the steward of our national parks and our national historic sites which collectively represent some of our most precious natural and cultural heritage resources.

Some have questioned the move of parks to Canadian Heritage. In my view it makes good sense to have the program of Parks Canada housed in a department devoted to our heritage.

(1545)

The historic sites and national parks are tangible expressions of our culture and the geographical realities that have helped to instil in Canadians a unique perspective on the natural environment.

*Government Orders*

It seems to me there is a special relationship between Canadians, aboriginal Canadians and immigrant Canadians, and the environment. This is expressed through Parks Canada and so it is part of our heritage.

In listening to various speakers regarding this bill, both those on the government side and colleagues in other parties, what has struck me is the fundamental nature of feelings that have been expressed. Truly this new department, the Department of Canadian Heritage, has responsibility for areas that strike a deep and resonant chord in all Canadians.

The Department of Canadian Heritage—I must admit it is a new name, but a new name that I like—is a department that is concerned about all those things that make us what we are, those things that set us apart in the global community. Anyone who takes the time cannot fail to be impressed by the range and diversity of the new department's program areas.

I do not intend to list each of these areas of endeavour, but I do want to note some of the major sectors for the benefit of those who have been following this debate. I have already mentioned Parks Canada. In addition the new department has responsibility for the arts, broadcasting, heritage conservation, cultural industries including film, video, sound recording and book publishing.

It is also responsible for the federal programs dedicated to the promotion of official languages; the pursuit of excellence in amateur sport, Mr. Speaker, which interests you and me greatly; the promotion of our cultural diversity and the encouragement of the full and open participation of every Canadian in society.

In short, the Department of Canadian Heritage is active in areas that have as their common objective the promotion of Canadian identity. I think everyone listening to this can relate to one or another of those areas of interest which this new department has that I have mentioned. In my riding of Peterborough, and I have only been a member of Parliament for a short time, I have already had personal discussions with constituents about virtually every one of those areas of heritage activity that I have mentioned.

As one can see from the proposed legislation we are discussing here, this bill will give sanction to a federal department that has programs that touch each and every Canadian. The department is a rich amalgam of sectors. Indeed I believe that the Minister of Canadian Heritage has the privilege to direct one of the government's most exciting and challenging new portfolios.

The word heritage means different things to different people. To me one thing is clear. Particularly this year at this particular time in this House one thing is clear: Our heritage matters and the department dedicated to it are necessarily of great importance at this time, at any time, to this country. I have no doubt whatever that the new Department of Canadian Heritage will

prove to be an able and vital player in the federal arena as it goes about carrying out the responsibilities conferred upon it by Parliament.

Although the bill before us says a technical purpose, confirming as it does the creation of the department in statute, to me it nonetheless represents a far-sighted and enlightened step on the part of the government, a step that will benefit our children and for which I think they will thank us. In my view this department will help ensure that Canada remains a country that others will look to as an example, a nation built on its aboriginal foundations that is confident enough in its identity to embrace the peoples of the world, not only accepting their cultural differences, but welcoming and acknowledging them for what they are, living examples of human expression that link us to the past, link us to the rest of the world and provide us with the foundation and certainty necessary to face the future with confidence.

(1550)

I have taken note of concerns expressed by some members about the rationale for placing responsibility for broadcasting within Canadian heritage while the telecommunications policy will reside in the new Department of Industry. These members pretend to worry about whether the government will be hamstrung by this arrangement and therefore be incapable of action in these two vital fields. I can only say the truth is far from that.

Canadians can be assured that both departments are co-operating, teaming their efforts and finding innovative and effective ways to satisfy their respective mandates.

We need look no further than the recent joint announcement of my colleagues the Minister of Canadian Heritage and the Minister of Industry regarding the government's request to the Canadian Radio–Television and Telecommunications Commission, the CRTC, to seek input and report on a number of regulatory and policy matters relevant to the development of the information highway.

Both ministers recognize that the interests of all parties, consumers, business, creators, in short everyone, will best be served by an open and transparent information gathering process.

Accordingly the government has asked the CRTC to consider such issues as the regulations in new services, the contributions to the objectives of the broadcasting act that these new services would be required to make, and the transition to fair competition between the various players on the information highway, particularly the cable television and telephone companies.

It is all too easy to sit and wring our hands and worry that the two departments will not be able to deliver on their mandates. Those that do so have their blinders on and refuse to see what can be done or accomplished if the will and effort are there.

*Government Orders*

We have heard many speakers on this bill talk about the dawning of the so-called information age and what that will mean for you and me today and for our children tomorrow. Although no one can be sure about the future we can all be certain that adaptations will be the prerequisite for success.

With respect to the future viability of our cultural sector this government is committed to ensuring that Canadian content services have a strong visible and audible presence on the information highway.

For me, debate at second reading has proved both interesting and telling in this matter, interesting because of the breadth and scope of the issues discussed and telling because it has pointed out the fundamental differences in the perspectives of this government and members of the opposition parties.

The negativism expressed by those in opposition to this bill is in stark contrast to the confidence shown by the government in tabling this legislation and in the various pieces of legislation that will establish the other large new departments.

Never has our national heritage and its expression been more important than at the present time. The government's actions in this regard are founded on a sense of optimism for the future, yes, optimism in continuing ingenuity, skill, and energy of our fellow Canadians toward ensuring a thriving and prosperous future for this country.

I want to assure each and every Canadian that they have an elected government that is committed to serving them in the most effective, efficient way possible.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for giving me this time and I look forward to early passage of this legislation.

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak again to Bill C-53 which establishes the Department of Canadian Heritage. In my first address to the House on this bill I discussed the issues of multiculturalism and copyright. Today I wish to address the issue of the national parks system. Yes, these inherently different areas all fall within the responsibility and jurisdiction of Canadian heritage.

(1555)

I continue to be puzzled as to why Parks Canada is now part of the Department of Canadian Heritage. While it is very true that our national parks provide educational opportunities to all Canadians to learn about Canadian history and culture, our 36 national parks and national park reserves across the country seem to me to have greater environmental importance. Prior to the introduction of this bill by the previous government, Parks Canada had been part of the Department of the Environment.

Parks Canada states in its "Guiding Principles and Operational Policy" that it contributes to "an understanding and collective sense of Canada's identity as well as a shared sense of pride. We celebrate this rich heritage through national historic sites, national parks and park reserves, heritage railways stations, historic canals, marine conservation areas, heritage rivers, federal heritage buildings and historical markers".

Parks Canada has redefined its purpose in the following manner: "To fulfil national and international responsibilities in mandated areas of heritage recognition and conservation and to commemorate, protect and present both directly and indirectly places which are significant examples of Canada's cultural and natural heritage in ways that encourage public understanding, appreciation and enjoyment of this heritage while ensuring long term ecological and commemorative integrity".

In 1930 the National Parks Act proclaimed that: "The parks are hereby dedicated to the people of Canada for their benefit, education and enjoyment and such parks shall be maintained and made use of so as to leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations".

Over time the mandate and purpose of Parks Canada has moved toward the greater emphasis on environmental protection and less emphasis on public enjoyment. By its placement in the Department of Canadian Heritage, I have to ask the question: Will the environmental concerns of Parks Canada become lost within the heritage issues?

Throughout its history, Parks Canada has been faced with the same challenges, balancing development while protecting and preserving the ecosystem and funding, administration and fiscal accountability of the parks system.

I wanted to know more about the concerns of the people who live in the townsites and earn their livelihoods from parks. Our mountain parks are world renowned and people travel from the four corners of the globe to visit them. The economic value of this tourism is in the hundreds of millions of dollars and impact directly on hundreds of jobs.

This summer I met with people from Banff, Jasper and Waterton National Park. The single largest challenge facing parks today is balancing development of parks while protecting the parks' ecosystem. There is no question that Parks Canada contributes to Canadian culture and heritage. Development of the park resources ensures that visitors to the parks are able to fully understand and appreciate our natural and cultural heritage. This development also ensures the livelihoods of those who live and work there. Since their business is based on visitors' appreciation of the natural wonders of our parks, protection of the sensitive ecosystem is as important to business people in the parks as it is to environmentalists.

*Government Orders*

This government is continuing its inaction by stating that it is consulting the Canadian public on many issues. This is also true of parks. Currently in Alberta and B.C. mountain parks alone there are numerous reviews including the four mountain parks five-year plan update which separates studies for Banff, Jasper, Yoho and Kootenay. There is also the Bow Valley study in Banff, including a two-year moratorium on development. There are operational reviews for the townsites of Waterton, Jasper, Wasagaming, Waskesiu, Field and Lake Louise; a study concerning the closure of the Jasper and Banff airstrips; an action plan update for Lake Louise and a study concerning the twinning of the Trans-Canada Highway through the parks. This is symptomatic of a government wrapped up in reviewing, discussing and studying. But is it really listening? I ask this question over and over. The focus of all of these studies is directed at environmental concerns, not the cultural benefits of our national parks.

I would like to address another major challenge facing Parks Canada: funding, administration and fiscal accountability. According to figures obtained from the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Parks Canada 1993-94 budget shows expenditures of \$170.2 million and revenue of \$32.5 million. According to the mathematics I learned in school, this leaves a shortfall of \$137.7 million. In these economic times it is impossible to understand how Parks Canada can maintain its administration and operation, let alone preserve our parklands for generations to come. Without a strategic and long range plan sustaining the parks at current levels it becomes more and more impossible for a cash strapped government.

(1600)

As has been demonstrated time and again there is a lack of access to information about specific parks expenditures. For instance, the residents of Waterton National Park have been invited to participate in an operational review. This review is based on three suppositions. First, those receiving government provided services should pay an appropriate and fair amount. Second, Canadians should receive fair market value for the use of their land and assets. Third, subsidies should be eliminated. This sounds like more do nothing mumbo-jumbo from the Liberal government.

At a public meeting in Waterton residents were informed that the annual budget of their community was \$750,000 while only \$75,000 was generated. It is astounding. The community is willing to pay its fair share. In fact they welcome the opportunity to be more involved in the decision making and operations of their community. However they have not been given access to examine the expenditures to determine where the money is

being spent and where it can be saved. The 85 year round residents are being asked to make up a shortfall of nearly \$700,000 without full and detailed information. Isn't it a ludicrous expectation?

These residents are questioning such things as the necessity of having the equivalent of 59 year round employees within their small park of 505 square kilometres and annual visitors numbering only 330,000. Meanwhile their public school is now closed, and I saw this. Their children will have to be bused out of the park to get an education. Their swimming pool has been closed and there are grass and weeds growing through the cracks. This is stark evidence that community input has not been heard.

Yet Parks Canada's vision statement clearly states: "Stewardship of historic and heritage areas is a shared responsibility. Canadian citizens must be more aware and involved in decision making and in the delivery of heritage programs".

On August 3, 1994 the Minister of Canadian Heritage announced that he was looking at the matter of user fees for Parks Canada facilities. It is not clear from the documents I have seen what exactly the minister is targeting with these user fees. Parks Canada is already spending more than \$170 million per year on national parks alone, not including other heritage sites.

Raising visitors' fees should only be considered when the government demonstrates its willingness to open its books and show Canadians where their money is being spent. Anything less becomes another unjustifiable tax grab and a government that is casting its greedy eyes to the already empty pockets of taxpayers.

In all my speeches to the House from the issue of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to multiculturalism and other heritage issues I have spoken of the need for fiscal responsibility and sound management practices. In closing I would ask some questions. Are we prepared to pay more to maintain our parks, or will our government continue to fund the parks system blindly and without accountability? How much more can the taxpayers of the country afford?

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on second reading of Bill C-53 to continue my opposition to it.

In my first speech, I reminded this House of some important considerations. First, I said that Quebec's problems are due to the very nature of the federal system since the federal system in Canada completely ignores the reality of Quebec. The original intention of Confederation has been gradually replaced by a strong central government in which one of the founding nations no longer has anything but the status of a small minority.

*Government Orders*

I also reminded this House that the existential questions of English Canada in no way concern the Quebecois and even harm the development of Quebec. We can only hope that English Canada can solve its existential problems for the good of our nations. Thus, the decision was made very unilaterally to spend huge amounts on the search for this elusive Canadian identity that supposedly supersedes the Quebec identity, which is very much alive.

(1605)

In the same vein, I mentioned the harmful effects of the federal government's immense spending power. For example, in the referendum debate which is now just getting under way, we can already see the real impact of this spending power on the form and direction that the debate will take. For the sake of Canadian identity and its promotion, as provided for in clauses 4 and 5 of the bill, the federal government will subsidize various groups and organizations to defend the "no" option, directly contravening the spirit of the Quebec law on referendums.

The newspapers told us again yesterday that the Council for Canadian Unity was setting up three organizations for the Quebec referendum. One of the means being used is the Terry Fox Centre, financed—you guessed it—with federal funds. This is just the beginning of federal money being wasted in provincial jurisdictions.

Experience in Quebec has taught us that these well-financed groups will grow rapidly in the coming weeks. As I already said, all this is contrary to the spirit of the Quebec law. This shows how much consideration the federal system has for Quebec's distinct character. In my first speech, I mentioned that it is important for the development of Quebec culture that the Quebec government control this whole area.

Does the federal government care about this? Not in the least. With this bill, they are getting ready for a systematic invasion of all cultural areas, including the arts, the status of the artist, cultural heritage and industries, conservation, exportation and importation of cultural property.

I remind you that the federal government's cultural investments will amount to almost \$1 billion a year in Quebec. That is what I mean when I say that the federal government's spending power is harmful to Quebec. I put forward these arguments only two weeks ago. Since then, new elements have confirmed how important it is to reject the Canadian heritage minister's bill.

First of all, we realized that the Minister of Canadian Heritage sees no limit to his power to take action. That in itself is very disturbing. We may well wonder how far the government would be willing to go if it felt that the Canadian identity was threatened. Would it be tempted to spend the money allocated to

the Department of Canadian Heritage and to other departmental programs on promotion, without wondering at all if it is a legitimate investment?

The Minister of International Affairs is about to promote Canadian culture through his foreign embassies and his cultural centre in Paris, which, incidentally, the Conservatives wanted to close. The evidence given at the hearings of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage raises similar questions. The mandate of the CBC seems to throw the door wide open to an extensive promotion of the Canadian identity. Curiously, except for one or two well-known exceptions, after two months of sittings, nothing has been said yet about Quebec culture.

Is it necessary to specify that the vast majority of those who watch national television live in Quebec? What culture other than Quebec culture are they trying to reflect? Another element to be considered is the central government's attitude towards the new Quebec government's legitimate practices. Following an old tradition, the Parizeau government is working to revitalize the relationship with France and promote Quebec products in that country.

As we know, Quebec has felt for a long time that it enjoys exclusive educational and cultural powers at the international level. Cultural products are an important part of these international exchanges. How can Quebec protect and promote its culture, when the central government is making laws such as the bill before us today that would give it control over Quebec culture, which is unacceptable?

(1610)

Once again, Quebec's specificity and autonomy are being denied. The right to control Quebec's culture belongs to the Quebec government, not to a government controlled by a majority representing English Canada. This is not a whim: It is a necessity. In fact, this is what the Bloc Quebecois reaffirmed in its dissenting opinion on the report tabled yesterday on Canadian foreign policy:

Successive Quebec governments have always rejected this argument of indivisibility and developed distinct international policies and relations that aim to serve Quebec's national interests and promote its influence and development, particularly in commercial, cultural, economic, political and social fields.

Since she was sworn in, the new Quebec Minister of Culture and Communications has been asking for the patriation of Quebec's control over the electronic highway and communications, which is essential to the development of Quebec's culture. In so doing, the minister reflects the collective will of Quebecers.

It is imperative that the federal government withdraw from Quebec's cultural sector and that it gives fair compensation to the Quebec government. For all these reasons, we oppose Bill C-53.



*Government Orders*

[English]

**Mr. Bernie Collins (Souris—Moose Mountain, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me much pleasure to take part in the debate concerning legislation that will establish in law the Department of Canadian Heritage.

As an opening comment I must say I am astounded by the determined attempts to turn a transactional piece of legislation into a seemingly complicated bill. The legislation before us is simply intended to give legal effect to a department that has been in effect for well over a year.

The Department of Canadian Heritage brings together the various elements that define us as a diverse and vibrant nation with a rich and bounteous cultural and natural heritage. The department's activities range from cultural development to arts, broadcasting, national parks, historic sites, amateur sport and multiculturalism. The department also administers social languages, state ceremonial and native programs, all of which contribute in a significant way to what makes uniquely Canadian.

The mission of the Department of Canadian Heritage which states "building our future together: strengthening a shared sense of Canadian identity which respects the diversity of the land and the people" reflects the broad range of activities that define the Canadian society. Direct support to our cultural industries, protection and preservation of our national parks and historic sites and the promotion of Canadian excellence in sports and culture are just a few examples.

Each and every part of the department is connected in some way to what we could refer to as the spirit and soul of Canada. Together these units form a striking panorama of our past accomplishments, our current reality and our aspirations for the future.

As the chief custodian of natural and physical heritage, Parks Canada commemorates, protects and presents both directly and indirectly places of significance to Canadian cultural and natural heritage as a means of encouraging public understanding, appreciation and enjoyment. The economic activity and tourism, generated by the department's operations make a substantial impact on the growth of many local economies. As well the parks service is setting new trends in its approach to the forging of innovative partnership arrangements with private and not for profit enterprises as a means of carrying out the responsibilities that fall within its mandate.

The Department of Canadian Heritage also plays a key role in the enhancement and development of English and French linguistic minority communities. Respect for Canada's two official languages, for the traditions and contributions of our aboriginal peoples, for our cultural diversity and for basic human rights

makes Canada stand out among other countries as a nation that truly values and appreciates its diversity.

Multiculturalism is essential to Canadian society. Countries throughout the world are trying to find the formula that will allow them to create a real sense of national identity among groups of different ethnic, cultural, linguistic and racial backgrounds. Many of these countries are now taking a serious interest in the 100 per cent Canadian model we have created.

(1615)

Members will note that in the act creating the Department of Canadian Heritage the government undertakes to advance the equality of all Canadians in their country's social, economic and cultural life. It recognizes the need to eliminate obstacles that divide Canadians and to forge bonds based on confidence and respect. The goal of multiculturalism is after all to create social cohesion and to strengthen national identity.

The Department of Canadian Heritage also focuses its efforts on the enhancement of culture and the development in Canada of a means of communication. Both are crucial to the future of our country not only in maintaining the uniqueness of Canada but also in acting as a powerful instrument of economic development.

No one will argue that we live in challenging times. At this particular juncture in our country's history unfortunately there are forces working to dismantle the entity that is Canada. Within this context it is imperative that government foster an environment in which Canada's rich cultural heritage can flourish and that all Canadians have access to their own products.

Moreover the march of technology is relentless, changing and in many cases erasing traditional borders. We are also witnessing changes which are taking place on a dramatic scale and are affecting the economies of our established trading partners throughout the world.

Within this backdrop and keeping it in mind now more than ever Canadians will benefit from the creation of a department such as Canadian heritage. I believe that the minister of the department has the privilege to direct one of the government's most exciting and challenging portfolios.

The legislation to create the department presents a far sighted and enlightened step by our government. This department will help ensure that Canada remains a country others look to as an example. It is a nation that is confident enough in its identity to embrace peoples of the world not only accepting their cultural differences but welcoming and acknowledging them for what they are: Living examples of human expression that link us to the past and provide us with the foundation and certainty necessary to face the future.

I believe that as a nation we need a Department of Canadian Heritage. I hope that the bill will receive speedy passage.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Hugh Hanrahan (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to discuss the second reading of Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage, which should be renamed the department of government waste and overlap. Hon. members across from me consider this bill nothing more than routine housekeeping yet to us in the Reform Party it is much much more.

Canadians want change. The Liberals are finally beginning to understand this and I commend them for it.

The Reform Party has been advocating decreases in immigration levels since the early 1990s and now the Liberals have adopted this idea. The Reform Party has been screaming loudly about the inadequacies in the criminal justice system and now the Liberals are reviewing the criminal justice system. The Reform Party has been pleading for serious amendments to the Young Offenders Act and the Liberals are also reviewing this issue.

The Reform Party has been talking about the critical levels of our debt and deficit. Our debt now stands at \$538,181,397,919.00. Just like magic, the Liberals are beginning to think there is a problem in this area as well.

Although we are not the government, we can still be extremely effective and proud to know that our policy directives are beginning to be implemented by this government. I must congratulate government members on their insight.

(1620)

I mention these few examples of where the government has been listening to us on the Reform side of the House. I hope this trend will continue in the future. I hope this will continue regarding Bill C-53.

As I alluded to earlier, Bill C-53 should be defeated in this House and sent back to cabinet for a complete overhaul. This overhaul should deal specifically with the notion of overlap and duplication such as: overlap between the Department of Industry and heritage; overlap between the Department of the Environment and heritage; and we are now seeing the possibility of overlap between the Department of Justice and heritage. The list goes on.

We as a government are spending over \$40 billion annually or approximately \$110 million every day. We do not have a revenue problem in Canada but rather we have a spending problem. Last week when I was back in my riding of Edmonton—Strathcona holding town hall meetings on social reform, many people commented on how much money this government continues to waste on needless or extremely low priority programs. The main programs that were mentioned time after time were official languages and multiculturalism.

First I want to say unequivocally that we are not anti-French nor anti-Quebec in the Reform Party. However, we do feel that a tremendous amount of resources is being wasted in areas in which the numbers do not warrant service in both languages. We do believe in implementing the policy of territorial bilingualism which would see maintaining official languages in key federal institutions such as Parliament, the Supreme Court and other federal services where the demand is sufficient to warrant cost effective minority language services.

Second, we have multiculturalism. It is here that I will focus my attention today. It seems clear to me that anyone who is critical of Canada's multicultural program is immediately labelled a racist. That is far too easy a way to avoid an issue. How can anyone debate an issue that from the onset has been reduced from an intellectual discussion to name calling? It is for this reason that I stand before my colleagues and challenge them to discuss the issue not on an emotional but rather on a rational intellectual level.

Proponents of the multicultural program have also begun to view honest criticism as attacks, and critics as enemies. Multiculturalism is a vision that proceeds from differences, from that which separates, and disregards that which unites.

Furthermore, in a survey conducted in 1991 Canadians were asked whether they approved or disapproved of government cancellation of multiculturalism funding which would force projects to be self-financed by the multicultural organizations themselves. Over two-thirds of all respondents approved and 45 per cent of them strongly agreed that multiculturalism should be funded by the multicultural organizations themselves rather than the federal government.

Because of time constraints I will only point out one of the measures in this act which is to provide support to individuals, groups or organizations for the purpose of preserving, enhancing and promoting multiculturalism in Canada. It is important to read a passage from a recent book written by Neil Bissoondath, an individual who immigrated to Canada from Trinidad. This book is called *Selling Illusions*. As Mr. Bissoondath illustrates quite clearly, one of the problems with the objectives of the multiculturalism act is:

—so it is with the ethnic cultures offered at the pavilions of Caravan and other such festivals; all the colourful ethnics bowing and smiling in a mechanical greeting gesture to all the tourists. They look like the real thing, but their smell is synthetic. They have no bite. They are safe. Culture Disneyfied.

This is perhaps even more of a concern than the wastefulness of the \$30 million we are presently spending on multiculturalism. In the divisive nature of this policy there is a notion or idea that we are discussing the creation of different laws for Canadians based only on ethnicity or culture. It is for this reason that the concept of multiculturalism through political cowardice and bureaucratic ineptitude and ethnic pressure has distorted federal policy beyond recognition.

*Government Orders*

(1625)

For example the Liberals are presently reviewing a cultural defence which would allow someone whose culture or religion provides an escape from prosecution for something someone else of another culture would be prosecuted for. The cultural proposal leaves open the question of whether wife beating, violent discipline of children and polygamy are to be condoned according to culture. This issue raises questions once again: How do you define cultural background? Do you have to be from this culture? Do both your parents have to be from this culture?

Another example would be the Ontario plan which would divert black youths from courts to community service work. Essentially this program would treat black youths differently from everyone else, even though there is no statistical evidence that black youths commit more crimes. The reason that data of crime by blacks in Canada is scant is that police departments do not generally keep race based figures. Why is that? Perhaps it is because our justice system in Canada is blind and should be blind to factors such as race or ethnicity.

What happened to equality before the law? What happened to treating all Canadians the same regardless of race or ethnicity? Both of these examples are classic illustrations of multiculturalism run amok.

What Canada needs is a government to lead by example. So give the people what they want. Scrap among other things the funding for multiculturalism. Send Bill C-53 back and replace it with a bill which has eliminated overlap and duplication as well as government waste.

Multiculturalism works counter to unification. It pulls at the very fabric of this great nation. What we need is equality, not special treatment for different groups and individuals. There is nothing fundamentally wrong with multiculturalism, provided it is funded by the multicultural organizations themselves. However, this is not the case in Canada and the reality is that multiculturalism is nothing more than an abuse of our generosity.

**Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to my colleague from Edmonton—Strathcona. I suppose I should assure him right off the top that neither I nor my colleagues on this side have any intention of adopting Reform policies nor their manners I do not think.

It is interesting that the member speaks about this policy and how it has been adopted from Reform and the next words out of his mouth are why it should be defeated. I am here to tell my colleagues and everyone else who are prepared to give me a fair hearing on both sides of the House why the bill should be supported.

Let me assure the member there is precious little in the way of the philosophy of his party that we are interested in adopting. Indeed that is why we ran candidates in every part of this country, in every single province. We ignored no provinces to field candidates. I think my colleagues opposite have realized their error there and are about to attempt to rectify that. Canadians know and realize what is their one truly national party in the House. That was seen in the fact that there was only one party which elected members in every province coast to coast to coast.

I am interested in explaining why I feel this is a very important bill that is worthy of support from those with open minds in all parts of the House.

There are several purposes for Bill C-53. It seeks to establish by law the Department of Canadian Heritage. It sets out the powers, duties and functions of the Minister of Canadian Heritage. It would settle various technical matters relating to the establishment of the department and it would put in place the public service organizational structure formalizing the transition of employees. It would bring under one roof communications, cultural industries, official and heritage languages, national parks and historic sites, voluntary action, multiculturalism, state, ceremonial and amateur sport.

(1630)

In other words, the bill would provide a much better co-ordination and integration of several important functions. It would seek to streamline those functions and to carry them out more effectively and more efficiently. I think that is a goal that ought to be supported by members on all sides of the House, that we provide the services of government more effectively and more efficiently.

I would hope that we would share that philosophy in all parts of the House. No, there are comments from members opposite in which we can see that because multiculturalism is part of this bill somehow it is not worthy of support. That is regrettable and it is simply un-Canadian.

What does it mean to be a Canadian. I would encourage some of the members from the Reform Party, who are hollering out comments now during my speech, to take a look at the Canadian Coat of Arms. The concept that somehow this nation has ever been one sort of pure culture or one blended culture is absolutely and patented nonsense. The very Canadian Coat of Arms has emblazoned on it the symbols of four cultures. This nation has four founding races.

I quite frankly think that many Canadians do not know that. I regret to say I suspect that some of my colleagues opposite are ignorant of the fact that there are four cultures that founded this country and they are very well depicted on the Canadian Coat of Arms.

*Government Orders*

From 1867 by definition this nation has always been multicultural. By definition we have always had more than one culture. This bill seeks to recognize and to continue a very important fact about this nation which is obviously not appreciated by some of my colleagues opposite.

In a word, this country represented a new nationalism, a blending of several cultures right from day one, with four founding cultures, with two dominant languages, and since 1867 we have become even more multicultural. This is not something that started recently. Those who think that ought to read some Canadian history.

Multiculturalism is not something new. It has existed right from the start of this country and it was enshrined in 1867 in the Constitution. As I have said several times, for those who care to hear it is well depicted on our coat of arms. We are a polyglot nation. We are a nation which draws from the strengths of people from around the world.

I hear members on all sides of the House speaking with accents from various parts of the world. Although I may disagree with their philosophy on certain things, I am proud to hear their accents. Nothing shows more graphically that we are a nation which draws from the peoples of the globe. There is no country made up of as many cultures of this world as Canada. That is something of which we ought to be proud. It is something which makes us uniquely Canadian.

Frankly that is the Canadian identity, that we are a nation which was founded with four cultures, two official languages, but has been generous enough since 1867 to open its doors to the peoples from around the world. They are literally flocking to Canada and that is the strength of this country.

That is why my colleague from Edmonton—Strathcona has no fear that we are stealing the Reform policy. Unfortunately my understanding of those members' policies is that they do not recognize that as a strength. That is a very basic strength of this country. Perhaps it is our greatest strength as a nation.

(1635)

The fact that Canadian culture will continue to drive our economy even more in the future as we enter an era of globalization of trade ought to be something which is seen by anyone who cares to take a look at the facts of the case.

A very dominant economic activity all over the world as we enter the 21st century is tourism. I do not think as Canadians we recognize that fact enough or that we do enough to capitalize on it. We are starting to address that and this government hopes to make it a key priority.

The fact that we can draw from people around the world to come and visit their friends and family who are living in Canada ought to make us a leader in world tourism if we are prepared to

see our multicultural character as a strength and not somehow as a liability, which I hear far too often in this House. It disappoints me to hear it no matter where it comes from.

Of course all of these changes are to be pursued within the ambit of fiscal responsibility. Canadians know that this government is committed to fiscal responsibility in all areas of federal endeavour. They can be assured that Bill C-53 is consistent with that objective and therefore with the comprehensive review of the federal government programs now underway.

Our government appreciates that there are some concerns about the decision to divide responsibility between broadcasting and telecommunications, between Canadian heritage and Industry Canada. There are valid reasons for that. The inclusion of telecommunications in the Department of Industry's portfolio recognizes the increasing role of the economy.

On the other hand, broadcasting has a tremendous impact on a country like Canada with the enormous geography we are blessed with and yet with a population only 10 per cent the size of that of our American neighbour. Broadcasting is vital in this country. We have to be very vigilant to make sure that it promotes Canadian culture at all times and that we not allow it to be dominated by the American broadcasting networks. Therefore it rightly belongs in the Canadian Heritage Department where this bill will have it housed.

The department is active in promoting Canadian identity in several major areas: natural and physical heritage, official languages, amateur sport, community support and participation and also the management of cultural development and means of communication.

We have 36 national parks in this country, many of them beautiful parks in our western provinces, but also in every province one would care to name. Surely we want to promote that. We have nine historic canals and four marine areas located throughout Canada. We are a nation with three oceans.

We will soon be celebrating the 75th anniversary of Parks Canada. Canada's parks generate an annual revenue of over \$1 billion, providing jobs for roughly 30,000 Canadians.

In the area of official languages, amateur sport, community support and participation, that in itself is a mouthful to say. Obviously one can see what tremendously important areas that encompasses. We are a nation of tremendous cultural diversity, of multiculturalism. It is a strength and it ought to be built on.

I will refer to the area of sport with which I am most familiar. When we send Olympic athletes to represent this country, they represent this country. They are not hung up on whether they are French Canadian, English Canadian, whether they are from Alberta or Ontario. They represent Canada and they win medals as Canadians. That is seen very clearly in the sport of ice hockey where we have tremendous excellence and really lead the world in that.

*Government Orders*

I recall the very famous goal, probably the most famous goal scored in hockey, the Paul Henderson goal; Henderson scoring from a French Canadian named Cournoyer and from an Italian Canadian named Esposito.

They are three Canadians who very proudly helped to defeat the Russians and to show Canadian excellence in hockey. That is the kind of teamwork we need in this country, all cultures working together, our multiculturalism seen as an asset, not as some kind of liability. Some groups get very hung up on the fact that we may be encouraging these cultures to hang on to what is important to them.

I am a father of three children and many of my colleagues here are parents. It is possible for me to be what I am, a Canadian of Irish extraction. I am very proud of it. I was raised to celebrate that fact. Also I am very proud of the fact that I am a Canadian.

(1640)

It is equally possible to be proud of two things at the same time. They are not mutually exclusive and I do not understand the very narrow minded approach that I hear from members opposite that somehow one cannot be proud of those two facts at the same time. It is to be pitied.

[Translation]

**Mr. Maurice Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to Bill C-53, whose purpose is to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage.

I would like to take a few minutes to comment on the mandate of the future Department of Canadian Heritage, especially its wording reveals something very disturbing about the future of Canada. It says: the mandate of the Department of Canadian Heritage, and I will read the entire text. My source is a document released by the Liberal government, which means that we can hardly question its authority. It says: the mandate of the future department is to create and promote among Canadians a profound sense of identity and belonging, based on bilingualism and biculturalism. It also says a little further on that the department's objective is to develop and implement programs that support a very clear sense of identity among Canadians.

The first two words of this mandate raise some questions about the purpose of, or even the need for this department, since "susciter" implies there is no sense of identity or belonging, according to the text.

Before my speech, I checked the *Petit Robert*, a dictionary whose authority one would also hesitate to question, and its definition of the verb *susciter* is to give rise to a feeling or idea. This is exactly the mandate of the Department of Canadian Heritage. To give rise to something implies that it does not exist.

It is rather odd that after 125 years, we have a government that creates a department of Canadian Heritage and admits in the department's mandate that a sense of identity or belonging does not exist. They are right, because what does exist in Canada is two identities. We have the existence of a very special and very obvious identity in Quebec, the francophone identity, which is open to all communities and provides that everyone who so wishes has an opportunity to develop his potential and live in harmony with everyone else.

There is also the anglophone identity, which is found mostly outside Quebec and which also is open to people of all nationalities, respecting their own cultural identity, while giving them an opportunity to grow in this country called Canada.

So it is entirely correct that this mandate should say and admit that a Canadian culture as such, of which all Canadians would be a part, including Quebecers, does not exist.

(1645)

During this debate, I would like to see the Minister of Canadian Heritage tell us which values are shared throughout Canada, that is in Quebec as in the rest of the country. This is my first comment.

On the face of it, I say that the mandate of the Department of Canadian Heritage is in fact to promote the values of this government, as opposed to the values of Canadians and Quebecers. In my view, that makes it a department of propaganda. We have known for decades that the federal government views culture in Canada, and particularly in Quebec, only in terms of bilingualism and multiculturalism.

Yet, there are dozens of countries where people are bilingual but still preserve their own identity. If you ask French people who can speak several languages such as English and Spanish what is their primary culture, they will spontaneously say that it is the French one. As well, I have yet to meet an American who would question his identity. It is a clear and simple reality which helps respect those who do not think like us and who do not share the same cultural background.

I also want to say that, traditionally, the federal government and other institutions such as the Supreme Court have always reduced, if not eliminated, Quebec's power over its own culture. Let me just mention communications, which is a vital sector for culture. Over the years, three decisions have been made by the Supreme Court which, as everyone knows and as former Quebec premier Maurice Duplessis used to say, "always leans on the same side". The first decision, in the late thirties, confirmed that broadcasting fell under federal jurisdiction. The second one, in 1974, had to do with cable television, while the most recent one, in 1994, concerned telephony. The end result is that Quebec is excluded from the communications sector, which is an essential and strategic tool for Quebecers' future.

*Government Orders*

I think I have one minute remaining on my speaking time. I would like to conclude by taking a look at the people who head these institutions, and the Minister of Canadian Heritage in particular, the hon. member for Laval West who, I think everyone will agree, is a very nice guy, but does not hesitate to impose his views on organizations under his jurisdiction. Just think back to recent events; these past few weeks, in fact during two weeks, the Bloc Québécois and the Reform Party have been asking for the resignation of the heritage minister for having interceded with the CRTC on behalf of his constituents.

During two whole weeks, during question period, the Bloc Québécois and the Reform Party raised repeatedly with the Prime Minister the need for the Minister of Canadian Heritage to resign for having interfered with a quasi-judicial organization which is in fact the equivalent of a tribunal. One can wonder what this minister will be able to do, in Quebec in particular, with his propaganda department come the day when the people of Quebec will decide their future.

(1650)

One last point. This minister will find strong support within his caucus. Let me name two supporters. First, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and member for Papineau—Saint-Michel, who is remembered in Quebec in particular for the statement he made in 1977 about the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation which, to my mind, is certainly one of the most prominent cultural diffusion vehicles in Quebec. With the prospect of the 1980 referendum in mind, he said he did not want to see the French network of the CBC take a neutral stand in presenting both sides of the issue, adding that at the time of the referendum, CBC employees would be expected to be unequivocally on the pro-Canada side.

Recently, the Prime Minister himself said that the operation of the CBC was governed by an act under which it was required to make the benefits of living in Canada known. That is what the CBC was established for, he said.

The message is clear, and we are perfectly justified in being concerned about the establishment of this department.

**The Deputy Speaker:** 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 Saint John— Veterans affairs.

Resuming debate. The hon. member for Victoria—Haliburton.

*[English]*

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to rise today to join the debate and once again speak in support of Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage.

Bill C-53 must be recognized as part of a greater reorganization of government. This reorganization will allow for a more efficient organizational structure in the department which in the long run will prove of greater benefit to the Canadian taxpayer, something all of us should be in favour of.

Although this department had its beginning under the previous government in June 1993, the current government of which I am a member has improved the department markedly. I am pleased to say these improvements are reflected in many accomplishments of the department in the past year in the area of heritage conservation, official languages, national parks and amateur sports to name a few.

With this in mind, the government is now proceeding with the task of confirming the reorganization of the Department of Canadian Heritage to better serve all Canadians. I believe it is important to remember that this department serves a large group of Canadians, not special interest groups as some members across the floor have criticized. The department serves national parks across the country, amateur sports across the country, heritage sites across the country and numerous cultural exhibits across the country. It is truly a national department dealing with Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

In my riding of Victoria—Haliburton in Ontario I think of the Trent—Severn waterway system which has transported millions of people in the last 100 years. It allows users to travel from Trenton to Georgian Bay on a heritage waterway system. In particular, each summer as a direct result of the commitment to heritage by this department, I see the operation of a blacksmith shop along the Rideau Canal system which stretches from Kingston to Ottawa and contains numerous heritage locks. This operation shows the importance of heritage and history in Canada. Add to that the diligent work and commitment of the department in the Trent—Severn and Rideau Canal systems and its important heritage will be preserved for future generations.

Culturally, certain members opposite argue that if the free market does not support certain types of art then they should not be produced. There are many examples of experimental or cutting edge art which appear on display in our National Gallery here in Ottawa. Once again some members opposite see no bottom line need for these pieces of art when in fact some of the

*Government Orders*

art is worth considerably more now than the original purchase price. Art cannot be judged quickly or haphazardly.

(1655)

Upon close examination and as a direct result of the department Canadian cultural industries have grown over 40 per cent from 1988 to 1992 when other industries saw their revenue and sales drop. In large part this is due to the benefits of programs like those for sound recordings, postal subsidies for book publishers, as well as film and video departments. As a matter of fact from 1987 to 1992 in Ontario alone the export of critically acclaimed books by Canadian writers increased about 70 per cent.

In addition, because the cultural industries rely so much on innovation and technology the jobs they create are of high skill, long duration and high value. Award winning books and movies, commercially successful theatre productions, million copy selling records and production facilities that attract international film producers are some of the areas in which Canada has become highly successful. All of these successes are signs of creative cultural industries that are increasing and growing each year. With those increases have come successful jobs and businesses for Canadians.

Canada's multiculturalism policy has the noble aim of promoting equal opportunity for all Canadians to participate in the social, cultural, economic and political life of our great nation. I would also like to encourage some members opposite to become aware and consult with those Canadians who are grateful for the multiculturalism policy and its benefits.

Our multiculturalism policy is an effort by responsible government to help Canadians understand one another and develop tolerance. Diversity does not divide us; it can only enrich our society. It is important to remember that if Canada wants to remain competitive in an ever shrinking world, we must pool our resources of diverse cultures and people.

I must commend the members opposite for their continued efforts to find something wrong with the department of heritage. It is apparent they cannot find anything. They cannot find anything new to say about the department until they read it in some newspaper. Perhaps they should concentrate on the fine effort put forth by the minister and his department as well as the policies and issues they manage. I believe if the members opposite focused on this instead of their theatrics, they would agree with me when I urge the passage of Bill C-53.

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for the opportunity to address Bill C-53, an act to re-organize the Department of Canadian Heritage.

I must confess I learn fascinating things when I come to the House and listen to some of the comments made by the members

across the way. It was fortunate for the hon. member, and I have to be careful how I say this, that a couple of his colleagues came in to give him some support, otherwise it would have been worked pretty thin.

I found out that there are four founding cultures in Canada. That is very interesting. I wonder if they all happened to set foot on Canada's soil at the same time, or whether they came in from four corners and met in the middle. It sounds rather odd. I found out that if we did not have a massive Department of Canadian Heritage we would not have heritage locks in the member's riding. That was quite enlightening, I must admit.

What we really need to do is rethink the very reason for the existence of this ministry rather than talk about some tinkering or on some reorganization of the department and the ministry.

Earlier I believe my colleague from Edmonton—Strathcona referred to Neil Bissoondath and made some remarks on Mr. Bissoondath's position on multiculturalism. I cannot remember if he quoted from his book or not, but I came across an editorial dealing with Mr. Bissoondath's latest book.

The editorial was written in the *Vancouver Sun* published on November 14. I would like to bring this to the attention of the House. To my knowledge this was not written by a Reform Party member but it quite closely shadows the position taken by Reform on multiculturalism. If I have some time remaining I would also like to bring a few other issues to the attention of the House, but the editorial in the *Vancouver Sun* reads:

Neil Bissoondath's latest book, a non-fiction examination of the federal multiculturalism policy, is provoking timely discussion of both the merits and the cost of the policy.

Mr. Bissoondath, a Canadian who originated in Trinidad, argues that the policy does not promote understanding and acceptance but instead underscores differences and thereby divides Canadians. Is he right? Is the multiculturalism department of the Canadian heritage ministry doing more harm than good, and would the \$26 million spent annually on grants be better used to reduce the deficit?

(1700)

It sounds a bit like a Reformer asking these questions but it is the *Vancouver Sun*. It would be foolish to chuck multiculturalism on the mistaken notion that it exists to finance folk-dancing jamborees. Some money may still find its way there but much of it provides substantial support to immigrants trying to fit into Canadian society.

There is support for ethnic communities struggling with intergenerational conflict for seminars to examine family violence and for cross-cultural training for institutions like the police.

While these aspects of the policy seem to attract support for many immigrants and other Canadians, the downside worries some of them. For Mr. Bissoondath, the downside is the weakening of the Canadian fabric as newcomers are stuck with hyphenated labels and end up neither simply Canadian nor whatever they were before they came here.

*Government Orders*

Some immigrants describe the downside in terms of stolen dignity. Others argue that the policy ghettoizes newcomers instead of encouraging them to develop loyalty to their new land. On the basis of what immigrants themselves are saying, it seems clear that the policy, now more than 20 years old, is due for an overhaul. It does not say a reorganization. It says an overhaul.

The financial crunch provides another reason for an examination of the multiculturalism program just as it does in the case of the Canada Council with its \$98 million budget this year, amateur sport with \$64 million, Advocacy for Women \$8 million and so on.

On a per capita basis, multicultural grants cost each Canadian less than \$1. Some of the projects seem worth much more than \$1 but in other cases \$1 is too much. Why is any money spent on poster and button campaigns against racism or on teaching Armenian?

If Armenians or any ethnic group wants their kids to be able to speak their language, they should find the money for it in their own pockets. Government funding for this kind of language training speaks to Mr. Bissoondath's point about the policy's role in fragmenting Canadians by giving groups a heightened sense of their own ethnicity.

It also confirms native Canadians in their disinclination to embrace immigrants as full citizens. We do not suggest that Canada should opt for the U.S. style melting pot, but our cherished mosaic feels a bit battered. It is time to rethink multiculturalism, its purpose, effects and costs in dollars and cents.

Thanks to Mr. Bissoondath, whose foreign roots make him uniquely qualified to debate multiculturalism, it is now on the agenda along with everything else. I concur in the thought that this ministry needs to be rethought rather than reorganized.

When I spoke to amendments to the bill I talked about the dozens of agencies and organizations that answer to the Ministry of Canadian Heritage. They range from the CBC to the museums and multicultural programs. I cannot help but wonder if many of these institutions could better serve Canadians from the private sector or whether they should have their funding reduced or eliminated altogether. Perhaps their functions could be better performed within other departments and under other ministries.

For example, I believe we could seriously consider cutting all the funding to institutions such as the status of women in Canada and, as I mentioned earlier, multicultural grants.

Another area where federal spending is unnecessary is on official languages. Why do we need an official languages commissioner? By making this a responsibility of the provinces and private organizations, more relevant service can be delivered with considerable savings to the federal treasury.

Under the Department of Canadian Heritage we have a National Battlefields Commission. I am sure that the forming of that is necessary, but perhaps it could fall under the jurisdiction of the defence department if there was no Canadian heritage ministry.

Then we have the Race Relations Foundation. It sounds like perhaps there may be some justification in that. It is hard to say but if there is perhaps that would fit under justice. Certainly it seems odd that we would want to indicate that race relations were part of our Canadian heritage. It almost has a negative connotation. It is not something we want to be part of our heritage but if there is a problem, it is something we want to fix.

The Public Service Commission might more appropriately fall under the jurisdiction of the Treasury Board.

(1705)

There are perhaps some things we should do with the CBC. If you asked the average Canadian what they saw as the most outstanding example of Canadian heritage I wonder whether they might talk about our people and the qualities of our people, or whether they might talk about our environment and the wonderful land that we have. I doubt very many would point to the CBC, especially to Telefilm Canada and the National Film Board, which certainly could be merged and probably privatized at a great reduction in cost to Canadian taxpayers.

I hate to even mention this because it has been mentioned so many times, but the museums are funded by the Department of Canadian Heritage. I wonder if they could not possibly be privatized as well. Maybe then the people that enjoy these museums would find things that would cause them to want to come to the museum rather than be disturbed by what they saw in some of these museums. It certainly would eliminate some of the boondoggles like the current museum being built in the Prime Minister's riding, I would add again, at great cost to the taxpayers and a study indicating that this thing is doomed to failure.

We find that after thoroughly and objectively reviewing all of the current responsibilities of the agencies of the Minister of Canadian Heritage that this minister may not be required at all. It is possible that once all the unnecessary or obsolete spending is removed there will not be enough left to justify a ministry at all. Perhaps the remaining justifiable responsibilities could be provided by other ministries. We believe that this would provide some savings to Canadian taxpayers.

I will take just a couple of minutes in wrapping up to indicate what they might be. There could be one less car and driver for a minister. There could be one less big office with minister's staff. There could be one less multimillion dollar MP pension plan to pay out, topped up by taxpayers. There would be less chance of letters of intervention to the CRTC if we removed the Minister



*Government Orders*

of Canadian Heritage. There would be less chance of conflict of interest. The smaller the cabinet the less chance there would be of conflict of interest. There would be one less typical Liberal bigwig to worry about.

I close by again saying let us rethink whether we even need a Department of Canadian Heritage, whether we would be better off in this country and have a better heritage if we had no Minister of Canadian Heritage. Let us rethink this whole thing rather than reorganize it.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval-Centre, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the reorganization proposed in Bill C-53 to make the Department of Canadian Heritage a promoter of Canadian culture from coast to coast is in fact a direct attack by the federal government on Quebec's specificity, in terms of its culture, language and cultural institutions.

This is evidenced by the inclusion of the Canadian culture in Canada's new foreign policy and it demonstrates once again the growing desire of the federal government to marginalize Quebec's specificity by imposing an all encompassing Canadian multiculturalism. This desire was very clearly expressed by the Minister of Canadian Heritage in his speech on Bill C-53, when he said: "We hope to rally the mighty forces of multiculturalism behind a cultural identity that is uniquely Canadian".

The objective is clear. Since the only references made in that speech to French culture in Canada concern the official languages and TV5, we have to conclude that the government feels it must absolutely manage to bring not only Quebec culture but also native culture into the supposedly ideal context of multiculturalism, considering the ever present and ever powerful American culture.

In such a context, you can easily imagine that the Official Opposition feels it would be suicidal to support Bill C-53.

In spite of the noble statements made by the minister, a man of letters if there ever was, how can the Canadian Parliament not be concerned to see today's culture, including our authors and creative artists—what I would call heritage in the making—be considered like an industry such as steel, footwear or poultry?

(1710)

For example, who will have the last word on the review of the Copyright Act? The Minister of Industry or the Minister of Canadian Heritage? Chances are that the Minister of Industry will keep the powers already vested in him, since nothing in Bill

C-53 clearly states how responsibilities are to be divided between the two departments.

Here is another example that should ring an alarm bell in this House. Thanks to the information highway, communications will soon reach a speed of Mach 2. Is it reasonable to reduce the whole issue to the marketing of fibre optics?

Yet, that is the conclusion we must reach since the Minister of Industry will be the one in charge. They are thus refusing to admit that the major technological revolution generated by the information highway will no doubt transform global culture quickly and dramatically.

It is often said that war is too serious to be left to generals. Could it be that a society's culture is too precious to be left to technocrats and businessmen?

I think that Quebec culture is too precious to be left in the hands of the federal government. The state of Quebec must be the only authority responsible for Quebec culture.

Quebec's historical demands in the field of culture have always been based on the recognition of its specific identity and on the desire of the Quebec government to be the only one in charge of promoting and defending Quebec culture. Examples of this political will are not lacking. In 1966, at a meeting on Canada's tax system, Premier Johnson said that Quebec must be the master of its decisions concerning cultural development.

In 1969, Premier Bertrand said that cultural affairs were in Quebec's jurisdiction. In 1973, under Robert Bourassa, Quebec wanted to take back control of all cultural policy, including the federal funding for it. In 1976, Quebec proposed that each province alone legislate on issues concerning the arts, literature and cultural heritage.

More recently, in 1991, the Bélanger-Campeau Commission mentioned the need for Quebec to have exclusive jurisdiction and responsibility for social, economic and cultural development. The same year, the Arpin Report, commissioned by the Quebec government at that time, said this: "We can conclude that overlap between the two levels of government clearly exists in terms of structures, programs, target groups and even legislation and fiscal measures. . . Harmonizing the action of the two levels of government has always been difficult. The federal government never wanted to recognize Quebec's precedence in cultural affairs".

For more than thirty years, the federal government, on the strength of its spending power, has meddled without any scruples in culture. The purpose of these incursions was clearly to downplay the impact of Quebec culture. The result has been to

*Government Orders*

promote duplication and overlap, while making the arts community dependent on federal largesse.

The federal cultural offensive reflected in Bill C-53 is only the tip of the iceberg. Consider the report of the Special Joint Committee reviewing Canadian Foreign Policy, which confirms Ottawa's resolve to subject Quebec culture to federal standards.

The dissenting report tabled by the Official Opposition condemns this attempt by the federal government to dilute Quebec's distinct identity by stirring it into a Canadian sauce of bilingualism and multiculturalism. Clearly, the sauce makes the dish.

The Official Opposition maintains, and I quote: "Where culture is concerned, the direction of Canada's foreign policy, as prescribed in the majority report, is based on the theory of a single nation, one single culture (so-called Canadian culture), and the resulting requirement that all the provinces must have equal status".

(1715)

To the Official Opposition, it is clear that "the principles of bilingualism and multiculturalism, which form the political bases for defining so-called Canadian culture, have the effect of denying the existence of Quebec culture, which is original and which developed essentially from its French origins, with contributions from the British, the aboriginal peoples and, more recently, the various immigrant communities".

Quebec will never let its culture be beholden to the federal government. The Official Opposition vigorously condemns this blatant attempt to make Quebec subject to federal dictates.

[*English*]

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to address Bill C-53 once again. It is my pleasure to talk about the various aspects of the Department of Canadian Heritage and to suggest that what is really needed when we talk about this department is not just a superficial streamlining of the department but a complete overhaul starting with many of the departments that reside within the Department of Canadian Heritage, including specifically departments like multiculturalism, the Canada Council, the National Film Board, status of women, CBC and many more.

Let me talk about some of these different departments on an individual basis and suggest that in some cases we could do completely without them.

Let me talk first about the department of multiculturalism, something many Reformers have talked about already. Hon. members from across the way have suggested that if there were not a department of multiculturalism somehow there would be no multicultural diversity in Canada. That is a crazy notion.

I remind members across the way that when we settled the west in this country we had cultures from all over the place. We did not need a department of multiculturalism. Those people had their own cultures, they preserved them with their own money,

which is a new concept for Liberals. It is something that is still done today. People do not need the government to tell them they need to preserve their culture. They will preserve their culture if they see fit with their own funds. That is what makes sense to most Canadians.

For some reason this government has decided that some cultures are more deserving than others, that there should be a list of priorities in terms of cultures and that some groups should get money and others should be shut out. I think that is very divisive.

I point out to the members across the way who have often said that Reformers offer no solutions on cutting spending, here is an area where we can cut spending, something like \$21 million. We could cut it today, I would argue, and most Canadians would be very much in favour of it.

I want to talk for a moment about some of the other problems with the department of multiculturalism. A minute ago I said that sometimes I think having a department of multiculturalism creates division. As an extension of that, not all behaviours are equal. Some cultures advocate types of behaviours that are clearly not supported by most Canadians. For instance, some cultures suggest that women should be somehow subservient and that they should play a lesser role. I do not agree with that.

I think when we start to fund cultures and give people money to support cultures, it stops what has become a standard in Canada, sort of an ethical or moral standard from spreading into these other cultures where sometimes they do not treat people with respect on the basis of gender. That is something I very much oppose and I hope the government across the way would oppose as well. We can make the argument that the department of multiculturalism has outlived its usefulness.

I would also argue that when we see things like what the justice minister proposed on the weekend or what came out of his department, that there be something like a culture defence in law, I think we can see the danger of this whole attitude toward setting up special status for certain cultures and what it can lead to, possibly opening up a Pandora's box.

(1720)

Thankfully Reformers were on guard for Canadians and quizzed the minister about this immediately. He backed away from it, and well he should have.

It is not because they saw this was flawed from the outset. It was only because Reformers jumped up, raised the point and forced the minister to back down and hopefully we will always be there to do that.

In the meantime we would certainly encourage the government members across the way to take another look at this whole department of multiculturalism and to acknowledge that this approach to governing can lead to division, can lead to some of these strange ideas in the justice system.

*Government Orders*

Another departmental organization that should be looked at in the Department of Canadian Heritage is the Canada Council. The Canada Council provides grants for all kinds of Canadian artists and people who should be and would be producing art anyway. We spend tens of millions of dollars through the Canada Council every year to pay people to produce what they at Canada Council call art.

I would argue that before there was a Canada Council and in spite of the Canada Council people still create art. I know in my own riding there are many people who are painters, writers, who are thrilled to try to produce art not because they get paid to do it but because it is a creative impulse that they have. In order to satisfy that impulse they produce art and all of society is enriched for it.

What I really like about it is taxpayers are not expected to pay for it. They are not expected to either fund the artist or to buy the art. Contrast that with the Canada Council where we have tens of millions of dollars going to publishers so that they can produce books from writers who are also funded and then of course they sit on shelves forever. I read a book actually that was funded by the Canada Council about the abuses in the Canada Council, believe it or not. It is a great irony that it is almost impossible to write a book in this country without it being funded by the Canada Council because those funds go directly to Canadian publishers. That is one of the strange ironies.

This particular writer talked about a warehouse being devoted to all these volumes of Canadian literature that people simply would not buy. They could not even give it away.

When they proposed to send packages of Canadian literature around to schools, even to prisons, they were rejected. I suspect rightfully so because at the end of the day beauty is in the eye of the beholder and people have to make these judgments for themselves.

I think that is the best argument of all for not having an organization like the Canada Council that completely distorts the marketplace and really cheapens the product because many very good Canadian writers are lumped together with the ones who are not very good. In the eyes of people who try to follow this they get a jaundiced view of Canadian culture because so much stuff comes out that is not good. It is funded by the government and people get a jaundiced view and at some point say perhaps all Canadian culture is not very good. That is very unfortunate. There is a lot of good stuff out there. Because of organizations like the Canada Council people get a prejudiced view of what we can produce in this country. That is very unfortunate.

Another institution that causes people to wonder about the government's spending of tax dollars is the National Film Board. My colleagues from the Reform Party in this House have raised the issue of a series of videos funded by the National Film Board on lesbian love. They were restricted videos, ones that contained very explicit scenes. This causes us to pause and wonder whether this government is serious really about cutting spending at all.

There are many millions of dollars spent by the National Film Board every year. Should there not be some strict guidelines that that say anything that is pornographic in nature or is x-rated should not be produced particularly with taxpayers' dollars when so many taxpayers would reject that?

(1725)

That is not what the Liberals think. It begs the larger question of whether there should even be a National Film Board. It seems to be largely unaccountable.

I would argue that many private producers of films would love to step in and provide films for schools as is done actually in the United States. I had a lady in my own riding who came to me and said she would like to show National Geographic films in the school. She wanted to know how she could go about getting the rights to them. As it turns out it actually offers these to schools for free. The National Geographic Society is a society that is funded by individuals, not by taxpayers. Why could that not happen in this country? I would argue very strongly that it could.

Let us talk for a moment about the department for the status of women also under the aegis of the Department of Canadian Heritage. One of the jobs it has it seems unfortunately is to fund private interests including the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, a group that is highly politicized, very narrow in its focus and absolutely and completely does not represent the views of all Canadian women no matter what it tells us. If it is so certain of its position, if it really does believe that it represents Canadian women then it should go to Canadian women and get its funding from them directly. I would absolutely support it in doing that.

At this point in this country when we are in such a terrible fiscal situation I encourage the government to take a look at the complete Department of Canadian Heritage to seriously evaluate whether we need great gobs of that department and to really finally get its fiscal house in order.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I realize I have only a few minutes. I have the pleasure to rise to speak for the second time on Bill C-53, An Act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage.

When I first spoke on this bill, I pointed out that this department was a “grab bag” with a hodge-podge of programs, as a result of dividing up responsibilities and bringing together parts of federal departments.

I also stressed the very relative political say of the Minister of Canadian Heritage as compared to the real power of the Minister of Industry who would hold the purse strings.

I ended my remarks by denouncing the fact that the existence of Quebec's culture was completely ignored since the bill was totally silent on it. And finally, I noted the unfair treatment given by management to the French network of the CBC as compared to its English counterpart, mentioning that many regional stations had to shut down.

In this respect, in a brief submitted to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, Mrs. France Dauphin, from the coalition for the defence of the French network of the CBC, raised a number of issues. For example, investment in programs per hour of broadcast time has increased by approximately \$7,000 as far as the English network is concerned, but only marginally in the case of the French network. In just five years, from 1987 to 1992, investment rose from \$30,500 to \$37,500 at the CBC while rising from \$17,500 to \$18,300 at SRC. In other words, a mere five per cent increase for the French network, as compared to a 20 per cent increase for the English network.

I want to go back to an important aspect of this bill, namely the sharing of responsibilities. In our opinion, this legislation reflects a firm desire to make this department a tool of promotion, if not propaganda, for Canadian multiculturalism.

As for the management of this new department, I agree with the comments made by the member for Calgary Southeast to the effect that there is no management strategy or plan. However, I would say that the Liberals are “seemingly” giving the Department of Canadian Heritage very extensive powers, and in that sense we have every reason to question the rather mysterious mandate of this new department.

For example, why maintain this artificial sharing of culture and communications technology? This dichotomy was created by the Conservatives with culture and the management of the cultural industry.

The fact is that the Minister of Canadian Heritage is only left with responsibility for cultural content, while the Minister of Industry is responsible for the means of communication. In other words, he is the one who has real control.

Moreover, the Minister of Industry managed to set up a consultative committee on the electronic highway. This is another example of overlapping, duplication and lack of co-ordination within the federal administration itself. The telecommunications and cable television industries are converging on this new department of Industry and this is a source of concern

### *Private Members' Business*

to us because it may have a bearing on the Canadian content, which falls under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

The fact is that real power over Canadian culture is in the hands of the Minister of Industry. Moreover, by granting the CRTC exclusive power to set the rules governing telecommunications in Canada, Ottawa downplays Quebec's interests and puts them on a par with those of the industry and consumer groups, which goes totally against Quebec's traditional claims.

Finally, let us not forget that Quebec was excluded from the broadcasting and cable television sector in 1974, and then the telephony sector in June 1993, at the expense of the CRTC which was granted extensive regulatory powers, thus confirming Ottawa's control over the whole telecommunications industry.

**The Deputy Speaker:** It being 5.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

### CITIZENSHIP ACT

**Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.)** moved that Bill C-249, an act to amend the Citizenship Act (right to citizenship), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

She said: Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for me to rise in the House today to speak on behalf of my private member's Bill C-249, an act to amend the Citizenship Act concerning the right to citizenship.

The bill amends the Citizenship Act so that a child who is born in Canada after December 31, 1994 will not have Canadian citizenship if at the time of his birth neither of his parents is a citizen or a permanent resident. However such a child will be granted citizenship when one of his parents becomes a citizen or a permanent resident and an application to that effect is made by the authorized person on behalf of the child.

This matter relates to concerns from my own constituency of Port Moody—Coquitlam and was further underlined in discussion as a member of the citizenship and immigration committee. Current events and policy descriptions made me increasingly aware of the weaknesses of and the necessity for change within the immigration system in Canada. Along with many other Canadians I can no longer passively accept the choices made for us by governments whose agenda for establishing policy in this area is dictated not by the realities of our country but too often by political and special interest agendas.

*Private Members' Business*

Canada's immigration and citizenship policies must work for the benefit of both the country and the new Canadian. It is of utmost importance that both interests be served. Policies that hurt the country hurt the future of all citizens of that country.

It is from this conviction that Reform's policy springs. In order for the country to best serve the interests of both new Canadians and the Canadian born, the economic needs of the country must be given highest priority when setting targets and policy for immigration. We must come down hard on criminal abuse and put the safety of the Canadian community as the uppermost priority. We must deal with the reality that Canada has one of the most open immigration policies in the western world, in fact all the world, and that very openness has led to some of the worst abuses.

Where does the issue of my private member's bill fit into all this? Because of our open and subsequently abused immigration policy, especially in the area of visitors' visas and refugee claimants, the pride of citizenship in Canada may be the casualty. We have developed a category of citizenship by convenience for those who can easily circumvent the system.

Visitors can take advantage of citizenship of convenience. They can arrive with the sole purpose of having their child born in Canada to have Canadian citizenship. On our present visitor applications no questions are asked about such medical conditions. Visitors can stay in Canada for up to six months and need only legitimize their stay by naming a contact they wish to visit, or even the fact they have travelled before and have not yet visited Canada. There is an agreement that they will not work and must guarantee that they will return to their home country.

(1735)

The system is established on the basis of trust and honesty and in turn Canada's hospitality has been abused. The possibility for an actual citizenship by birth industry becomes obvious where a fee for service is demanded for accommodations and arrangements for childbirth in Canada.

Under the present rules for a visitor who has a child born in Canada the child automatically becomes a Canadian citizen. Let us take, for example, the issue of the so-called passport babies reported in the Vancouver *Sun* in November 1993. They reported that the number of babies born to non-resident mothers in B.C. has been between 246 and 333 a year for the last three years according to B.C.'s vital statistics division. These numbers may be much higher as they do not take into account those maternity cases that only appear to be resident because of a B.C. address on their hospital records.

The Toronto *Sun* in January of this year reported that there were about 400 such births of non-residents last year in Canada. It reported that immigration officials find the trend disturbing and are now calling for changes to ensure the parent is either a

citizen or a landed immigrant. The United States and Britain are clamping down on the practice and are tightening up their citizenship laws. One immigration worker was quoted in the article as saying that it was like buying Canadian citizenship when these mothers came here for the sole purpose of having their children born here.

The potential for abuse is wide open on this issue. It concerns all of us who place pride of ownership in the citizenship we hold so dear. The citizenship of convenience is available to those who are able to afford it by personally paying the cost of \$1,500 a day for hospital coverage as well as the cost of staying in Canada for, say, a month previous to the birth. In other words Canadian citizenship can be bought for the price of \$30,000. Here is yet another privilege for the wealthy and their provision for the future of their children. Might I add it may not have been such a great coincidence that the first child born in Vancouver in 1994 was to a mother without any permanent status in Canada.

I conducted a telephone poll in my riding of Port Moody—Coquitlam this spring on the issue of whether or not legislation should be introduced. Over two-thirds of the respondents said that the act must be changed to stop this type of abuse and the trivializing of Canadian citizenship.

Why is it important that Canadian citizenship not be given out so freely? Why should those who are born here, regardless of their parents' status or their intention to stay in the country, be deemed Canadian? As I have examined the issue it has become increasingly clear to me that there are very real consequences that relate to the very rights and privileges of citizenship we as Canadians hold dear.

Citizenship should come not only with a list of rights. It should also come with responsibilities which help make us better citizens and our country one of the very best to live in. This sentiment was repeated time and time again in the spring of this year as the citizenship and immigration committee conducted hearings on possible amendments to the act. It was on my initiative that the committee pursued the issue of citizenship of convenience by birth, and the committee unanimously agreed with the proposals.

New Canadians seldom take their place in Canada for granted. The freedoms we enjoy and the wealth and beauty of the land should make us all uniquely proud to be Canadians, but the pride in the land comes from participation and shared responsibilities for the future of our families and our communities.

As another witness so eloquently put it, nationhood is built around shared values, a shared history, indeed a shared commitment to the country. This calls for responsible interaction and a commitment to being in this country. It is a willingness to become part of the community and to be committed to the pursuit of learning together what it takes to make the country great.

*Private Members' Business*

In the case of passport babies there is no commitment to the country and there is no fulfilment of the responsibilities of citizenship. There is no growing up in the country or understanding what it takes to be a good citizen. There is no commitment to the country until the child possibly chooses to return at, say, age 18. Is the original motive simply to sponsor their parents when they arrive? The whole essence of the intrinsic value of citizenship is rendered meaningless and in the long term society is not strengthened or furthered in its advancement in terms of the contribution of its members.

(1740)

Furthermore at any point in time as a citizen that child is entitled, after a minimal residency requirement, to complete medical coverage and full education rights as well as all other Canadian social programs. In the extreme case these children could grow up to a life of crime in their home country and then decide to come to Canada. Because of their birthright citizenship, there would be nothing we could do to prevent them from coming here even though it would be obvious they would not share the values or responsibilities we cherish.

For those whose parents use our freely given citizenship as only a means of security or convenience in the future there is no shared contract or demonstration that they are committed to our country. It is a convenient and easily obtained commodity for the future value it may hold. This is a flagrant abuse of the generous visitor system.

Preservation of the integrity of Canadian citizenship became part of another consideration within the refugee determination system. The complexity of the system in our country has led to abuse by those who make refugee claims as a means of circumventing the immigration system. We have created an inland refugee system in Canada where the process of determining the claim of status can take up to three or four years before a final decision is rendered. During that period life goes on and of course babies are born.

How can a rejected refugee claimant be asked to leave in a final determination when one or two children born here in Canada have citizenship? Those rendering the decision must take into account the fact that the children are Canadian and are entitled to all the accompanying rights and privileges of Canadian citizenship.

Let us examine for a moment the process so we can appreciate the factors that go into the delay that creates the dilemma. First, let us consider a bogus refugee claimant, an individual with absolutely no right to legal status but with intent to use the system. He or she is interviewed by a senior immigration officer to assess grounds for a claim. They are given at least one month to supply supporting data and more time is often requested.

Most would have no such original documentation with them so they must create it.

They are also entitled to legal representation. On request legal aid will be provided to them. At that stage those claimants who fall into predefined categories are given an expedited hearing. All applicants are provided with a scenario for the qualifying categories of expedited hearing. The claimants then can tailor their claim according to what the government has given them as an outline.

A full hearing is held for others. There is usually a two to three month wait before the hearing can be convened. To this point the claimant has usually been in Canada for at least six months. The hearing takes place before a two-member board and both must agree on a decision not to grant refugee status, that is only one member must be convinced to grant refugee status.

If the claim is rejected a written statement of reasons must be given and these reasons will be examined by the Federal Court of Appeal. If rejected by the Federal Court there is a further review by the department on humanitarian and compassionate grounds. The entire process can take two, three or even four years.

It is a fact that almost 80 per cent of refugee claimants eventually end up staying in Canada, even though only 35 per cent of claimants fit into the UN definition for convention refugee. Upon inquiry it seems impossible to garner data on how many of the 80 per cent are affected by the added consideration of having had children born in Canada.

It is unfortunate there are those who choose to abuse the very system designed to protect them. The vast majority of visitors and refugee applications are not seeking to use the present rules to their own end. The bill fully recognizes the need for provision for children born to bona fide participants in the due process of our refugee system. They will be fully recognized as citizens upon application after their parents have obtained their permanent status.

One consideration remains to be addressed. Some accommodation in law, perhaps through a simple amendment to the bill, is necessary to avoid a condition of statelessness for those born on Canadian soil. In conclusion, the present system that grants automatic citizenship to all those born in Canada regardless of their parents' residency status invites the intentional abuse of a shrinking and unpredictable world.

(1745)

Immigration should provide access to those who choose to strengthen the fabric of their new home. The value of our citizenship and the value of our great country will be the sum of the values and the sense of belonging of its proud and prosperous people.

*Private Members' Business*

The practice of citizenship of convenience of birth must be addressed by this House. To thus raise the integrity of our citizenship process is to impute added pride and purpose to all Canadians, past, present and future.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam indicated before the debate began that she wished to share her time. Approximately seven minutes remain in the hon. member's time but I do not see the member who was going to share this time with her. Shall the Chair assume the time is not going to be shared?

Very well, the hon. member for Mission—Coquitlam has roughly eight minutes.

**Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I might ask you to help me out a little and let me know when my conclusion time approaches so I can maybe finish the sentence I am speaking.

I rise today to speak in support of my friend's private member's bill which deals with the growing problem of people coming to Canada just in time to give birth, their babies therefore gaining Canadian citizenship.

This bill would eliminate the conferring of Canadian citizenship on the baby unless one of the parents became a Canadian citizen or a permanent resident of Canada and an application is made on behalf of the child for it to become a citizen. The automatic conferring of citizenship would cease.

When I first was made aware of the situation of people coming to Canada to occupy our maternity wards to have children and then go back to their country of origin, I thought this to be an unusual state of affairs. It could be argued that Canadians should be flattered that people from other countries thinking so highly of Canada and the benefits which flow from Canadian citizenship that they will actually come to Canada to give birth.

As well, I understand that in the majority of cases people who are doing this pay for the medical care they receive. Therefore, what is the harm? The health care system is compensated. We should be flattered that people from around the world want to give their babies Canadian citizenship. It is difficult to argue that this is a method to ensure that 18 years hence the child will sponsor his or her parents into Canada as immigrants because the child, now 18, is a Canadian citizen.

I suppose there is a good chance this would eventually happen. I do not think this is the most grievous flaw with the act as it is presently written. The Citizenship Act should be changed to that this practice of using Canada as a birth place of convenience stops. This practice should stop because to continue it is to make a mockery of the system we presently have in place by which people become Canadian citizens.

People come to Canada from all over the world. They come here for many reasons, but for the vast majority they come because Canada is a land of opportunity, a land of fairness and equality, a land where all are to be treated alike.

If this is true, and I believe it is, how do we reconcile the complicated procedure which immigrants and refugees have to go through to become Canadian citizens with the fact that a mother can come here for a few days, have a baby which automatically assumes Canadian citizenship and then leave? To my mind these two procedures cannot be reconciled and the latter must be eliminated.

Those who make a conscience decision to come to Canada and then to apply for Canadian citizenship do so because they have certain expectations about citizenship, what it is, what it means and what flows from it. These people understood what it means to be a Canadian citizen. They each must take an active part in building this country we all share.

A sense of being Canadian is something that can take time to develop. It means being part of a large family and as such it means assertion of certain rights and responsibilities that are based on our traditions and shared values.

Under the charter of rights there are certain guarantees that all Canadian citizens have: the right to vote in the federal and provincial elections, the right to be a candidate in federal and provincial elections, the right to enter, remain in or leave Canada, the right to earn a living and reside in any province, and minority language education rights.

Canadians also have other rights as citizens. They may have a Canadian passport. They may be considered first for some jobs. Along with these rights come responsibilities to strengthen our communities, participate in a political process, obey Canada's laws, eliminate discrimination and injustice, respect the rights of others, respect private and public property, care for Canada's heritage and support Canada's ideals.

(1750)

Canadian citizenship today is I believe about all of us as citizens participating fully and equally in our national life. It is about promoting our national symbols and values and building a Canada where all of us can feel at home.

It is my belief that those who practice active citizenship strengthen our democracy, our national identity and our sense of responsibility for Canada, strengthen our relations with another, improve the quality of our institutions, help us deal with society's problems.

The oath of Canadian citizenship is taken by many people every year. It is a solemn declaration which places responsibilities on the person who takes it. It can only be taken after the applicant meets the following standards: is at least 18 years old, is lawfully admitted to Canada for permanent residence, has

lived in Canada for a total of three years in the four years immediately before applying for citizenship, can speak one of Canada's official languages, has enough knowledge about Canada including the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, is not under deportation order or in prison, has not been convicted of an indictable offence within the last three years and is not considered a threat to the security of Canada.

Even after meeting these standards, an interview must be held by a citizen court judge. I therefore urge all members of the House to support the bill to end the standard by which citizenship is dealt with in Canada.

Citizenship in my opinion should be used as a vehicle to promote an active critical participation in public affairs on the part of Canadians. Passage of this bill will show the world how seriously we value Canadian citizenship and all the benefits that flow therefrom.

**Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I regard this private members' bill as a very serious bill and one on which I am very pleased to speak.

Yet I cannot help feel that I have heard from Cassandra's prophets of doom and gloom who see conspiracies under every bush. One would swear that our shores are about to be invaded by pregnant women, plotting to have their babies on Canadian soil so that these cunning infants can somehow steal their Canadian citizenship and thereby threaten our national security.

It is really surprising to hear what I regarded as a very serious private members' bill treated so flippantly and lightly. I am surprised at that and I am really disappointed. I just hope that this invasion is not imminent of these pregnant women.

During the election campaign our government called on Canadians to examine our policies in the red book, to look at what we consider to be our priorities and commitments as a party. They responded rather clearly coast to coast to coast in the endorsement that they gave to this party.

The Reform Party members opposite who are interrupting and do not want to hear this, that is fine but Canadians are looking for that new decorum they speak of and it is interesting that it does not apply when they are hearing ideas with which they disagree.

Be that as it may, we acknowledge the importance of building a nation in which citizens view themselves not as isolated individuals or rival interest groups but rather as a mutually supporting community. Fundamental to such a vision is the need to build a Canada based on mutually held privileges and obligations.

### *Private Members' Business*

It is difficult to promote the acquisition of Canadian citizenship without conveying a sense of the fundamental values that are inherent in that commitment.

At the present time our security is undergoing fundamental changes, serious changes. Canada is confronted with a variety of economic, cultural and social challenges and one of them is not this perceived invasion by pregnant women to have their babies on our shores.

We are faced with a serious need to integrate a population that is more culturally diverse than ever before into a society that is more complex than ever before.

As I said earlier today in this House, Canada is more than ever a polyglot nation. We draw from virtually every single culture in the world. The members on this side and the majority of Canadians regard that as one of our fundamental strengths, regard that as what it means to be Canadians, the essence of the Canadian identity.

It is not something to be feared, not something to be cut down and sliced down into a much more limited vision of what it means to be Canadian.

(1755)

We need to develop a clearer sense about what we can expect from our new citizens and what this nation has to offer. To achieve this we need new citizenship legislation. We agree with that. We need a new Citizenship Act that will reflect the times.

Within the year this government will introduce new comprehensive citizenship legislation. It will provide a blueprint for Canadian society as we enter the 21st century.

I agree with the hon. member that Canadian citizenship is precious but it is not something to be hoarded and hidden away in some sort of xenophobic fear of those people who want to come here from these other countries.

It is something that should never be taken for granted. Citizenship encompasses civic rights, duties and responsibilities. It means defining the principles underlying our citizenship and democracy, including equality of opportunity, informed participation, respect for the Canadian rule of law, non-violence and mutual respect.

Such a vital issue is not something to be tinkered with lightly. Frankly I fear that the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam is doing that. The hon. member spoke about not trivializing Canadian citizenship. Then I heard and could not believe the latitude that was taken in the remarks she made and the litany about the perceived refugee problems. I think we ought to be very careful not to lump in problems real or perceived around the issue of refugees with citizenship and granting citizenship to new-born babies. I was frankly surprised to hear those remarks.



*Private Members' Business*

One cannot and should not make changes to citizenship lightly in a bit by bit, chip away at it fashion. It is much too important to be done in that manner.

It would be premature in my view if not irresponsible for this House to pursue in isolation just one small aspect of the citizenship question at this time. It would seem that there are members in this House, thankfully not on this side, who are obsessed with these perceived problems, almost seeming to me at times to border on xenophobic fear of people coming here from other nations. I am surprised to hear that.

Despite the protests from the members opposite at this time I am very surprised to hear this initiative repeated time and again. Our government has undertaken a review process which will help us to create stronger, better and more efficient citizenship legislation. A new bill will soon be tabled.

I accept the fact that the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam probably means well in her initiative but it is at the wrong time, it is far too small in its scope and it is simply something that needs to be done in a more comprehensive way.

When this occurs the appropriate time will come to address this issue more fully in what I say must be a comprehensive, responsible manner.

[Translation]

**Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take part in this debate on Private Member's Bill C-249 to amend the Citizenship Act. The motion tabled on May 11, 1994, by the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam will ensure that a child born in Canada after December 31, 1994, will not have Canadian citizenship if, at the time of his birth, neither of his parents is a citizen or a permanent resident.

This issue was barely touched on in the consultation process carried out by the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration in June. At present, the Citizenship Act states that every person who is born in Canada is a citizen, except children of foreign diplomats and diplomatic staff. The existing Citizenship Act is 20 years old. It was not until November 1993 that the daily newspaper *Vancouver Sun* came up with figures on the number of children born in Canada to parents who were not permanent residents.

(1800)

No scientific study has been carried out on the issue yet. The story was based on information provided by nurses at Saint-Paul Hospital in Vancouver. It was reported that the majority of these children were born to parents originally from Hong Kong who wanted to become Canadian citizens. There was a lot of controversy about this news story in the Vancouver Chinese community, but community leaders dismissed the issue as a minor problem.

A Citizenship and Immigration official vaguely mentioned something about some 400 children having been born to foreign nationals in Canada in 1993 and not all of these births being used to secure a Canadian passport.

The Department of Citizenship and Immigration does not have any statistics on Canadian-born children whose parents are not citizens or residents of Canada. There is a very simple reason for that: birth registration is a provincial responsibility. The federal government has no authority in this area.

Is the bill proposed by the Reform Party based on exact figures showing a large-scale conspiracy from abroad, an endless flow of foreigners knowingly taking advantage of the Canadian government? Some parents are here legally, like students, temporary workers or refugee claimants.

[English]

Clearly the situation is not serious enough to call for radical changes to the law at this time. The motion aims at creating a new category of people living in Canada. Children born after December 31, 1994 whose parents are neither Canadian citizens nor permanent residents would not be given automatic citizenship.

[Translation]

One of the principles behind the Citizenship Act is that of *jus soli* or law of the soil. This fundamental principle is applied by most countries. The motion put forward by the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam rejects the territorial principle out of hand.

In my opinion, this bill reflects the biased feeling that immigrants abuse the system. However, it must be pointed out that Canadian-born children will grow up as Canadians and will not need language training or other reception services involving government expenditures. They will integrate more easily into the Quebec or Canadian community.

If this bill is adopted in its present form, a child born in Canada may run the risk of becoming stateless. According to article 3 of the Declaration of the Rights of the Child, proclaimed by the UN General Assembly on November 20, 1959, the child is entitled, from birth, to a name and a nationality. I stress the word nationality.

This motion will create a legal vacuum for these children. And this is supposed to be the International Year of the Family!

We know that visa officers in this country and in various Canadian embassies are very reluctant to issue tourist visas to pregnant women. So there are really no figures to support allegations of abuse in this respect.

I agree with the previous speaker who said there had been no invasions of pregnant women in Canada.

*Private Members' Business*

(1805)

*[English]*

The declaration of the rights of the child signed by Canada stipulates that children are in need of special protection and care, especially appropriate legal protection before and after birth. This country owes to our children the very best we can offer.

*[Translation]*

Governments must recognize these rights and ensure they are observed by passing the appropriate legislation. These rights shall apply to all children without exception and without distinction or discrimination on the basis of race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinions, national or social origin, income, birth or any other situation, whether it applies to the child itself or to its family. The child must grow up in an atmosphere of love and moral and material security.

The figures we have so far on children of non-residents born in Canada are very tentative and there have been no major problems. If there is any abuse, it is certainly minimal.

In any case, we will wait for the text of the bill to amend the present Citizenship Act which the minister has promised to table this fall, before we make a definitive statement. For the time being, I am against Bill C-249.

*[English]*

**Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand here and speak to Bill C-249 from my colleague on the other side of the House, the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam.

In doing my research starting yesterday in preparing myself to speak to this today at first blush I thought the bill had merit but on getting deeper into the subject material I discovered that it probably was premature. The bill before us today represents a very small fraction of a much larger debate concerning the direction which Canadian citizenship will take in the future.

Bill C-249 does draw our attention to the important citizenship questions which will be coming into play in the coming months and I agree there is a need for change in the way that Canada addresses its citizenship issues.

It is unfortunate that Bill C-249 does present an ad hoc approach to dealing with citizenship issues. Something as important as changes to the citizenship act should not be tinkered with one small piece at a time.

In April this government committed itself to the development of a new citizenship act. We recognize the need to amend the current legislation and we recognize that we must remove anomalies in access to citizenship and to reinforce citizenship integrity. Right now the key to reinforcing this integrity lies not in the introduction of an individual specific legislation, it rests

in the development of a broad citizenship strategy. We must have a clear sense of the direction we wish to take before we can even begin discussing the specifics.

We must develop a plan which reflects the will of the people. It must also encourage those seeking Canadian citizenship to obtain a knowledge of and commitment to this country. It must call for new citizens to become actively involved in community life. This is the essence of the government's approach. Yes, it will be a complicated process. It is a process we have already started and is one we are committed to seeing through.

A standing committee was formed in April to review ideas which would enhance the visibility and value of our citizenship. This group tabled its findings in June. I might add that the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam was a member of the standing committee that did produce the report "Canadian Citizenship: A Sense of Belonging".

The report on page 17 does state that it appears some women may be coming to Canada as visitors solely for the purpose of having their babies. However, the committee recognized that it was a very small problem and that children born in Canada should not automatically become permanent residents. In so concluding the committee considered testimony of those who supported this position.

(1810)

In this same report there are 28 recommendations of changes to the citizenship act. Of the 28 the one the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam mentions is number 12. It is one of the 28 recommendations in this booklet. The minister I believe will be tabling a new citizenship act in the new year and I think all of those 28 recommendations can be addressed and spoken to. It certainly will come before the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration at that time. This is probably when I changed my mind in that I think it is a bit of ad hockery to be dealing with this one particular aspect of this report.

These recommendations by no means stand alone forever. Ten months ago the Department of Citizenship and Immigration launched a process of consultation with Canadians. From February to September in town hall meetings and study groups thousands of Canadians told the government what they thought. More than 10,000 Canadians from communities across the country and from all sectors of the economy and society expressed their views on the important bonds between citizenship and immigration and how these values linked to form their visions of Canada in the next century.

We have heard from Canadians and we have already taken action. These consultations have been invaluable for several reasons. First, they have let us know how the Canadian people feel. Second and just as important, the consultations have prompted Canadians to reflect on their hopes and dreams concerning what it means to live in this great nation.

*Private Members' Business*

The government's citizenship legislation will seek to achieve a range of goals. It will strive to promote among all Canadians the exercise of civic rights by strengthening citizenship education and promotion. We must consider the mutual privileges and obligations ingrained in the relationship between Canadian citizens and our society.

A new citizenship act will also modernize the technical apparatus presently in use. Too many people who are currently entitled to become citizens and desperately want to are delayed by an administrative system which has become cumbersome and awkward. There are blockages in the system. There must be a better way.

Through consultation and thoughtful action we will find it. The minister has already decided that the new system will no longer include citizenship court judges. This duty will in future be performed by distinguished Canadians drawn from the ranks of the Order of Canada.

The issues discussed in Bill C-249 are important, far too important to be dealt with on such a basis. The standing committee has addressed the subject before us today. Recommendations have been made, but it would be premature to cut off one issue from the body of work done until it can be properly placed within the context of a comprehensive citizenship plan. Such a plan is being developed. Let us have the good sense to wait for it.

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, as the Reform Party's critic for citizenship and immigration I am very pleased to support the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam and her proposed changes to the citizenship act in Bill C-249.

I would like to begin by saying that this bill was tabled on May 4 of this year, almost two months before the committee's report was produced. When the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration was formed it was given five general goals to accomplish. Among them was the goal to find ways to enhance the value and visibility of Canadian citizenship.

During the committee's proceedings members of Parliament were told many times that the value of Canadian citizenship has become trivialized. As one witness said, to be a citizen of this wonderful country all you had to do was pass the tests, pay the taxes and that is it. Others expressed concerns over how Canadian citizenship has become little more than a convenient commodity for foreigners or an insurance policy that can be cashed in during times of trouble.

The committee heard stories of women coming to Canada for the sole reason of having their babies here. Under current Canadian law any child born in Canada is automatically granted Canadian citizenship without question. It would appear that the

word has spread around the world about this Canadian generosity.

(1815)

According to recent *Vancouver Sun* reports, upwards of 300 babies a year or more have been born in British Columbia over the past three years to non-residents. That is over 900 children in British Columbia alone. Some of these births were of course the result of unusual circumstances.

Hospital staff claim however that the vast majority of these babies were born to Hong Kong residents hoping to either queue hop into Canada or at the very least offer their child or themselves an insurance policy in case the transfer of Hong Kong from British to Chinese rule does not proceed smoothly.

In time these so called passport babies will be eligible for all the benefits that Canadian society has to offer: subsidized college and university schooling, access to social programs, job training programs, old age security, and on and on. All of this for people who may not have a single connection to this country aside from a piece of paper saying they were born in Canada.

As well, at the age of 19 these children will be able to sponsor their own parents into Canada even though the children themselves have spent little or no time in this country. This in my opinion amounts to little more than an insurance policy for the parents involved and makes a mockery of our citizenship.

I admit that the passport babies issue is a minor one, especially when compared to other issues in the Citizenship and Immigration portfolio. It is however an obvious loophole that is being abused and therefore must be closed.

I believe the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam has struck an excellent balance between taking a firm stand against abusers of the system and showing compassion for newborn children. She advocates that a child born in Canada will only be granted Canadian citizenship if at least one parent is either a permanent resident of this country or a Canadian citizen.

Parents such as these have clearly shown a commitment to Canada by becoming residents or citizens and should therefore be rewarded for this commitment by granting their children all the rights and privileges that come with citizenship.

Children born in Canada to refugee claimants will automatically receive their Canadian citizenship as soon as at least one of the parents becomes a permanent resident or a citizen. On the other hand passport babies will be required to take on the citizenship of their parents.

This bill if passed by Parliament will in my view have a two-sided effect. First, it will send a clear message to the rest of the world that Canada places a high value on its citizenship. For a newborn child to become a citizen, the family must show a strong commitment to Canada by striving to become residents or citizens. Such a commitment will be too strong for some and

*Private Members' Business*

will end both the flow of passport babies and the pursuit of Canadian citizenship to act as a child's or parent's personal insurance policy.

Second, it will send a clear message to Canadians that the federal government values citizenship and takes a firm stand on who can acquire it. Fewer Canadians than ever before I feel are viewing their citizenship as a valuable commodity.

The words Canadian citizen have been devalued because of many stories like this one of the passport babies and the flagrant abuse of citizenship requirements. This amendment would be a first step in restoring the value of citizenship to those who cherish it most, that is Canadians.

In closing, I wish to point out the consensus that I feel Bill C-249 holds within this House. The standing committee made these very same recommendations four months ago in its report "Canadian Citizenship, A Sense of Belonging". This report authored by an all-party committee unanimously recommended:

"Children born in Canada should be Canadian citizens only if one or both of their parents is a permanent resident or a Canadian citizen. Children born to a parent who has been recognized as a convention refugee or to a parent who is a refugee claimant subsequently recognized as a convention refugee by the Immigration and Refugee Board should automatically gain Canadian citizenship".

I must emphasize that these very recommendations were both endorsed by all members of the committee, Liberals, Reformers and members of the Bloc Quebecois, and are here in black and white in Bill C-249.

(1820)

Clearly the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam in drafting this bill has reflected the concerns held by Canadians as well as the thoughts and intents of the standing committee. I call on my fellow members of this House to listen to the Canadian people, set aside their partisan differences and support these very important amendments to the Citizenship Act.

**Mr. Stan Dromisky (Thunder Bay—Atikokan, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to address this House regarding Bill C-249, an act to amend the Citizenship Act, proposed by the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam.

We have before us the opportunity to address the process by which we confer citizenship upon new Canadians. Prior to addressing the specifics of the bill, I would like to speak briefly about the importance of the citizenship process. The integrity of this process must be protected because, as all members in this House are aware, it is considered a great honour to be a Canadian citizen. Canadian citizenship is renowned and respected world-

wide. In this regard we are admired for our tolerance and our fairness.

Despite this, we do have an understanding that there is a need for a reform of our Citizenship Act. The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration indicated on April 14 in this House that the time had come to introduce amendments to the 20-year old act:

We need a Citizenship Act that also ensures fairness and integrity, one that removes certain discriminatory aspects of current legislation, eliminates inconsistencies in the granting of Canadian citizenship and improves the process of acquiring that citizenship.

To attain this goal important steps have been taken such as the elimination of the role of citizenship judges and the introduction of significant administrative and regulatory changes aiming to expedite the process more efficiently such as increasing the daily number of hearings, establishing group hearings, extending business hours, et cetera. The termination of partisan judicial appointments was especially supported by many Canadians.

At the same time the minister also requested the standing committee to study our Citizenship Act and provide recommendations for improvements. Shortly thereafter in June the committee released its report entitled "Canadian Citizenship: A Sense of Belonging" which presented a series of recommendations.

Of particular relevance to the private member's bill up for debate today are three recommendations which have already been referred to, but I would like to paraphrase them. Children born in Canada should be Canadian citizens only if one or both of their parents is a permanent resident or Canadian citizen. Second, the provision should be made to ensure the above rule need not apply if its application could cause a person born in Canada to be stateless. Third, an exception to the first rule should provide that children born to a parent who is a successful refugee claimant should automatically gain Canadian citizenship.

In light of the above recommendations I feel compelled to point out some serious deficiencies in Bill C-249, the private member's bill being debated today. Although the basic principal of this bill has been agreed upon by the committee, the bill remains quite incomplete in that it has not addressed the latter two recommendations which I have just alluded to. Moreover, the danger exists that this bill can be employed as a vehicle for inciting unwarranted fear among Canadians by exaggerating statistically negligible abuses of the Canadian citizenship process.

A relevant example in this respect involved cases of foreign mothers, be they visitors or refugee claimants, who give birth to children on Canadian soil for the express purpose of attaining Canadian citizenship for their children. I should point out that I have been informed by the Department of Citizenship and

*Adjournment Debate*

Immigration there is no evidence to indicate we have a significant problem to this end as claimed by the Reform Party.

The committee concluded in this regard indicating in their report that passport babies, as this phenomena is affectionately referred to, does not appear to be a major problem. Nonetheless, the committee provided recommendations designed to prevent the possibility for abuse.

(1825)

We should all be very clear in this respect. The committee did by no means imply that a problem of any significance existed when it provided suggestions on how we might prevent the possibility of abuse. As such I caution members across the way that it is terribly irresponsible to initiate unwarranted anxieties based upon unsubstantiated claims.

Some members of the House appear prone to taking advantage of occasional and statistically insignificant occurrences and blowing them out of proportion to advance a political agenda. We have seen this many times.

As I alluded to earlier the member's bill is suspect in that it is incomplete. It appears to address a simple problem with a common sense solution. However we live in a complex world in which situations are precipitated by not one factor but often myriad variables which may not at first glance be readily apparent. Most problems require thoughtful and careful analysis and sometimes demand complex solutions to yield optimal and fair outcomes.

The bill is not well rounded nor fair because it has not considered certain scenarios. Although reflecting the essence of the committee's first recommendation found on page 17 of the committee's report, the bill fails to take into consideration the two accompanying recommendations which provide important exceptions to the first rule.

Let me elaborate in this regard. It would be ruthless and uncompassionate to deny children Canadian citizenship if they could not be granted citizenship from another country. We could not leave children in a predicament such that they would remain stateless. I am appalled that the member did not see fit to include this reasonable exception.

Furthermore, regardless of the hon. member's stated intent, the bill indicates very clearly or in no uncertain terms that the children of foreign mothers might gain citizenship only after one of the child's parents became permanent residents or citizens.

This poses a serious problem given that it does not take into account the case of successful refugee claimants who do not choose to seek permanent resident status or citizenship. Because accepted refugee claimants are not obliged to seek permanent

residents or citizenship, the possibility exists that their children would for all intents and purposes be denied citizenship.

I was most disappointed to note that there was absolutely no reference to the above two exceptions in the member's bill. I am confident that had a careful and in-depth analysis been conducted the contents of the bill would have been more complete and comprehensive.

Without an acknowledgement of these exceptions outlined by the committee, the essence of the hon. member's bill is rendered unfair and our citizenship process rendered incomplete. This is simply not the Canadian way.

In conclusion, Bill C-249, although commensurate with the general essence of the first recommendation on page 17 of the standing committee's report, remains incomplete to the point where it would render the citizenship process unjust and exclusionary. For the above reasons the amendment should be exposed for what it is, a vehicle for partisan gerrymandering.

On the bright side, in the near future the House can expect a comprehensive and fair reform of the Citizenship Act. I am confident that the revised act will prove well balanced and will seriously consider the recommendations presented in the June report of the standing committee.

In the meantime the Reform Party would better serve the interests of Canadians by contributing in a positive manner to the citizen reform process rather than dwell upon the—

[*Translation*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. The hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

[*English*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1) the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

---

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

### VETERANS AFFAIRS

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC):** Mr. Speaker, on July 10, I asked the Minister for National Defence and Veterans Affairs if he recognized that additional changes were needed to Bill C-84 and, if so, would he put these changes on the legislative agenda now as time for our merchant navy war veterans is running out. He stated that the Department of Veterans Affairs was working on reforms that would speed up the processing of veterans' claims. I agree with this. However it is not the only thing that the merchant navy war veterans require.

*Adjournment Debate*

(1830)

Bill C-84 is a complex bill which amends various war pension acts. By rejecting the principle of equality with war veterans, veterans affairs locked the merchant navy under a civilian act instead of including it under an amended War Veterans Allowance Act.

One solution to the inequities of Bill C-84 is a simple amendment to include the wartime merchant navy in the War Veterans Allowance Act.

The government has said that Bill C-84 is a good bill. I say it is a start. Some merchant seamen and their families are receiving some benefits and that is a positive step in the right direction. Unfortunately it is not as inclusive as it should be.

Bill C-84 is not satisfactory as it does not extend full veterans status to merchant navy veterans. Nor does it provide equal status to the full range of health, disability and income support benefits by the department.

This past March the deputy minister of Veterans Affairs who was involved in the 1992 act admitted at a House of Commons committee hearing that the act was not perfect and contradicted himself by saying he did not see a need for major change. As well, last Friday the Secretary of State for Veterans stated on a CBC program that all merchant navy veterans qualify for all veterans benefits, but this is not so.

After 50 years the present labour government in Australia has granted merchant mariners full benefits under its Veterans Entitlements Act. In granting them full benefits and equality the government has fully recognized the contribution merchant seafarers made in the defence of their country.

During the war Canadian merchant ships carried essential war materials needed for the war effort to succeed. The merchant navy was a constant target for German surface raiders and U-boats. It is no small wonder why they had the highest casualty ratio of any of the services with one seaman in ten being killed.

The current Deputy Prime Minister last week stated that Canada's merchant navy made the seas wholesome once again and kept open the gates of freedom.

After the war merchant navy veterans were officially civilians. They were not eligible for veterans benefits. We as a country have recognized the injustices against our merchant navy seamen and women. Why have we not compensated them adequately?

Last week the government moved closer to recognizing the war efforts of the merchant navy. First was the dedication of the *Book of Remembrance for the Merchant Navy War Dead*. The book is a lovely symbol of remembrance for the over 2,200 merchant navy seamen who died in both world wars. Second was

the participation of the merchant navy war veterans in the vice regal wreath laying ceremony which was agreed to by the legion.

The number of surviving merchant seamen and women is about 3,200 and their average age is 74 years. All they are seeking is equal status, treatment and access to benefits.

I am asking the Secretary of State for Veterans to start the changes to the legislation now so it can be put on the legislative agenda before it is too late. Time for our merchant navy veterans is running out. Let us once and for all fully recognize the merchant navy as the fourth arm of the armed services.

It is my hope that the parliamentary secretary will not just deal with the issue of pension reform which the Minister of National Defence addressed in his first answer. I am asking if he acknowledges that changes are necessary to Bill C-84 and, if not, why not and, if so, when will the reforms be initiated.

**Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for outlining the alleged shortcomings of the previous government's legislation. Perhaps to complete the irony in that remark, this government will certainly consider correcting any legal or technical flaws in the legislation.

I have personal knowledge of this subject because I was a member of the standing committee that fought for and won these benefits for merchant seamen. The real point is that the legislation is succeeding in doing what it was intended to do. Merchant navy veterans have the same access to veterans benefits as their military counterparts. They are eligible for disability pensions, war veterans allowance, the veterans independence program, long term care and veterans funeral and burial grants.

There is no veterans program currently available to military veterans that is not also available to merchant navy veterans.

Listening to the hon. member for Saint John this House would wonder if merchant navy veterans are receiving anything. They certainly are receiving all the benefits. In fact an estimated 2,000 merchant navy veterans and their dependants are receiving veterans benefits and that is certainly a long way from the theme suggested by the hon. member.

Having said that, the merchant navy representatives have identified several areas where they believe that legislation could be improved. The Secretary of State for Veterans met with the groups involved and their proposals are presently under review.

From this review changes with respect to the merchant navy veterans benefits will take the form of amendments that would be considered for inclusion in a general housekeeping bill. That kind of bill is put forward from time to time to modernize language and to address technical matters.

*Adjournment Debate*

The merchant navy representatives at this meeting were also asked to bring to the secretary's immediate attention any specific case where it appeared that benefits were being denied because of a shortcoming in the legislation. May I conclude by extending to the hon. member the same invitation. I thank her for her question.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Under Standing Order 38(5), the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. under Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6.36 p.m.)

---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Wednesday, November 16, 1994

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Computers for Schools

Mr. Arseneault ..... 7847

### Louis Riel

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) ..... 7847

### Barrie's North Collegiate Ski Team

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) ..... 7847

### Louis Riel

Mr. Duhamel ..... 7847

### Partners in Excellence Project

Mr. Cannis ..... 7848

### Deficit Bonds

Mrs. Kraft Sloan ..... 7848

### Social Program Reform

Mrs. Picard ..... 7848

### Canada Pension Plan

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yellowhead) ..... 7848

### Michel Bellemare

Mr. Bellemare ..... 7849

### Canadian Culture

Mr. O'Brien ..... 7849



**Regina Rams Football Team**

Mr. Collins ..... 7849

**Foreign Policy**

Mrs. Debien ..... 7849

**1995 Canada Winter Games**

Mr. Penson ..... 7849

**Post-Secondary Education**

Mr. Bhaduria ..... 7849

**Law of the Sea**

Mr. Wells ..... 7850

**Social Program Reform**

Mr. Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul) ..... 7850

**Post-Secondary Education**

Mr. Taylor ..... 7850

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Post-secondary Education**

Mr. Bouchard ..... 7850

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) ..... 7850

Mr. Bouchard ..... 7851

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) ..... 7851

Mr. Bouchard ..... 7851

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) ..... 7851

Mr. Dubé ..... 7851

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) ..... 7851

Mr. Dubé ..... 7851

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) ..... 7852

**Immigration and Refugee Board**

Mr. Manning ..... 7852

Mr. Marchi .....	7852
Mr. Manning .....	7852
Mr. Marchi .....	7852
Mr. Manning .....	7852
Mr. Marchi .....	7852

**Post–secondary Education**

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) .....	7853
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	7853
Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) .....	7853
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	7853
Mrs. Ablonczy .....	7853
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	7853
Mrs. Ablonczy .....	7854
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	7854

**Collège militaire royal de Saint–Jean**

Mr. Jacob .....	7854
Mr. Massé .....	7854
Mr. Jacob .....	7854
Mr. Massé .....	7854

**National Defence**

Mr. Harper (Calgary West) .....	7855
Mr. Collenette .....	7855
Mr. Harper (Calgary West) .....	7855
Mr. Collenette .....	7855

**Unemployment Insurance**

Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	7855
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	7855
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	7856
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	7856

**Post–secondary Education**

Mr. Cauchon .....	7856
-------------------	------

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) ..... 7856

**Private Medical Clinics**

Mr. Hill (Macleod) ..... 7856

Ms. Marleau ..... 7856

Mr. Hill (Macleod) ..... 7856

Ms. Marleau ..... 7856

**Fisheries**

Mr. Bernier (Gaspé) ..... 7857

Mr. Tobin ..... 7857

Mr. Bernier (Gaspé) ..... 7857

Mr. Tobin ..... 7857

**Alan Eagleson**

Mr. McClelland ..... 7857

Mr. Gray ..... 7857

Mr. McClelland ..... 7857

Mr. Gray ..... 7858

**Inglis Limited**

Mr. Peric ..... 7858

Mr. Manley ..... 7858

**Immigration**

Mr. Nunez ..... 7858

Mr. Marchi ..... 7858

**Government Expenditures**

Mr. Penson ..... 7858

Mr. Manley ..... 7858

**China**

Mr. Robinson ..... 7858

Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) ..... 7859

## **POINT OF ORDER**

### **Review of Canadian Foreign Policy**

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) .....	7859
Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier) .....	7860
Mr. Boudria .....	7860
Mr. Hermanson .....	7861
Mr. Milliken .....	7861
The Speaker .....	7862

## **ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

### **Order in Council appointments**

Mr. Milliken .....	7862
--------------------	------

### **Government Response to Petitions**

Mr. Milliken .....	7862
--------------------	------

### **40th Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference**

Mr. Speller .....	7862
-------------------	------

### **Committees of the House**

#### **Justice and Legal Affairs**

Mrs. Barnes .....	7862
Mrs. Venne .....	7862

### **Act to Revoke the Conviction of Louis David Riel**

Bill C-288. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted .....	7863
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	7863

### **Petitions**

#### **Ethanol**

Mr. Crawford .....	7863
--------------------	------

#### **Abortion**

Mr. Crawford .....	7863
--------------------	------

**Human Rights**

Mr. McGuire ..... 7863

**Euthanasia**

Mr. McGuire ..... 7863

**Abortion**

Mr. McGuire ..... 7864

**Justice**

Mr. Gilmour ..... 7864

**Assisted Suicide**

Mr. Williams ..... 7864

Mr. Wappel ..... 7864

**CRTC**

Mr. Wappel ..... 7864

**Abortion**

Mr. Wappel ..... 7864

**Questions on the Order Paper**

Mr. Milliken ..... 7864

**Motions for Papers**

Mr. Milliken ..... 7864

**The Late Hon. Eugène Marquis**

Mr. Langlois ..... 7864

Mr. Milliken ..... 7865

Mr. Hermanson ..... 7865

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Department of Canadian Heritage Act**

Bill C-53. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading ..... 7865

Mr. Adams .....	7865
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) .....	7867
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	7868
Mr. Collins .....	7870
Mr. Hanrahan .....	7871
Mr. O'Brien .....	7872
Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead) .....	7874
Mr. O'Reilly .....	7875
Mr. Hermanson .....	7876
Mrs. Dalphond—Guiral .....	7878
Mr. Solberg .....	7879
Mr. Daviault .....	7880

## **PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

### **Citizenship Act**

Bill C-249. Motion for second reading .....	7881
Mrs. Hayes .....	7881
Mrs. Jennings .....	7884
Mr. O'Brien .....	7885
Mr. Nunez .....	7886
Mrs. Gaffney .....	7887
Mr. Mayfield .....	7888
Mr. Dromisky .....	7889

## **ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

### **Veterans Affairs**

Mrs. Wayne .....	7890
Mr. Mifflin .....	7891

### **Appendix**