



House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 171

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, March 21, 1995

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, March 21, 1995

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO THE DEPLOYMENT OF CANADIAN FORCES IN SOMALIA

Hon. David Michael Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), and further to the commitment made in this House on November 17, 1994, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, an order in council establishing the commission of inquiry as to the deployment of the Canadian Forces to Somalia.

[English]

This is an order in council establishing the commission of inquiry as to the deployment of the Canadian forces to Somalia.

* * *

CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to section 61(3) of the Canadian Human Rights Act and Standing Order 32(2), I am pleased to table, in both official languages, le rapport annuel de la Commission des droits humains for the year 1994 for referral to the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons.

* * *

(1005)

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 32 petitions.

[Translation]

MAINTENANCE OF RAILWAY OPERATIONS ACT, 1995

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Labour, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-77, an act to provide for the maintenance of railway operations and subsidiary services.

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

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): When shall the bill be read the second time? Later this day?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): At the next sitting of the House.

* * *

[English]

RAIL STRIKE

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I seek the unanimous consent of the House for the following order. I move:

That notwithstanding any standing order, immediately after the completion of Private Members' Business on this day, the House shall revert to Government Orders for the purpose of considering Bill C-77, an act to provide for the maintenance of railway operations and subsidiary services at the second reading stage, in committee of the whole, at the report stage and at the third reading stage, provided that the House shall not adjourn this day except pursuant to a motion by a minister of the crown.

In light of the substantial losses being suffered in the Canadian economy as a result of this rail strike, it is appropriate that the House deal with this motion. I seek consent to put it to the House today.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Does the hon. parliamentary secretary have the unanimous consent of the House to table the motion?

Mr. Dupeppe: Madam Speaker, I must say no. We proposed amendments to the government. Had it accepted them, we would

Routine Proceedings

have had all three readings today. However, given its refusal, I must withhold our party's consent.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): We therefore do not have unanimous consent.

[*English*]

Mr. Hermanson: Madam Speaker, I want to make it clear that the Reform caucus is not part of the opposition's response. We support the speedy passage of legislation to end the rail strike given its drastic consequences for the Canadian economy.

* * *

PETITIONS

DANGEROUS OFFENDERS

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present today a petition on behalf of the citizens of Calgary asking that dangerous offenders be ineligible for parole until their full sentence has been served.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, it is my duty and honour to rise in the House to present a petition duly certified by the clerk of petitions on behalf of 43 individuals from Ontario.

The petitioners request that Parliament at the earliest possible time initiate a wide ranging public inquiry replacing many being convened piecemeal into the Canadian Armed Forces, including reserves which will investigate, report and make recommendations on all matters affecting its operations, tasking, resources, effectiveness, morale and welfare.

(1010)

BILL C-240

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I have a second petition to present on behalf of 57 constituents of Saanich—Gulf Islands and surrounding area, again duly certified by the clerk of petitions.

The petitioners call on Parliament to enact legislation against serious personal injury crimes being committed by high risk offenders by permitting the use of post sentence detention orders and specifically by passing Bill C-240.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have three sets of petitions on related matters, but the petitions are different.

The first one says that because of the inclusion of sexual orientation in the Canadian Human Rights Act, it will provide certain groups with special status, rights and privileges; that because the inclusion will infringe on the historic rights of Canadians such as freedom of religion, conscience, expression

and association, therefore the petitioners call on Parliament to oppose any amendments to the Canadian Human Rights Act or to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms which would provide for the inclusion of the phrase sexual orientation.

* * *

BILL C-41

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Madam Speaker, this is the second petition on a related matter.

It says whereas the majority of Canadians believe everyone currently has equal status under the law and whereas Bill C-41, section 718.2, would give special provisions based on sexual orientation, therefore the petitioners pray and request that Parliament not pass Bill C-41 with section 718.2 as presently written and that in any event, it not include the undefined phrase "sexual orientation", as the behaviour people engage in does not warrant special consideration under Canadian law.

DISCRIMINATION

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the last petition I have states that the undersigned residents of Canada draw to the attention of the House of Commons that members of Parliament have recently made hateful comments which contribute to the climate of intolerance, fear and violence for lesbian, gay and bisexual Canadians; that more than 80 per cent of Canadians believe that gay men, lesbians and bisexuals are subject to discrimination and that many gay and lesbian Canadians have been harassed, beaten or even murdered in violent expression of this discrimination; and that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees everyone equal rights.

Therefore, the petitioners call on Parliament to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to protect individuals from discrimination based on sexual orientation.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present the following three petitions from my constituents of Comox—Alberni.

The first petition contains 780 signatures and calls on Parliament not to enact any further firearms control legislation, regulations or orders in council.

The second petition comes from constituents all across British Columbia and contains 454 signatures. It requests that Parliament refuse to accept the justice minister's anti-firearms proposals and insist that he bring forward legislation to convict and punish criminals rather than persecute the innocent.

JUSTICE

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Madam Speaker, this last petition comes from across Canada and contains 550 signatures.

Supply

The petitioners request that in memory of Dawn Shaw, a six-year-old girl who was murdered in my riding of Comox—Alberni, that 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. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to present a petition to Parliament calling on the House of Commons to ensure that the present provisions in the Criminal Code prohibiting assisted suicide be enforced vigorously and that Parliament make no changes in the law that would sanction or would allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

(1015)

[Translation]

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—FUNDING OF CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ) moved:

That the House condemn the government for the refusal by the Minister of Canadian Heritage to publish the government's decisions concerning funding for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) for the next three years, thus causing an ominous threat to loom over the CBC's French-language network.

She said: Madam Speaker, today's debate will be on the following motion, which I am submitting to this House with the support of my colleague from Mercier:

That the House condemn the government for the refusal by the Minister of Canadian Heritage to publish the government's decisions concerning funding for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) for the next three years, thus causing an ominous threat to loom over the CBC's French-language network.

This motion has become necessary because of the Canadian heritage minister's refusal to be open and confirm the information his deputy minister gave the President of the CBC on the day the budget was tabled in this House. According to this information, in the next three years, the CBC will have to absorb some \$350 million in cuts, despite this government's formal and oft-repeated commitment to stable multi-year financing for the CBC.

This lack of openness on the part of the minister and this stubborn denial of the facts show contempt for CBC employees. They create a climate of insecurity which can only harm our TV network. That is why our motion today condemns the minister for not disclosing all the cuts planned at the CBC. This course of conduct is also being denounced by the francophone press.

For those who know how to read and listen, the government had made clear commitments to the CBC. On October 4, 1993, the Canadian Conference of the Arts distributed a questionnaire aimed at finding out the main political parties' respective positions on culture and communications. The Liberal Party of Canada responded as follows: "By slashing funding for national institutions like the CBC, the Canada Council, the National Film Board and Telefilm Canada, the Tories have done great harm and shown how little they care about cultural development. Their savage cuts will hurt the next generation of performers, reduce the number of writers, composers, dancers and other creative artists, and undermine our cultural production. The development of our cultural organizations will be stunted. Cultural life outside the major cities will decline. In short, our country will weaken to the point that it will have to fulfil its cultural aspirations with foreign products".

The Liberal Party went on to say: "A Liberal government will be committed to stable multi-year financing for our national institutions".

This was the first firm commitment the Liberal Party made during the election campaign and it was reiterated in the red book, which says: "Canada needs more than ever to commit itself to cultural development. Instead, the Conservative regime has deliberately undermined our national cultural institutions. Funding cuts to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the Canada Council, the National Film Board, Telefilm Canada and other institutions illustrate the Tories' failure to appreciate the importance of cultural development".

After this impressive illustration of Tories' failures, the Liberals go on to state in their red book that they "will be committed to stable multiyear financing for national cultural institutions such as the Canada Council and the CBC. This will allow national cultural institutions to plan effectively".

Almost as soon as he took office, the minister claimed to be a friend of the CBC. On February 3, 1994, he announced the appointment of Anthony Manera at the head of the CBC. In a letter to Mr. Manera and in the press release he issued at the

Supply

time, he stated his firm intention, as government member, not to impose further cuts to the CBC.

(1020)

By the end of the fall, the word was that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation would not escape the finance minister's bistoury. However, to Mr. Manera everything still appeared to be clear. Testifying before the heritage committee during the hearings on the CBC, Mr. Manera maintained that the Minister of Canadian Heritage had indeed promised him that the CBC would continue to receive multiyear funding. In his mind, the heritage minister's commitment was firm and unequivocal.

On that occasion, the hon. member for Richelieu asked Mr. Manera: "When you took the position, did you have a solemn commitment from the government to maintain that financing on a stable basis for a certain period, which is for five years starting with the 1994-95 budget? Did you have a commitment of that sort, before taking the plunge, with such a vision of the CBC?" And Mr. Manera said, directing his answer to the chairman of our committee: "Mr. Chairman, the answer is yes".

But now it would seem that all of us misunderstood, starting with Mr. Manera.

On January 25, the Minister of Canadian Heritage was reported by the Canadian Press as stating that anyone who understood that there would be no cuts to the CBC misunderstood him.

I am quoting from a Canadian Press article. It says the heritage minister did not rule out further cuts to the CBC, saying that the government had never promised that the corporation would be spared in the upcoming budget. The federal plan announced last year to stabilize CBC finances should not be seen as a pledge to keep the broadcaster's budget at current levels, said Mr. Dupuy. He added, and I quote: "If it was interpreted as freezing the situation, it was the wrong interpretation".

Oh, dear. Then everyone who read the Liberal Party's response to the Canadian Conference of the Arts was mistaken. Then, we all misinterpreted what was written in the red book, the press release and the letter signed by the Minister of Canadian Heritage, the last two which were issued to the press on February 4 and in which the minister firmly committed himself to maintaining CBC's funding.

The budget confirmed what the minister had been hinting at. The budget plan tabled in the House on February 27 announced that the CBC's budget for the next fiscal year would be cut by 4 per cent, which translates into \$44 million.

The budget plan also stated that, over the next three years, the government would be cutting \$676 million from the budget for funding crown corporations which fall under the Department of Canadian Heritage's mandate. The same day, the deputy minis-

ter sent the CBC president an information brief on the breakdown of the \$676 million in cuts. The table in the brief clearly showed that the CBC would have to absorb \$44 million in cuts for 1995-96, \$97 million in 1996-97 and \$165 million in 1997-98. Unprecedented cuts, even under the Conservatives.

The \$15 million which the Department of Foreign Affairs used to pay each year to fund Radio Canada International should also be added to the cuts, because the corporation will now have to pay it. The president had already stated that he would not preside over the crown corporation's demise, so he resigned.

What did the Minister of Canadian Heritage do to support his president? Nothing. He merely said that Mr. Manera was aware of the cuts and even added that Mr. Manera had informed him that he intended to resign a few weeks earlier. One day he stated that the only figures which his deputy had given to Mr. Manera were those contained in the budget; the next, he said the opposite. He admitted that Mr. Manera had obtained documents on program review.

These documents show that the government plans to cut the CBC's budget by more than \$300 million over the next three years. Mr. Manera did his homework, he let the public know about it, and then, he resigned.

(1025)

That was on February 28. On March 15, in the afternoon, it was the turn of the vice president of the French TV network. Meeting first with her staff and then with the press, Mrs. Fortin, in a presentation which was exceptional, I must say, insisted on setting the record straight for her employees. Seven hundred and fifty positions will be abolished on the French television network of the CBC, since it will be losing \$60 million over three years as a result of the cuts agreed to by the heritage minister.

What will be the consequences of these cuts? Well, there will be fewer cultural productions, fewer in-house productions, fewer television serials and less Canadian content, and all this in the age of the information highway. However, the heritage minister continues to pussyfoot around. No, there are no other cuts than the ones announced in the budget; no, the CBC did not inform him of any layoffs. In an editorial published in *La Presse*, editorialist Pierre Gravel talks about the lack of openness on the part of the heritage minister, and I quote: "Instead of being straightforward and behaving like a minister conscious of the seriousness of the issues, Mr. Dupuy only answered with a metaphor, in very poor taste, about the fact that when you let the ewe out of the barn, it comes and relieves itself on your doorstep".

Yet, the budget mentions \$676 million in cuts to the crown corporations which come under Heritage Canada, namely the CBC, Telefilm Canada and the National Film Board. Mr. Manera did, in fact, receive a letter from the minister, and the minister

now admits that under the program review a plan for cuts was indeed produced. We are now used to the pussyfooting of the Minister of Canadian Heritage. Chantal Hébert, a reporter with *La Presse*, mentioned it in an article entitled: "The variable time of Minister Dupuy". His controversial statements have become his trademark.

In an article published on March 4, Mrs. Hébert said that, in the case we are dealing with, the minister "sent smoke signals in all directions, and gave as many different interpretations of events as there are days in the week. His public declarations contradicted the outgoing president, his top civil servants and what he himself has said unequivocally on the same issue". While the heritage minister is getting ready to drastically cut parliamentary appropriations to CBC-SRC through the back door, the chairman of the Canadian heritage committee, the member for Don Valley West, is appearing on the front porch, ready to talk.

He appeared twice on "Le Point médias", on Radio-Canada; he has appeared on CBC "Prime Time"; he is appearing on any possible forum available to him, more often than not replacing a heritage minister who would rather stay silent. And what is our heritage committee chairman saying on all these forums? He is saying that the future of CBC-SRC lies in a formula somewhat similar to PBS, in the United States, an under-financed public network which, according to Madeleine Poulin, of "Le Point médias", reaches only one per cent of the population.

Of course, he says, somewhat reluctantly—since he is after all a man of culture—, that French television is slightly different from English television because, as he told "Le Point médias", the Quebec environment is not yet a multi-channel one. The member for Don Valley-West was clearly implying that Quebec was slightly behind the rest of Canada, because fewer viewers have cable, but that it is only a matter of time before we are engulfed in the multi-channel universe. After all, he said, we already have TV5, and, to a degree, we are already being invaded by French-speaking European television.

It is not a coincidence if the committee chairman is displaying in such a manner his personal feelings on public broadcasting. We feel that he has been given a mission. He is preparing public opinion for a radical shift in policies regarding Canadian public broadcasting.

(1030)

In the guise of sharing his personal opinion, the chairman of the committee is revealing to us the views of his government and is preparing us accordingly. Make no mistake: public television for the Liberal government amounts to a Canadian version of PBS.

This vision is perhaps fine for English Canada, which in any event seems to be having quite a bit of difficulty finding a niche in the multi-channel universe, as the committee chairman so

Supply

eloquently put it. But this vision is completely wrong where French television and Radio-Canada in particular are concerned.

And that, furthermore, is what Radio-Canada, TVA, the Union des artistes, the Guilde des musiciens and the Association des producteurs de films et de télévision du Québec had to say at the information highway hearings now being held by the CRTC. In the present multi-channel universe, French television occupies a generalist niche, and this is not just some theory, but hard reality.

Of the 50 most popular French-language television productions in Canada, 47 are produced here in Quebec, where we are just as exposed to the multi-channel universe as our English-speaking cousins in Toronto. Radio-Canada reached 3.9 million viewers last February 5 with the independently produced *made in Québec*.

Knowing that French television is under-funded compared to its English counterpart, one wonders what we could achieve if we were on the same financial footing as the English arm of the CBC.

A recent poll by Som-Radio-Québec revealed that 53 per cent of Quebecers opposed cuts to the CBC, and 7 per cent thought there should be an increase in its parliamentary votes. Perhaps the fact that 60 per cent of Quebecers say they like their television network is not enough for English Canadians, who take decisions about the French network without even viewing it.

This is why Michèle Fortin said that the disappearance of Radio-Canada's public television from the generalist niche, where it reaches large audiences never reached by Canadian English-language stations, is collective suicide. Mrs. Fortin quite rightly recalled that, in Quebec, PBS-type public television niches are already occupied by RDI and Radio-Canada, for example.

So, as the CBC French network Vice President, Mrs. Fortin, has also noted, the member for Don Valley West does not watch French television, like others, for that matter, who wish to impose on it a solution that is perhaps better suited to the English network.

The Bloc Québécois will oppose the loss of CBC French television. We have already lost a lot. Like my fellow citizens from Rimouski, I have witnessed the closure of three local TV broadcasting stations in the lower St. Lawrence in 1990. Acting as it did, the CBC French network deprived the region's inhabitants of the opportunity for debate, for the exercise of democracy.

In the coming debates, the government will try to make us believe that no decisions have yet been taken. Indeed, they have been taken, just not announced, that is the difference. In the coming debates, the government will try to make us believe that

Supply

it will replace parliamentary votes by new funding sources to be suggested by the heritage committee.

It is no secret that the member for Don Valley West told “Le Point médias” that the committee’s mandate was to study the sex of angels, in other words, to find long term sources of funding for the CBC French network, not just for next year or the year after.

In the coming debates, the government will try to make us believe that the committee of three experts that it will soon set up to study the complementarity of the mandates of Telefilm, the National Film Board, and Radio–Canada as well as of their funding might change the situation for Radio–Canada. The government will get no one on this side of the House to believe such nonsense.

The government might attempt to say that cuts were imposed on Radio–Canada, but it will convince no one. The impact of the \$10 million cuts made to Radio–Québec, as difficult as they were, has nothing in common with the \$60 million cuts made to the CBC French network.

(1035)

The government may also try to make English–speaking Canadians think that we do not care about their national television, but that is not true. If we are focusing more on the French CBC today, it is mainly because its vice–president has announced the effects the forthcoming cuts would have on our television.

We would not have the presumption to tell English–speaking Canadians what their television should be like. As for the Reform Party, it will probably say how pleased it is to see that the heritage minister is implementing part of its program.

Indeed, the Reform Party did propose to reduce the CBC’s budget by 25 to 30 per cent in the taxpayers’ budget it presented a few weeks back. This proposal in no way takes into account the role public television plays in Quebec and in French Canada nor does it meet the expectations of French–speaking Canadians.

I will conclude by quoting the French television spokespersons who appeared before the CRTC: “The policy proposals that will be drafted in the months to come will focus on one major and crucial objective, the promotion and preservation of French–Canadians’ identity. Our current broadcasting system requires its partners to make a lot of room for Canadian content, and that has furthered the expression of our cultural identity and has contributed to the growth of audio–visual production in both our official languages. We should not let what we have acquired so far be jeopardized”.

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest to the hon. member’s speech. Like her, I am a staunch supporter of CBC’s French language network and of the CBC.

[*English*]

I listened with great sympathy to what the member opposite had to say. I am a great supporter of both radio and TV as far as the CBC is concerned. That includes Radio Canada International. I like the fact that by radio we can reach out not only to Canadians of both languages but to all those interested in Canada, whether they speak English or French, whether they be in the English speaking world abroad or in la francophonie. I am a great supporter of that.

I like the fact that from coast to coast to coast Radio Canada and the CBC are there in both languages. The northern service of the CBC is a particularly fine example of what is being talked about. It deals with the most remote areas of the country. It spills over into Greenland, which is related to Denmark, and into Alaska. Our voice is heard in both languages throughout the north.

It is partly as a result that French is one of the languages used in simultaneous translation by the legislature of the NWT in Yellowknife. It is one of the eight languages it functions in.

As a member from Ontario, from a riding where less than two per cent of the population speaks French, the French language services are a very special feature of the CBC. In Ontario we have La Chaine, a provincially based French language service and it has great support throughout the province.

The CBC is a billion dollar a year corporation. We know that like large government, large corporations have problems. They have financial problems. They have organizational problems.

Many members here have had experience with the CBC. I am told the CBC is top heavy, and in particular is middle heavy. It is heavy in the middle management area.

(1040)

It has excellent artistic people on air, on camera who write and produce things. A great deal of the resources go into middle and upper management areas.

Does the member not think any billion dollar corporation in Canada should be examined from the point of view of its efficiency with great detail in these difficult financial times?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Tremblay: Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. It goes without saying that we must absolutely ensure that—with a budget of one billion dollars—CBC is managed efficiently. We must ask ourselves the right questions but, more importantly, we must get answers.

I sit on the heritage committee and its members almost unanimously agree that we are somewhat disturbed by the corporation’s lack of transparency when it comes to really telling us how it is managed. There are many things which we do not know about. For example, we do not know the exact cost of

the corporation's head office. Only recently did we find out how much it costs to pay this group of bureaucrats, lawyers, secretaries, specialists or experts—whatever you want to call them. It costs the corporation \$15 million just to appear before the CRTC every year. This \$15 million is almost money thrown out the window since, after all, the CRTC cannot take away CBC's licence. The corporation is governed by an act. So these positions could be cut.

Sure, there are positions which can be cut. But I am concerned that these cuts might affect artistic workers or creators. If three or four vice-president positions are eliminated, I will not rise in this House to question that decision. It goes without saying that cuts can be made. The head office is useless, but no one can answer that question.

Do we still need a large engineering service, at a time when the information highway is becoming a reality? Unfortunately, we did not take on a leadership role in that regard. There are many questions to be asked. However, the problem is the situation in which we find ourselves; it is the uncertainty in which the minister keeps us. He does not say things the way they should be said. Will cuts be made? Yes, they are mentioned in the red book. The figure is \$679 million, but the government continues to claim that it is \$44 million. This is the problem.

I read an article in which a minister claimed to be a person of substance. That must be the case only when he is talking to the media, because so far we have no evidence of that when he speaks in this House.

[English]

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I find it particularly unfortunate today that the Bloc has chosen to bring this issue to the House for a couple of reasons.

We have thousands if not tens of thousands of people who presently cannot get to work or even if they could get to work do not have the materials with which to conduct their jobs. It is estimated the strike by the rail workers which the Bloc is stopping will cost the economy \$3 billion to 5 billion. When the Bloc comes to the House to discuss this issue, I find it really unfortunate.

Speaking specifically to the motion of the Bloc, why is it—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Order. Your question should be directed to the previous speaker and her comments.

Mr. Abbott: Madam Speaker, I was coming to that. Why is the Bloc motion dealing only specifically with the issue of Quebec? If it is the official opposition, why is its motion not more encompassing with respect to the question of CBC?

Supply

[Translation]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Madam Speaker, I made it clear in my speech that I would talk specifically about the French-language network of the CBC because this is the one I know best and because Mrs. Fortin was the only vice president to make her position known. The vice president of the English-language network probably never thought that there would be cuts because he believed Mr. Manera. So he did not do what he had to do and he still does not know where to cut in the English network. For her part, Mrs. Fortin was ready to adapt to the new situation.

(1045)

Since my colleague mentioned the train, I will tell him that if the proposals from the official opposition were accepted, we could easily resolve the rail strike. If we could have a little bit more co-operation than confrontation in this House, the problem could be solved in the next three hours.

It is fine to debate our respective points of view, but if we were to stop arguing for the sake of arguing, we could solve the real problems.

Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a great pleasure to rise on behalf of the Minister of Canadian Heritage and speak on a motion from the opposition concerning significant and continuous support of the CBC by this government.

Discussions about the CBC cannot be but emotional, undoubtedly because the CBC is so dear to Canadians.

[English]

Each night Canadians tune in to CBC news to keep up to date with the new challenges facing the country and the government. As Canada's first source of public information and as a source of national pride, the CBC is acutely aware of the challenges that must be met for Canada to achieve a sustainable level of prosperity.

The CBC is Canada's largest cultural institution. It is the guardian of the Canadian experience. The voices of Canadians echo through its history and its archives. For most of this century Canadians have sought their reflection, which they found in the CBC.

[Translation]

Since it was founded in 1937 by the then Liberal government, the CBC has been the main instrument of the Canadian broadcasting policy. As a true reflection of our country's growth, the CBC has adjusted to the new realities with the passing decades.

Reflecting the Canadian situation at the time, the 1968 Broadcasting Act conferred a far-reaching mandate to the CBC: to broadcast everything, in fact, so as to please everybody. This

Supply

mandate was quite appropriate in 1968, since the CBC, particularly the CBC television network, was the only service many Canadians had access to in a world where broadcasting was still made through waves.

Nowadays, the conditions are drastically different. Apart from technological progress, among them the multichannel broadcasting, Canada can now rely on dynamic and innovative private producers. This means that the CBC does not have to produce all its own programs, particularly its entertainment programs. Thus, the CBC now buys about 46 per cent of its English-speaking and French-speaking programs from independent Canadian producers. These programs complete its in-house programming.

[English]

In recent years the CBC has been focusing increasingly on bringing Canadian programming to Canadians. To counter the dominance of U.S. mass culture, the CBC's primary concern has been to attract large audiences to Canadian programming. That is just what the CBC has been doing.

Witness the success of CBC productions like "Road to Avonlea", "La Petite Vie", "North of 60" and "Scoop", to name only a few. CBC programming, especially in drama, has achieved excellence over and over again.

[Translation]

The problems and challenges of the French language network are not those of the English-language network. Indeed, the French-language market is more limited and concentrated than the English-speaking market. This creates conditions and an industrial structure that are quite different than in English Canada. This government recognizes that these two different situations call for different policies.

(1050)

The French network of the CBC has done an excellent job in Quebec, where it is very important to French-speaking viewers. The province has its own star system and many artists from Quebec are well known in all French-speaking households. The network has been a useful springboard for French-speaking artists and has contributed to the creation of a strong Franco-Canadian identity.

[English]

Not since the advent of television has the CBC been asked to accelerate its evolution to the extent that technology and finances are demanding today.

However the public must never be the missing link in the CBC's evolution. Last fall the public joined the Standing

Committee on Canadian Heritage in its journey toward a new future for the CBC that will be more than brave new words. It will be a future that will ensure the survival of the fittest source of Canadian content, the CBC.

The road to CBC's success was paved with new definitions, new ideas and new ways of dealing with the realities of the time. The most recent exercise of this kind dates back to 1991 when one of the elements of the CBC's mandate was reaffirmed: "to contribute to a shared national consciousness and identity".

[Translation]

The funding provided to the CBC accounts for more than 60 per cent of the total federal funding provided to cultural organizations under the Department of Canadian Heritage. The CBC could be compared to an orchestra that provides a showcase for all the cultural instruments.

[English]

The CBC has allowed the community of Canadians to develop regionally and nationally while always being in tune with each other's concerns. The CBC can legitimately take credit for being the link that allowed the far flung communities of the second largest territory on earth to define themselves as Canadians. The CBC is the lens-crafter of Canada's vision of itself and the world. It magnifies our cultural sovereignty and helps us see our way clearly through many challenges ahead.

[Translation]

The Minister of Canadian Heritage thinks that the present context, characterized by all these challenges and changes, gives us an opportunity to re-evaluate the role that public broadcasting plays and must continue to play, given the increasing globalization and the existing social and economic situation.

[English]

The epicentre of the first tremor of challenge can be found in the realm of technology. Consider the multiplication of television channels which is already considerable and which satellite and digital compression are about to render astronomical.

One may ask what purpose public broadcasting serves when services and choice proliferate and the line between public and private television, once clearly defined, seems to be blurring. The response to that challenge is that the role of the public broadcaster has never been greater, nor the need for it more urgent.

[Translation]

These multiple choices, coming for the most part from outside Canada, will be dictated essentially by the logic of commercial television, which is different from that of public broadcasting.

*Supply**[English]*

If public television is to survive it is in its best interest to flaunt the characteristics that distinguish it from commercial television. It is by firming its difference that public television justifies its social values.

Public broadcasting cannot be guided solely by commercial considerations in so far as it has quite a different mission to bear witness to society's progress to affirm our national identity. The true mission and values of the CBC form the source of its appeal to many Canadians.

Public broadcasting is an instrument designed to democratize culture and information and showcase the Canadian contribution on the world stage. That is the public service in public broadcasting and one important reason why it should not be sacrificed entirely to the demands of commercial advertising.

We understand that as a public corporation facing low tide fiscally, the CBC needs to launch itself as a cultural vessel custom built for these leaner times. We are confident that CBC management will be able to navigate through uncharted waters ahead.

(1055)

In the 1995 budget funding for the CBC was set at 4 per cent below previously scheduled levels. This will amount to a savings of \$44 million for the coming year.

[Translation]

As the opposition speculates about the contents of the 1996 budget, the Minister of Canadian Heritage has been hard at work laying the foundations for a stronger CBC.

[English]

We already know that important changes are taking place within the broadcasting industry. Fundamental changes beyond budget reductions and advances in technology leading toward greater diversity are expected to translate into more competition, fragmented audiences, a major investment in technology and potentially higher costs for Canadian programming.

In television the advent of digital video compression will make direct broadcast satellite distribution possible and increased capacity for cable undertakings will make the 500-channel universe a reality.

[Translation]

The government must ensure that the private and public Canadian broadcasting system is ready to compete at the national and international level, on the information highway and in all the mega-networks of the future.

[English]

The review by the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage of the role of the CBC combined with the other supporting initiatives of the government, the information highway advisory

council, the examination of the direct home satellite issue, the mandate review of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the National Film Board and Téléfilm represent the comprehensive integrated approach that will result in sound government policy which will take Canada and Canadian cultural products successfully into the information age. The approach will allow Canadian broadcasting and Canadian culture both English and French to thrive.

As the opposition speculates about the contents of the 1996 budget the Minister of Canadian Heritage has been hard at work laying the foundation for a stronger CBC.

[Translation]

According to the Bloc Québécois, it is a threat that can only be eliminated by the publication of speculative projections for the next two years.

[English]

The hon. member's motion refers to some ominous threat looming over the CBC's French language network. The motion wrongly attributes this threat to a decision of the government to publish only the precise funding level of the CBC for the coming fiscal year.

[Translation]

By speculating on the possible number of people that will have to be laid off by the CBC, the opposition does nothing to help the cause of our public broadcasting system and adds to the climate of uncertainty felt by employees affected by the cuts.

[English]

I would like to end on a curious note. It seems strange to me that the entire basis of the motion is the hon. member's concern over the contents of the 1996-97 federal budget which should only matter to her after the separatists lose the referendum. Her heated comments are evidence of a referendum campaign gone stone cold.

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the parliamentary secretary indicated that the CBC should be the body involved in defining our identity as Canadians.

I have heard that point before in the House from members opposite. I have had no calls from my constituents asking for anyone to define them as Canadians. I have heard of no calls from my colleagues' constituents to help them define themselves as Canadians. I certainly feel no need personally to have anyone define me as a Canadian. I am a Canadian and I am happy and proud to be one. I do not need anyone to define what a Canadian should be.

(1100)

Has the hon. member had calls from her constituents for a definition of Canadians? Maybe the hon. member could refer to letters and petitions she may have received as well as calls about the definition of Canadians.

Supply

Furthermore, does the member feel that the CBC, a crown corporation, would be the body her constituents would go to for a definition of what a Canadian is? Going to a government organization to get a definition of what we should be as Canadians sounds a little strange to me. I would like the hon. member to respond to those questions.

Ms. Guarnieri: Madam Speaker, the hon. member asked me if I have had discussions with my constituents about the CBC in recent days. If that is the benchmark the hon. member uses simply to gauge the importance of the CBC, then there is a serious omission, if he will forgive me, in the hon. member's education.

Yes, I have had numerous discussions with my constituents about the CBC. It has been a topic of conversation recently and it has certainly been highlighted in the press. The Reform Party's view of the CBC is really the same view the Spanish trawler has of the last turbot. The Reform fantasy budget would fish the CBC into extinction. The Liberal approach offers the opportunity for the CBC to grow and thrive in a new age of broadcasting.

One reason the Liberal budget has been so well received by so many people throughout the country is that they understand our cuts are not based on some ideological vendetta against cultural communities. They are based on necessity and not on the type of philistine intolerance shown by the Reform Party of our cultural programs. Our budget is driven by a genuine necessity of concern for the programs that Liberals have built and Liberals will continue to build in the next century.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Tremblay: Madam Speaker, I listened attentively to my hon. colleague, whom I know very well for we have been working together since the beginning on the heritage committee. But I do feel there are limits to trying to mislead people. Truly, this government seems to be affected by the untruth syndrome. There is no more serum left to cure it because they have exhausted all the supplies available, for they have failed all the tests they underwent throughout their existence.

We are not speculating about the number of positions that will be cut, we are taking the word of the vice-president on it. That is not speculation. We are not only concerned about what will happen, but also sick and tired of hearing the minister telling us lies in the House, not telling us the truth and misleading us from start to finish. People are fed up. That has to stop. We need the real figures because it is imperative for both the francophone and the anglophone networks to know exactly where they are going in order for the CBC to really evolve.

The hon. member stated that the minister, instead of speculating about the years ahead, is laying down the foundations of the CBC. Foundations my eye. He is destroying those foundations.

He is not building them up, but demolishing them. So, Madam Speaker, what is the hon. member waiting for to wake up within her government, before there is no more public television left? Everybody knows public television comes with a price tag. Every decent, self-respecting country has a public television network, and that does not prevent private television from existing beside it. We are not asking for a status quo regarding the CBC's finances. We know there is some clean-up to be done. But we are asking the government to stop making these deep cuts and preventing the president of the CBC from getting the corporation back on its feet, on the right track.

(1105)

What is the hon. member waiting for to stand up—she is the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage—and to wake her minister up so that he will stop destroying this essential cultural tool?

Ms. Guarnieri: I fully agree with the hon. member there are limits to misleading people. The motion she just submitted misleads the Canadian public. I think the president of the CBC showed at a sitting of the committee she attended that he understood fiscal realities much better than the official opposition does.

I would like to remind her of what Mr. Manera, former president of the CBC, told us. I will find the quotation because I want you to hear the very wise remarks he made. Here is what he told us: "Mr. Chairman, we of the CBC, acknowledge that the financial situation facing the country is indeed serious and we certainly cannot escape, nor should we intend to escape, the austerity measures that have to be taken in order to bring our finances in order".

As you can see, the former CBC president had a realistic point of view. It is quite clear that, as a government, we will reexamine the role of the CBC, and the standing committee, three members of that committee and the Minister of Canadian Heritage all work very hard on this. I hope the hon. member will be patient enough to wait for the advice of a committee she sits on. Future budgets will provide the CBC with the resources it needs to carry out its redesigned role.

We know what our commitments are. I want to give assurances of that to the hon. member, and I think it is about time that the Bloc woke up.

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ.): Madam Speaker, when the parliamentary secretary refers to her committee, I hope she is kidding. There are two distinct components in the CBC, the French network and the English network, but the committee which she is a part of comprises a majority of English-speaking people, who are Liberal on top of that. It is therefore pretty difficult to get parity.

Supply

It is like putting Dracula in charge of a blood bank. Would she please explain to us how she intends to be fair in this committee, where anglophones form the majority, so that the interests of the francophones in the CBC are defended?

Ms. Guarnieri: Madam Speaker, I wonder what the member is trying to make me believe. Does he want me to believe that the Bloc members are wasting their time in the committees? Personally, I have a lot of respect for the work of the members of the committee. I do not think we have wasted our time. We will reflect on this and recommendations will be presented at the end of the process for the minister's consideration.

I find the Bloc's interest in the CBC ironic and I often wonder what lies behind this passionate interest in an entirely Canadian cultural institution. Why does the Bloc reject the country which has created an institution it admires?

(1110)

[*English*]

Mr. Hugh Hanrahan (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the Reform members will be splitting their time today.

It gives me great pleasure to rise today to discuss this motion which has been put forward by my hon. colleague from the Bloc Quebecois.

It is important to note that it seems a little particular that we are debating this issue in the House when this exact issue is before the heritage committee. We as a committee have been reviewing the CBC for quite some time, focusing primarily on the issue of the role of the CBC in a 500 channel universe.

When the committee began this endeavour in September of last year, our mandate also included how to fund the CBC and report to the finance minister with recommendations for budgetary cuts in this year's budget. That timetable was postponed. We then set a new tentative date to conclude and make our recommendations to the House as a whole by the beginning of March. It is obvious the committee did not meet that timetable.

Presently we are still reviewing the CBC. No action plan or recommendations are in place. Therefore perhaps it is appropriate that the Bloc has introduced this motion to debate this issue on the CBC.

It is also abundantly clear to me and to most Canadians that this government is unwilling to deal with the fundamental issues such as the CBC and its financing. Since our arrival in Ottawa this government has introduced discussion paper after discussion paper while ignoring the pleas of Canadians for action.

If we look at the Liberals' latest budget, we see they have begun to sing from the same songbook as the Reform Party.

Canada's national debt and deficit have moved from the back burner to the mid-range burner. These notorious tax and spend Liberals are beginning to see the flaws in such a policy, yet they are still attempting to hold onto all government entrenched programs through an ever decreasing amount of resources.

The fact is however that Canada does not have a revenue problem but a spending problem. This spending problem is perpetuated by the fact that the federal government continually spends billions of dollars on programs that could be done by the private sector at no cost to the taxpayer. This would ensure that the necessary funding would be available for priority departments such as health, education, defence and veterans affairs.

In terms of privatization, this government has taken a step in the right direction, however it has not gone far enough. Every ministry has one or more areas in which the government is providing a service which is in competition with the private sector or could be done more effectively by the private sector.

We as a government must balance our books which means all areas of public financing must be evaluated for efficiency, cost and effectiveness. It is for these reasons we are looking at the financing of the CBC.

The CBC's primary mandate should be the provision of distinctive culture specific information and drama programming. In an increasing multichannel environment the current mandate to provide a wide range of programming that informs, enlightens and entertains is too broad.

It is also clear that the mandate of the CBC is to provide Canadians with predominantly Canadian programming. What Canadians are being subjected to is extremely questionable in terms of meeting this prescribed mandate.

(1115)

The issue is no longer whether the CBC has adequate funding. That has passed long ago. Rather, it is the structure of the CBC. In particular, the CBC has not adjusted to the realities of the marketplace. It is outdated, highly centralized and expensive.

We must constantly remind ourselves that the Canadian broadcasting environment has changed radically since the original conception of the CBC.

New technologies and new services change viewing tastes and fundamental changes in advertising behaviours have transformed the broadcasting environment. Do not forget that in a world where the CBC is no longer the only national service, does it make sense to use scarce public funds to subsidize the provision of commercial television programming?

In this new world of broadcasting, consisting of many more options to television viewers, public broadcasting cannot effectively maintain the objective that it is all things to all people.

Supply

It is therefore essential for survival in this multichannel universe that the public broadcaster be willing to reinvent itself. It is quite evident the corporation is unwilling to do that.

The president and the former president of the CBC stated revenues were not their mission. We must therefore as parliamentarians address this area for them. Since revenues are not the mission of the CBC, what is?

How can a private company such as CTV make revenues its mission while still adhering to Canadian content regulations? CTV last year spent \$488 million while the CBC spent \$561 million on Canadian content programming. This is not a huge difference considering we spent over \$1 billion for the operation of the CBC and nothing on CTV.

CTV spends close to the same as CBC on Canadian productions. The difference is that one is government owned and one is privately owned. One is a drain on the public purse, the other adds to the public coffers through taxation of profits.

Had this government privatized the CBC it could have saved the taxpayer approximately \$800 million and this number does not include revenues that would have been generated from the sale of approximately \$1.5 billion in assets, which the CBC currently holds.

The sceptics will rise and say that if we privatize the CBC, Canadian culture will perish, Canadian culture cannot survive without government intervention. Surely they jest. Canadians are extremely talented. They produce, write, paint, create. They do this not because the government says it is okay, but rather because they want to create. The fruits of their labour will sell if it is quality, and it will not if it is not.

Art and culture should be created not because government thinks it is so, but because the artist wants to do it. The more government gets involved, the more things seem to go awry.

I would like to make a comparison between the privatization of Air Canada, Petro-Canada and the possibility of similar action being taken with regard to the CBC but I see my time is running out.

I would like to amend the motion of the Bloc. I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "years".

(1120)

Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Madam Speaker, if I understood the main thrust of the hon. member's comments, he certainly encourages the government to privatize the CBC.

I noticed in the Reform fantasy budget it mentioned cutbacks of some \$360 million. I wonder if the hon. member could delineate what the Reform game plan would be for the CBC.

Mr. Hanrahan: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for the opportunity to deal with the question.

What I would recommend very clearly is that we look at a number of possible options with respect to the privatization of the CBC. The first option would be an outright sale to the highest bidder.

While I recognize the beginning of a trend to cut the CBC's budget, what concerns me is that we are going to continue to cut the CBC and have it die the death of a thousand cuts. There will be nothing left at the end of it. If it is going to be viable, saleable, I recommend we sell it while it still has strength.

Another possibly would be a simple public share issue which would divest the government of the entire company. A third option, although I do not particularly favour it over the other two, is mixed ownership involving public and private investors, as we have done with other companies.

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Madam Speaker, in addressing the motion on funding for the CBC brought forward by our honourable Bloc colleague, it is passing strange that this motion on a supply day should take place when we have almost a national crisis on our hands with the rail strike. I do not see how talking about the CBC is of any import alongside that problem. Nevertheless, here we are faced with it today.

I will paraphrase the hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata when she addressed a Reform motion on the CBC last June. She said although the Reform Party may disagree emphatically with the way certain situations are dealt with at the CBC, it does not support the motion presented by the Bloc member for Rimouski—Témiscouata.

If we look at the history of the CBC we see it was the genesis of the Aird commission in 1929, although it did not officially become the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation until Mackenzie King's Liberals rewrote the Broadcasting Act in 1936. The last revision of the Broadcasting Act came in 1991 under Brian Mulroney's Tories.

(1125)

However, over that time the mandate of both French and English CBC has remained relatively unchanged. Is it possible for a mandate nearly 60 years old to still be valid, particularly in an age of technological change such as we have now?

The forerunner of the CBC, the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission, suffered from underfunding, an uncertain mandate and inappropriate administrative arrangements. The same is true in part of the CBC today.

If we look at these problems separately, we must first address the issue of underfunding. We know Canadian taxpayers cannot afford to increase the roughly \$1 billion in subsidies the CBC already enjoys. The Liberals' answer was to pass legislation for the CBC to borrow money. This is certainly not the answer, as it only increases Canada's already enormous debt load.

The Liberals have also considered taxes on things like video rentals and movie tickets to fund the CBC. This is also unacceptable, as Canadians are already overtaxed. Therefore the only solution would appear to be privatization to allow the corporation to become competitive and raise funds through the private sector by means such as increased advertising. There is no reason the CBC does not have the capacity to compete commercially.

The second problem of an uncertain mandate can best be illustrated by looking at how Canadian politicians view the role of the CBC. Last June in the House the Prime Minister said: "The law says in defining the mandate of the CBC that it must inform people on the advantages Canada represents. This is the reason for the creation of the corporation".

One day later on CBC radio the Deputy Prime Minister stated the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has a responsibility to acknowledge that one of its responsibilities is to promote Canadian unity.

Neither of these interpretations reflects the reality of the CBC mandate which is to provide a wide range of programming that informs, enlightens and entertains, and to reflect Canada and its regions to national and regional audiences while serving the special needs of those regions.

While this example points to part of the problem with the uncertainty with the CBC's mandate, it also illustrates the way a public broadcasting service can become politicized and even manipulated by its political masters. I believe privatization could address this problem as market forces would quickly force the CBC to find its niche while still promoting Canadian culture. It would also remove the potential for political interference.

The final problem that existed with the CRBC 60 years ago and is still relevant for today's CBC is inappropriate administrative arrangements. The CBC receives more than \$1 billion in taxpayers' money to operate yet still has a deficit of \$45 million in its operating budget. In the last year about 2,000 jobs have been cut at the CBC in an effort to become more competitive. Despite these drastic cuts to the staffing budget, CBC's deficit continues to grow. There is simply no incentive at the administrative level to ensure a healthy bottom line.

Privatization appears to be the only acceptable method of dragging the mother corp into the fiscal realities of the 1990s and beyond.

Supply

Let us look specifically at the CBC French operations of Radio-Canada. A recent news report suggests that up to 750 of the 2,500 employees at SRC may be cut as a result of funding cuts. The vice-president of French television, Michèle Fortin, admitted in the same article: "Those who will suffer most from probable cuts are not viewers. We can supply to the public programs of the same quality and content if we purchase them from private producers or other networks".

(1130)

If that is truly the case, and we have no reason to doubt Mr. Fortin, then what is this ominous threat looming over the CBC's French language network which my hon. Bloc colleagues are so concerned about?

We should also look at an independent survey conducted by the CROP polling firm in October of last year. In that survey, French speaking Quebecers stated that the quality of programming on privately operated TVA was equal to that of government funded Radio-Canada. In fact, in all areas the respondents rated the two stations equal.

However, when asked if: "Because Radio-Canada is subsidized and the other networks are not, that creates unfair competition", 56 per cent of French speaking Quebecers agreed while only 39 per cent said no.

Similarly, when French speaking Quebecers, many of whom we might presume are Bloc supporters, were asked if Radio-Canada's public funding should be cut because of the federal government's deficit problems, 55 per cent said yes while only 37 per cent disagreed. They are roughly the same percentages.

The same arguments I presented for the privatization of English language CBC are relevant to French CBC. The only way to ensure a viable Radio-Canada into the 21st century is to make the operation responsive to market forces and to take advantage of modern satellite technology.

For example, CBUF-FM, the CBC's French language FM radio station in Vancouver, has a staff of 25 and an annual budget of \$2.2 million. Its average audience in any given quarter hour over its entire broadcast area is 100 people. That is according to the Bureau of Broadcast Measurement.

The same is true of Edmonton's French language station CHFA which has a staff of 32 and an annual budget of \$2.4 million. Again, according to BBM figures, the station is fortunate if its audience tops 600.

In just these two examples we see how \$4.6 million in tax dollars are being spent to service 700 people. That is almost \$6,600 per listener. This is not very efficient.

If these services were privatized and forced to depend on local advertising it is quite likely they would be forced to close. However, with the advent of modern satellite technology it is quite possible to maintain a small staff of reporters in both markets that would provide local stories and features via sa-

Supply

tellite to be included in regional and national programming. This would not only save taxpayers millions of dollars but would also allow Radio-Canada to fulfil its mandate and get out to the people of a minority language where it is needed.

The time for bleeding heart motions such as the one before us today is over. We must address today's situations based on today's realities, not some teary eyed, romanticized vision based on the way we did things in the good old days. Times have changed.

Today's fiscal realities will undoubtedly mean restraint and government downsizing. However, tomorrow's technology means we have an opportunity to provide government services and information in ways politicians of even 15 years ago never dreamed.

For this reason I urge the House to vote against this near-sighted motion of yesteryear and leap into the 21st century by listening closely to the ideas my Reform colleagues and I have and will present during the course of the debate.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened to the member's remarks and I share a different view of the CBC. The Liberal Party founded the CBC in 1934. I have always believed that it was one of the great instruments that held the country together.

(1135)

I believe also that in remote regions of our country where the private sector would not necessarily make the investment and take the risk, that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is there to make sure that every part of the country is interconnected and we can all feel as one.

A lot of things have been developed in Canada that have defied economic logic or to use business terms, earnings per share per quarter. We are not running a business here. We are building a nation. The criteria that one uses when building a nation and developing a set of values and a character for a nation are totally different from the value system used when running or building a business.

I would like to think that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is something that should be looked at in terms of building a nation and not just as a stand alone profit centre.

I regret that the Minister of Finance and the government have had to make the cuts in the budget to the CBC. Many people at the CBC are constituents of mine. I spent many a long hour having a glass of cranberry juice with Larry Zolf on the Danforth where he would reminisce about the contributions various artists have made and how some have grown through their exposure on the CBC. Right now all of these things are being jeopardized because the international bond markets, the people

who control the real flow of capital, are holding the gun to our brain. I regret that and I know most members do.

Can the member not see that perhaps when we get our fiscal house in a little better order over the next few years that as a galvanizing agent we would go a long way to find something better? Would he not then, once our fiscal house is in better order, see that the CBC is something we should reinvigorate and make sure that it continues to build on that long history of pulling the country together?

Mr. Ringma: In response, Madam Speaker, I have to say first that we have a long road ahead of us before we get our fiscal house in order.

We are well aware of the situation. We are still \$560 billion in debt. The deficit reduction program introduced in the latest budget is inadequate to cope with the situation. We are paying more and ever more money into servicing that debt. In two to three years time with the Minister of Finance rolling the moving target, we are still going to be in deep trouble if in fact we have not hit the wall before then.

I have to negate the argument "in time". I do not know when that time is going to come.

My second point in response would be that essentially the hon. member is living in the past. I concede that the CBC in times gone by has furnished part of the glue that has held the country together.

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

(1140)

[Translation]

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to second the motion presented by my colleague, the member for Rimouski—Témiscouata. The motion reads as follows:

That the House condemn the government for the refusal by the Minister of Canadian Heritage to publish the government's decisions concerning funding for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) for the next three years, thus causing an ominous threat to loom over the CBC's French language network.

First, I will give a brief background. Then, I will describe the present situation and analyze its impact on the French-speaking community of Quebec and Canada.

Before starting, however, I would like to point out that, unlike the government, I will use both terms, that is SRC and CBC, to refer to the two sectors of our public television instead of SRC in the French version of documents and CBC in the English version. For greater clarity, the term SRC will refer only to the French network and the term CBC, to the English network. You will see later the importance of this distinction.

Under the precedent Conservative regime, many cuts were made. In 1990, certain services were abolished, 1,100 jobs were cut, three local television stations were closed, eight stations were transformed into information production offices. These cuts resulted in savings of \$108 million.

These measures were vigorously denounced by the Liberals. The famous red book put it this way: "Funding cuts to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the Canada Council, the National Film Board, Telefilm Canada, and other institutions illustrate the Tories' failure to appreciate the importance of cultural and industrial development". Those are the words of the Liberals in their red book.

And it went on: "A Liberal government will be committed to stable multiyear financing for national cultural institutions such as the Canada Council and the CBC. This will allow national cultural institutions to plan effectively". It would be difficult to find better intentions concerning culture and the SRC.

What is the situation today, following the tabling of the budget in February? On that famous day, February 27, 1995, we learned the extent of the budget cuts which would affect the Department of Canadian Heritage. We learned that this department's budget would be cut by \$676 million over the next three years, in other words, 23 per cent of its global budget.

These cuts would affect the budgets of the CBC, Telefilm Canada and the National Film Board, which would be reduced by 4, 4 and 5 per cent respectively. In the case of the CBC, depending on how you understand the figures, it means a minimum cut of \$44 million for the 1995-96 fiscal year. Furthermore, the day after the budget, the government decided to transfer Radio Canada International to the CBC and that accounted for an additional amount of approximately \$12 million.

At the same time, the minister announced that the government would review thoroughly the terms of reference of the CBC, the NFB and Telefilm Canada. The CBC mandate would be examined, according to him, within a framework similar to that of the study being done by the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage on the role of the CBC in a multichannel environment.

We must remember that, before the budget was introduced, the CBC already had to support a loss of revenue of \$180 million because of the cuts previously made by the Tory government and a decrease in commercial revenues. The former president, Mr. Anthony Manera, was already worried that these cuts could kill public television for good.

Nevertheless, the Liberal government, in spite of the rhetoric of the red book, will not be impressed by so little, and certainly not if it is the Minister of Canadian Heritage talking.

Supply

And the saga goes on. Right after the budget was tabled, on February 28, it was announced that Mr. Manera would talk to the employees to explain the financial situation of the CBC. The explanations remain vague because figures can be seen differently by different persons. Yet, everybody agrees that in April 1995, the CBC will have to cut between \$40 and \$50 million to offset this loss of revenue, also called the structural deficit.

(1145)

On the same day, Mr. Manera announced his resignation as chief executive officer of the CBC, when his mandate was supposed to end in February 1999, that is in four years. Talk about an early retirement!

In support of his decision, Mr. Manera alleged personal reasons, which the Minister of Heritage hurried to repeat using these words: "Mr. Manera has resigned for personal reasons; everything else has been totally invented".

By "everything else", the minister was referring, among other things, to the scenario of a \$300 million reduction in the budgets of the CBC over the next three years. I would recall that, on his appointment to his position, in November 1993, Mr. Manera had demanded assurances from the minister that no huge cuts would be applied to the CBC. At that time, the same minister had made a commitment to give the CBC multi-year financing. He even went so far as to promise Mr. Manera that there would not be any more budget reductions at the CBC. He had dared describe himself as a "friend of the house", meaning the CBC, when he had been appointed as the Minister of Heritage. That is too much!

We must realize that we are not talking about ancient history here. We are talking about November 1993, just 18 months ago. We are talking about assurances that were given by a minister to one of the most important departments of his government. How sad and shameful.

Mr. Manera, who seems to have been somewhat more lucid than his minister, came back by setting the record straight: it was a cut of not only \$44 million that the CBC would suffer, but of \$350 million by 1997-98. The government was getting ready to reduce the total budget by 23 per cent over three years. All this after the minister had confirmed to his president that there would be no more cuts.

How did the minister respond to his president's statement? First, as I said earlier, he repeated that Mr. Manera had resigned for personal reasons. According to the minister, there was no relation between this resignation and the budgetary cuts announced. He said he knew that Mr. Manera was going to resign and that his resignation was for personal reasons. Somehow, Mr. Manera made it clear in his speech to the employees that he was resigning because of the budget cuts. This is quite a lack of communication. This minister is no doubt fully proficient in the

Supply

area of communications. He went on to say the same thing again on March 16 in similar circumstances.

In Montreal, the vice-president of the CBC French network, Mrs. Michelle Fortin, could already foresee the impact the announced cuts would have on the operations of her organization. On March 15 and 16, she called a meeting of her employees to take stock of the situation. According to her, the organization in Montreal would suffer cuts of about \$60 million and there would be a downsizing of some 750 jobs over the next three years.

In answer to a question asked in this House in that regard, the minister said he knew nothing about the downsizing and tried to justify his position by saying that the CBC, his "official source" of information, had made no official decision. Need we remind you that the president and chief executive officer had already resigned and declared that he had no intention of presiding over the implementation of the new budget.

I would like to go back briefly to the minister's statements, in the order in which he made them. We saw that when he received Mr. Manera's resignation on February 28, the minister said it was for personal reasons. The day after, on March 1, he only mentioned again the figures contained in the budget. On March 2, we learned that Mr. Manera recognized he had received from the deputy minister of Heritage a secret document outlining the scope of the cuts for the three following years. The members of this House were treated to blatant nonsense.

While the opposition had that document in hand and was quoting it, the minister refused to admit that the figures were right. According to him, this document is based on assumptions which are part of a program review undertaken by another minister. All this when we know that the cuts depend on Cabinet's decisions. Where was the hon. minister? Is he not a member of the Cabinet? It seems that Radio-Canada employees and executives are better informed than the minister about the situation that is prevailing in this organization. In fact, on March 18, the *Gazette* published the information that Mr. Alain Pineau of the CBC had announced that the regional stations were threatened by the budgetary cuts.

(1150)

For the time being, it is more than appropriate to wonder what the minister has to gain by hiding the truth, since evidence points in that direction. We also have to wonder if further cuts are not going to be announced soon. We have to wonder what major initiatives the minister intends to put forward within the national television, and what political implications they will have.

It is interesting to look at the public opinion about these cuts in the French network. A recent SOM poll released last week by *La Presse* showed that 60 per cent of respondents want the

subsidies allocated to the CBC maintained or increased. It seems the public can only praise CBC-SRC for the way it does inform Canadians and increase their general knowledge. In Quebec, the results are even more impressive since one Quebecer out of three are opposed to the cuts Radio-Canada is facing.

That raises a completely different issue: the gap in the audience ratings between Canada and Quebec. Quebecers listen a lot to national television whereas only 12 per cent of their English-speaking counterparts watch it. This is a big difference which should, in theory, have an impact on the subsidies allotted the two networks. Up until now, however, viewer ratings were not among the criteria used to determine budget allocations. We pay more attention to the production costs of the programs, which are higher in English Canada than in Quebec. This is a vicious circle in which we have been trapped for a long time and which has been raising questions for many years.

Let us turn to the announcement made by the minister with regard to the CBC mandate review. For the French network, this announcement raises a lot of concerns. Indeed, we know that English Canada is generally not happy with the CBC, as far as its cost-quality ratio is concerned. For \$1 billion, many people think that we could get more for our money. As I said, this vision is not shared in Quebec where people are satisfied with the performance of Radio-Canada which is reaching, on average, 35 per cent of the viewers. Once again, we are faced with the dilemma of the two solitudes.

Once again, these two solitudes have different needs and tendencies. Could the government decide it would be politically correct to invest more in the French network, which has good ratings, than in the English network that is not very popular? Can we imagine that the Canadian federalism could be flexible enough to allow for the government to be very generous with the French network, while reducing drastically the subsidies allotted to the English network? This question has not been debated yet. We must also ask ourselves what would be the consequences of the budgetary cuts.

In his brief to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, the CBC spokespersons mentioned the possible impact of the reduction of its budgets. They said that the CBC would have no choice but to put thousands of people out of work. They added that their services would have to be drastically reduced and that no part of the mandate of the CBC would be left untouched.

The Minister of Finance said recently that any important reduction of the CBC budget would require a review of its current mandate. The citizens, the corporation employees and this House have the right to know where the minister and his government are going with the CBC. The Canadian public will not tolerate any longer the mysteries and the balderdash of the minister. Therefore, tell us what to do.

Supply

(1155)

[English]

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, as I listened to the member for Quebec talk about national institutions and our commitment to national institutions I did not understand where she was coming from. That party is committed to dismantling national institutions; that is its whole mission here. Have the Bloc members suddenly had some kind of a conversion they have not declared in public? Are they trying to figure out a way to recommit themselves to Canada by pushing the CBC? I cannot figure them out.

The member also talked about our commitment to stable, multi-year budgets. The member is absolutely right. It does say that in the red book.

One of the difficulties we have and which all Canadians should know is that we are trying to rebuild an economy that was literally on its knees. Our recovery is fragile. We are starting to get a little steam, but what does the Bloc Québécois do this week? It refuses to let us table our back to work legislation so we can get our national transportation system going. This causes a ripple effect beyond imagination.

For an example I will use a sector that I had some association with, the automotive sector. It is not just the assembly plants that are brought to their knees, it is all of the small and medium size auto parts manufacturers that ship to these plants. The Bloc Québécois right now is hurting the chances for a renewal of this country's economy even more so by shutting down our ability to rebuild this economy by keeping our transportation system in order.

The best hope and the best long term chance the CBC in all of its facets has in terms of restoring itself to the funding and renewed strength we would all like to see is by the Bloc members committing themselves to rebuilding the economy of all of Canada rather than thinking about their own parochial interests. Does the member not see that?

[Translation]

Mrs. Gagnon: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his questions and remind him of the commitments the Liberals made on multi-year financing to allow the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to make a balance sheet for several years instead of operating on a piecemeal basis, as it is the case now.

When it sat in the opposition and during the election campaign, this government made promises that I do not think it can keep now. My colleague seems to be particularly concerned about the economic situation and he would like the Bloc to bring forward solutions to deal with some economic problems and the economic recovery.

I have here some figures. For instance, defence spending, which amounted to \$11 billion, will be cut by 4.97 per cent, the budget for the advancement of women will be cut by 30 per cent and the budget for culture and communication will be cut by 23 per cent. Those figures show where the priorities of this government are: cutting by 23 per cent the budget for culture, which amounted only to \$1 billion, and the budget for the advancement of women, which amounted only to \$10 million, while defence spending is only reduced by 4.97 per cent. What about your priorities for economic recovery? We wonder.

In answer to another question that the hon. member asked about the railway problem, the opposition proposed some alternatives and I think that if the government had listened to them, perhaps we would have reached a decision very quickly.

(1200)

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Madam Speaker, since its beginnings, la Société Radio-Canada—The French language counterpart of the CBC—has been the voice of Canada's franco-phone population and the mirror of our culture.

Sociologists will tell you just how closely the birth of the Québécois identity is linked to the cultural programming that Radio-Canada broadcast into our living rooms. Thanks to Radio-Canada, francophones in all parts of Canada have seen and recognized themselves. The network has offered shared experiences to all and, through its programs, opened up a window on the world. In more recent years, Radio-Canada has allowed the world to learn about our culture, our way of life, and our values.

We are all proud of Radio-Canada's achievements. We are proud because they are closely linked to the success of our broadcasting policy. This policy, which is set out in the Broadcasting Act, ensures high calibre programming in French. The Act stipulates that "English and French language broadcasting, while sharing common aspects, operate under different conditions and may have different requirements".

And in fact, la Société Radio-Canada has managed to give us quite unique programming, programming that has been highly successful and is even the envy of some on the English-language CBC side.

Thanks to this broadcasting policy, French-language programming obtains unbelievably high audience ratings, year after year. Nineteen of the twenty most popular French-language shows, and forty-seven of the fifty most popular French-language shows are produced in Canada. Yes, they are produced in Canada. And these programs are popular because they are good, their quality is universally recognized. This explains why a series like "Les filles de Caleb" has been sold in over forty countries.

Supply

Some people will say that this series owes its success to those who made it, which is true. We are indeed lucky to be able to count on such talented artists. Some of them have had their talents recognized abroad and have decided to work there. Gifted though they may be, however, not many of them could have reached such heights without the help of government policies and support to the cultural community.

Among the federal institutions which contributed in this way, I should mention Telefilm Canada, the National Film Board and the Canadian Radio–Television and Telecommunications Commission.

Not only has Radio–Canada played a leading role in the process of cultural affirmation, it has also played an incalculable role with regard to linguistic affirmation. As explained by the Authors of the report of the Task Force on Broadcasting Policy, also known as the Sauvageau–Cuplan Committee: “Francophones are well aware of the importance of radio and television in strengthening the language. The best known example is the sports vocabulary, which was almost completely anglicized, even in France. Two Radio–Canada announcers, Michel Normandin and René Lecavalier, had to develop new terms to describe the games they were announcing and the French equivalents they developed were adopted so wholeheartedly that competing private broadcasters, print media and sports fans gradually began to use them, and they eventually became an accepted part of the language.”

(1205)

However, not only do francophones benefit from good quality programming, they are also able to receive broadcasting signals from a variety of sources. In the first place, there are the conventional television services: Télé–Métropole and Télévision Quatre Saisons, as well as two French–language education networks: Radio–Québec and TVOntario’s La Chaîne.

In addition to these, there are a number of specialized services: Réseau des sports, Météomédia, Canal Famille, TV5, Musique Plus and, just recently, Réseau de l’information, RDI. This last service addresses a need that had been identified within the Canadian broadcasting system. I hasten to add that the Bloc Québécois itself had demanded that such a service be established. RDI went on the air January 1, 1995, and since then it has been doing an admirable job of covering events in Canada and elsewhere.

All these services provide a range of programming more varied than that available in any other francophone country.

[English]

Furthermore through TV 5 the federal government has been able to ensure that the influence of Canada’s francophone culture spreads to the four corners of the earth. TV 5 broadcasts in Europe, Africa, the United States, Latin America and the Caribbean. We anticipate that its signal will soon be picked up in Asia. In all these parts of the world a Canadian traveller staying

in a place with the necessary receiving equipment will be able to watch Bernard Derome and numerous other broadcasts produced in Canada.

One cannot speak of Radio–Canada without mentioning its regional presence, particularly outside Quebec where its programming had considerable impact in communities such as my own in St. Boniface which until recently had the impression that mass media were inevitably anglophone. Collective identities in minority communities began to emerge thanks to Radio–Canada.

There is no doubt that the review of the corporation’s mandate and the budget cuts the government had to impose will require some realignment. However the need for realignment had become unavoidable because of the 500–channel universe and the information highway.

The reality is that we are going through a period when certainties will be tested, when change will be the only constant, when our creativity will be our chief resource and unfortunately when public funds will continue to be in limited supply.

This does not mean that we are giving up. We must find common solutions to ensure the continued vitality of French language culture and to ensure the relevance of our national institutions based less on the resources allocated to them and more on the imagination we are capable of showing. The committee on heritage has already taken steps in this direction. We must continue our deliberations and come up with innovative solutions.

Radio–Canada will measure up to the challenges. It will be able to fulfil its present mandate as well as any other mandate that it might be given. Its past accomplishments has secured it a promising future.

(1210)

[Translation]

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Madam Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak to this motion, which I will do from a different perspective. The Bloc was extremely critical of the minister’s lack of openness this morning because the announcement made by Michèle Fortin may seriously handicap a powerful instrument for the transmission and production of Quebec culture.

But first of all, I would like to respond to members who wondered why we were defending the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, since it is a federal institution and we want to get out of Canada.

I would like to read a quote from what Pierre Elliott Trudeau said in 1967 in *Le fédéralisme et la société canadienne française*: “One way of offsetting the appeal of separatism is by investing tremendous amounts of time, energy, and money in nationalism, at the federal level. A national image must be

created that will have such an appeal as to make any image of a separatist group unattractive. Resources must be diverted into such things as national flags, anthems, education, arts councils, broadcasting corporations, film boards". This is what Pierre Elliott Trudeau wrote in *Le fédéralisme et la société canadienne française*, HMM, 1967.

We are defending the CBC's French network, which we feel is at risk because of imminent cutbacks, because we are aware that despite the mission Pierre Elliott Trudeau wanted to give the network, Radio-Canada has been a very important vehicle for the transmission and production of Quebec culture, although we could have dispensed with some of the bias involved.

Altogether, it is part of our living heritage. This is an institution that belongs to us, and we want to make sure it will not only continue to exist but will be able to improve the quality of its productions. In fact, Radio-Canada is the depository of a collective resource, a collective instrument that is essential to our culture, and the Minister of Canadian Heritage has no right to trifle with the future of this powerful collective instrument of Quebec culture.

I may recall what was said by Gérald Leblanc on tv—it was not on Radio-Canada—last Sunday. The following gives some idea of the ratings of French television in Quebec compared with those of Canadian tv productions in the rest of Canada: "When the Royal Air Farce, an excellent comedy program, reaches one million viewers out of a potential 20 million, it celebrates and breaks open the champagne. However, every week, Radio-Canada and TVA together regularly reach a viewership of three million or more out of a potential seven million".

(1215)

He added: "If we were to obey the dictates of the market, Radio-Canada would be affected, cuts would have to be made, but the CBC could not survive". Far be it from me to suggest that we should take away the CBC's means to survive. We are only too aware of the significance culture holds for the future of a people and a nation. We can state forcefully that no people, no nation, with the exception of the United States perhaps, can let the powerful instrument which creates and conveys its culture become hostage to the marketplace.

I add that the CBC is the only broadcaster that has strong Canadian content during peak hours. All other Canadian television networks have a low domestic content, around 20 to 30 per cent during peak hours, which can seriously affect Canadian culture. As for us, we chose this morning to show how important Radio-Canada is to the Quebec culture and how much we want not only to know what the government is planning but also to block its plans to deprive the SRC of its means. We care because the goals of the SRC are intrinsic goals, they are the collective

Supply

goals it was created to achieve. That is why we cannot afford to let Radio-Canada be deprived of its means.

Mrs. Fortin, to whom I listened with great pleasure, was defending wholeheartedly in her own energetic way the role of this public television network which she compared to public schools. We never say that public schools are not profitable and must be financed in some other way. Public television has an important role to play. At least, it plays an important role in Quebec and it can play that role even better. We think that our colleagues from English Canada could ponder with us ways of strengthening Canadian culture.

Being a francophone in North America can be difficult since we represent a little more than 2 per cent of the population and we are surrounded, submerged by English language channels. To remain a country not only with a distinct border but also with a distinct national identity, Canada—which does have its own culture, though sometimes it is not easily differentiated from that of the United States—must protect its public television.

I would like to say a few words about culture. If in fact we attach so much importance to public television and to television in general, it is because television is, along with other audio-visual techniques, the main vehicle of culture nowadays. It is not only a vehicle of that culture which exists and which we shall try to define, it is also an extremely important forum for cultural production.

(1220)

When one realizes the public reached by Radio-Canada and TVA in Quebec, when one realizes the impact popular programs may have on the people, how these programs can strengthen its cultural identity, give rise to debate, question actions, attitudes and values, one realizes how alive our culture is, nurtured of course by our heritage, our history, the arts and all that cultural production embraces, but digested and distributed in another form, vehicled by the media of our times.

In this era of telecommunications, which is still full of surprises, it is a means, the most important means of distribution, development and production of culture.

Figures alone are not enough when we are talking about such an important instrument, which defines what people will think and are thinking and what affects Canadians' current and future desire to live together. This is what nationalism is all about. This is why we say that there are two countries within this country. We keep seeing it—every day. And what we want is sovereignty, because we think it is better for our people.

At the same time, we are aware that Canadian culture as well warrants clearer definition. It too needs to find expression in a world in which it is perhaps more threatened than francophone culture, because it shares a common language with the United States, which is more than a neighbour; it is the prevailing influence of our time. And if, because of this, Canadian minds

Supply

are fed American values, images, references, history, action and activities, I would take the liberty of saying that one must draw one's own conclusions and take no delight in the fact that English Canadian public television reaches such a small portion of the population, quite the contrary.

Of course, there are my hon. colleagues beside me who say that culture does need the help of the state. I would challenge them. The state does not create the cultural product, the artist. However, without a way to live, without sufficient means, few artists, artistic endeavours and cultural productions would survive, particularly in today's world. We must remember, here again, that the CBC is in competition with American productions, which have 20 times the resources.

We have chosen to talk about the CBC because our culture, its life and its evolution, depend in part on the continued availability of resources. Just as in the past, during the Renaissance, people needed patrons, the patrons are now being replaced by the state, by states.

(1225)

No people, no self-respecting nation can afford not to support this great tool which television has become.

It must be said that the audiovisual medium requires a lot of resources. You and I can make video clips, but to produce programs which can compete with other programs coming from all over the world, we need resources. Otherwise, all the talents available to us will either be under-utilized or not used at all.

Culture is what defines a people, a nation. It is its soul. Its way of being. It is not static. It implies a knowledge of the past. It implies the handing down of the cultural production of previous generations. But it also implies a certain intermixing. It implies that each generation has to embark on the creative process using the same basic tools. But, in the long run, it is culture, this way of being, which guarantees that globalization will not reduce all cultures to the one with the most resources. This is what is really at stake in the present situation when we talk about all these numbers.

In 1992, in a fantastic speech he made in Montreal, Boutros Boutros-Ghali said: "The sound globalization of modern life implies the existence of strong cultural identities, since an excessive or ill-conceived globalization could crush various cultures and melt them down into a uniform one, which would spell nothing good for the world".

He added: "Individuals need an intermediary between a universe too large for them and their solitary status, for the mere fact that, at the start, they need a language to understand and decipher the outside world. What they need are practical alliances and a framework of cultural references, to sum it up, a passport to the world". Television is that passport to the world

for most young people. That is why it is a national responsibility. This passport contributes the most to the creation of future societies, because it does not act alone.

I digressed a little, but now return to Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali's speech. "Nation-states, which transcend the physically closer alliances of family, clans or villages, fill these needs. A nation has a common reason for existing, which is the first step towards the universal, towards a universal civilization. An orderly world is a world of independent nations which are open to each other and respect each other's differences and similarities". This is what I call the fruitful logic of nationalities and universality.

To defend the Société Radio-Canada and the CBC, the Bloc Québécois says "stop". Culture is the soul of the people, and if culture is not given sufficient means, the growth of these little people, these small states, will be stunted in a world overshadowed by the giant we all know well.

(1230)

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Madam Speaker, first of all, I would like to congratulate my hon. colleague for Mercier on her excellent, and in a large part spontaneous, intervention. It shows how much culture, whether it is Quebec culture or Canadian culture, is dear to her heart and how much she knows about the fundamentals of its development.

I would like my colleague to comment on what I am going to say, because my understanding of the present debate on the future of the CBC reminds me of other debates we have had on the future of Quebec culture and Canadian culture.

Just remember the whole copyright issue which is so fundamental to the development of Canada and Quebec from a cultural point of view. Remember also everything related to the information highway where Quebec, because of its different language in North America, is not recognized, not invited to participate. This is extremely serious. It is also excluded because of the centralizing nature of Canada.

Another example is what happened with Ginn Publishing, where English Canada sacrificed for peanuts a Canadian publisher, simply because we are considering ourselves more and more as vassals of our American neighbour.

This debate on the CBC shows that it is essential to the preservation of the future of English Canada, of the English Canadian culture. As to the Quebec French speaking culture, we are preparing the future so that it will be preserved. I would like my colleague to comment on this subject, that is the American influence on these issues.

Mrs. Lalonde: Madam Speaker, that is in fact the underlying basis of my remarks. We must not think that, in this world where the economy plays such an important role, we cannot afford to

invest in culture. Because culture is the very essence of our identity.

More than that, very concretely, the cultural industry is the main showcase for our cultural talents and products. This industry also needs encouragement.

The fact that Quebec cannot sign international agreements, negotiate its own bilateral contracts or participate in regulatory talks, that it is thus often unable to develop direct expertise, that it cannot address some problems such as copyright matters, and that it cannot continue regional and local production, for example, because it cannot afford it and because the resources come from Ottawa, all contribute to its erosion, if we continue with this comparison.

The French, who are the unchallenged champions of culture, invest heavily in their culture, their heritage, their television, their arts community.

(1235)

We could say that they know how important this industry is, but they also know how closely it is tied to their place as a middle power in the world. They know that culture is the glue that makes people want to live together. They know that it is extremely important to allocate all the resources and all the energy they can to this industry.

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will preface my comments on the motion before us by the following preliminary remarks because I want to make myself perfectly clear.

First, I have the profound conviction that there is a need in our country for a national public broadcaster. I am convinced that this broadcaster is essential to our cohesion and the development of our culture, as both francophones and anglophones. After listening to a fair number of my colleagues opposite, I am happy to see that they support the position I have always defended. Inasmuch as they continue to support this position I just heard our colleague mention, I am very pleased with their contribution. We are working together to ensure that Radio-Canada remains a large corporation and continues to contribute to the development of the francophone culture in Quebec and elsewhere in Canada.

My second introductory observation concerns the relationship between the government and Radio-Canada. I think that there is no ambiguity there either. There has been much talk about this issue. The government, and the Minister of Canadian Heritage in particular, always made it clear that we respect Radio-Canada's autonomy, as essential to this great institution but also to freedom of press, which we wholeheartedly support.

So, what is the government's involvement? Well, Radio-Canada belongs to all Canadians and the government is responsible to ensure that this public property is managed properly and well

Supply

run. That responsibility takes a specific form with budgeting, in so far as budgetary appropriations are part of CBC's budget, and I will get back to this, and with appointments to the board of directors and, of course, to the executive level of the corporation.

The government can express opinions, as I just did, on general issues related to CBC's position in the world of communications. We can express such opinions. We state our general policy, so that CBC's managers can develop their plans and their management strategy in compliance with the federal government's vision and main policies.

The third point is that the review and the decisions made concerning CBC are part of a larger initiative, namely the development of what is called the information highway. The information highway will, of course, provide information, but it will also contain numerous and significant cultural elements. There is no ambiguity here. As spokesman of the Canadian government, I keep saying that we hope that Canadian content will be prevalent on that information highway. As I said earlier, and opposition members support that position, it is important that the information highway helps promote Canadian culture, which includes the French-speaking Canadian and Quebec culture.

(1240)

What should we do now? There are three basic institutions which belong to Canada and which can help create this Canadian content. The largest one of is CBC, of course, but there are also the National Film Board and Telefilm Canada. These agencies are in the sound and picture business and, to be sure, very important decisions will be made this year, in 1995, regarding the creation of sound and pictures by Canadian producers.

Numerous studies commissioned by the Minister of Industry and myself are currently being conducted regarding this issue. There is a reference to the CRTC, an advisory committee on the information highway, as well as several other committees at work. All this will lead us to make fundamental decisions a little later on this year, when the consultation process will have brought together all the elements we need to elaborate our policies, the architecture of the information highway and the traffic regulations for this highway.

I think it is important to say these things, because it is within this context that the CBC and the two other agencies I mentioned must make their contribution. It is only natural to address this issue and to consider the way the CBC will be able to play its part.

This brings me to the decisions announced in the Budget which will especially affect the CBC. There are three of them. Nothing complicated, only three decisions. First, the government will undertake a fundamental review of its support, and the mandates of, the three agencies I mentioned.

Supply

Of course, the object of this review is to ensure that these three agencies are in the best position possible to play their roles on the information highway. When I talk about the mandates of these agencies, I use the expression in the large sense. I do not mean only a sentence in a piece of legislation. I think it would be wise, while we are examining all our communications, to review this particular aspect of the mandates. This was the first decision that was announced. I will have the pleasure, very soon, to announce the members of the group that will carry out this review and the very specific terms of their mandate.

The second decision announced in the budget was the transfer of Radio Canada International back to the CBC. This decision was made because it was found that the CBC should again assume the responsibility for this agency. I know this will have repercussions on the budget but the conditions and budgetary aspects of this transfer can be the subject of various discussions between the CBC and the government.

Finally, there is the parliamentary appropriation for the coming fiscal year. This appropriation provides for a 4 per cent reduction in the CBC's base budget as far as the parliamentary appropriation for this fiscal year ending soon is concerned. So, why were so many questions asked, since these decisions are clear?

We were asked why the parliamentary appropriations for a second and third fiscal years were not announced at the same time. The answer is simple. If we are serious with our review of the mandates and our study, it would be wise to wait for the results of this examination and for the recommendations that will follow before deciding on the CBC's budget for the second and third years.

(1245)

To drive from Ottawa to Montreal, one does not need as much gas as if he or she would be to go to Quebec City. Thus, there is a link between the mandate and the budget, as the CBC's chairman indicated many times publicly. Thus, we answered that question and we will have mandates redefined when preparing for the next budget, for next year's budget.

Another thing we have to take into account is the work of the House heritage committee. This is a review of the CBC and it includes, as indicated by the reference, or it will include, I hope, a review on other possible sources of funding the CBC could have access to. That report is not the only document that mentions possible new funding sources for the CBC.

How could we set future budgets permanently when basic elements of the fiscal situation of the CBC are not yet known?

To conclude, I would like to say that I agree with a view that has been expressed by members on both sides of the House: It is important that radio and television programming by our public and private broadcasters provide the bulk of what is transmitted over our information highway.

A few weeks ago, I was in Brussels for a meeting of the G-7 communications ministers. It turned out that I was the only minister who was also in charge of cultural matters. The message I had was essentially what I just said. We cannot discuss setting up an infrastructure without first discussing the content it will carry.

After my remarks, there was no more talk of a comprehensive information infrastructure; all of the talk was about a new information society. That is very important in my view. I got unanimous support, including from the American delegation, when I said that the content that will be carried over those international information highways should reflect different cultures and languages instead of a standardized content that would not be positive for creative artists around the world.

That will conclude my remarks. We are in the process of developing important policies. I know this is a difficult period. We cannot ignore the present fiscal limitations that everybody understands. We have decided that we should all contribute to bringing down the deficit. We should not fool ourselves: this government has a tough fiscal policy, but that policy is supported by 70 per cent of Canadians. I am pleased to add that all agencies that report through me told me that they understood the fiscal situation of the government and that they were ready to co-operate, so that we can eliminate a deficit that makes it so difficult to govern this country.

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Madam Speaker, I want to thank the minister for taking the trouble to come here to get his message across. There are a few questions I would like to raise.

But first, I thought it was interesting that he had a clear itemized message for us. Last year, we spent the year, from the time we were elected until the end of June, sitting two days a week on the Canadian heritage committee and listening to people who came to talk about the electronic highway, to be told that Mr. Manley and Mr. Dupuy, the two ministers, formed a committee that would ask the CRTC to look into the information highway.

(1250)

Now we are starting all over again. The same people who came before the committee will do the same before the CRTC.

The minister said earlier: "I cannot announce the budget cuts for next year or for the year after". Not according to our sources, which made it very clear in the newspapers and on television that the cuts for next year were already known. He said: "We cannot do that, because I asked a lot of people to look into the matter". Well, that is precisely what the Canadian heritage committee has been keeping itself busy with for the past six months. It has heard the testimony of many people who came and talked about the CBC. And even before our report was released, we already knew this report would be submitted to a

Supply

committee of three experts and we knew as well that the decisions had already been made.

This year, \$44 million will be cut. If the government cannot announce next year's cuts because it is waiting for the findings of a committee which has yet to be appointed, on what basis did it make its cuts this year? I am not saying that the status quo is what we wanted, financially speaking. Not at all. But the government did not even wait until the committee finished its work or, because it failed to take the longer view, give it its mandate soon enough for the work done by our committee to have an impact on the budget.

We asked whether we should work a little faster so that we could have an impact on the budget. We never got an answer. The sad part is that taxpayers' money had already been invested in the SECOR studies on the situation at Telefilm and the National Film Board. Since that was not satisfactory, another study was ordered. The government thinks everything will be all right, thanks to the information highway. It is like deciding to build a controlled access highway across Canada and getting rid of our other highways. Even with the information highway, we still must keep our other highways.

The government is letting one of those highways—the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—go to pieces by putting it in a financial situation that is unacceptable at this time, without taking the time to make the right decisions and without taking the time to ask, for instance, whether it is necessary to maintain CBC headquarters, to send the corporation each year to the CRTC, and so forth. Many areas will be affected by cuts. However, when the government announces it will cut so many positions, it will not necessarily be the vice presidents, so that we can keep the people who are involved in production.

How can the minister guarantee that we can do this? Someone will have to administer the \$180 million in foregone revenue, the \$44 million that has just been cut and the \$15 million it will take to manage Radio Canada International. Can we have the assurance that those who lose their jobs will not be the performers, producers and creators? How can the government guarantee it will remove people who are not directly involved in production but are part of a bureaucracy that has to issue cheques in Ottawa to pay people who take part in television broadcasts in Nova Scotia, for instance?

Mr. Dupuy: Let us speak first about the respective roles of the CRTC and of the heritage committee. They do not deal with the same issues, although these issues are related.

The CRTC's terms of reference deal with competition problems arising between the cable industry and telephone companies. These problems cover a series of issues which are industrial, commercial or cultural in nature, but which do not come under the terms of reference of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

(1255)

Specifically, in view of the importance given by the government to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, it was very important not to let a whole discussion on the architecture of the electronic highway take place while ignoring the broadcasters, particularly the biggest of them all.

That is precisely why I wanted a thinking process on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation which would be open to all parties and to all the people who would decide to testify.

As for the relationship between the reports that the heritage committee will produce and the last budget, of course, it would have been possible for the heritage committee to report very quickly, but I believe that it did what had to be done. It took the time to think about this and it also gave us the time to think. We have targeted a fiscal year, but that is precisely in order to benefit from the advice that the heritage committee and the other advisory organizations will give us.

There is nothing unusual for a government, whether a Liberal one or other, that has always determined in its budget the commitments for the next fiscal year, to continue to do so. This world is not a world of absolute certainty; it is changing. And we are indeed going through a period of huge changes in the field of communications. It would have been irresponsible to say: "We are going to take decisions for the next 15 years", when everything is changing and we have not yet seen the results of this serious work which is being done.

This also brings me to a comment on studies. There have indeed been many studies. We are up to here in studies. But this time, we are not initiating a new study, let there be no confusion about this. We are trying to have people synthesize the data, to help government bring the elements together and prepare some specific recommendations. So we are certainly not trying to delay things, on the contrary, we want to accelerate the process.

We must not forget that by next summer, next fall, we will begin to see the preparation of the next budget. This is exactly what the deadlines will force us to do. By the time the next budget is ready, I hope we will have answers which will be satisfactory for the CBC.

I must say I disapprove of the attitude of the Bloc Québécois. They are trying to cause uncertainty, precisely in the mind of those they pretend to be protecting. Those who will suffer most will be the craftsmen, the people who will feel distressed by this confusion the Bloc is trying to create, for reasons that are not always clear. I will not go into details. However, I feel we should explain the truth and the process to those who, after all, are at the origin of all productions. That is what we are trying to do and I hope my colleagues will cooperate to ensure that these people, who have always contributed in a remarkable way to the Canadian culture and the Quebec culture, will understand we

Supply

want to help them and give them a mandate where they will truly have a role to play.

It is false to say that government is trying to kill the CBC. On the contrary, the government is trying to ensure that the CBC will be the most efficient instrument, the best institution with the best policies, to carry out the new mandate.

[English]

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the Bloc motion reads:

That the House condemn the government for the refusal by the Minister of Canadian Heritage to publish the government's decisions concerning funding for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation over the next three years, thus causing an ominous threat to loom over the CBC's French-language network.

(1300)

In essence the Bloc is chastising the government for not being accountable on spending decisions. Naturally I agree with that. My party agrees with that. We believe very much in the principle of accountability.

If turnabout really is fair play, and I believe it is, I have some questions for the Bloc. Where does it get off blocking the business of an entire nation on the whole issue of back to work legislation and the railway strike? How accountable is the Bloc being to its own people in its own province of Quebec who are losing pay, jobs, business and markets because their party will not stand up and act for them? Where is its concern for the unemployed now?

I really feel the Bloc is letting people down. It has acted irresponsibly throughout the whole process and has thwarted the democratic will of this place. That is why I find it ironic that it would put forward a motion that would force a degree of accountability on the government.

Let us talk for a moment about accountability and about the motion. The motion is too narrow. The separatist government of Quebec talked about how it would protect minorities in Quebec, but there is no mention of CBC English language services in the motion.

I have to ask why that is. Just how deep rooted is its commitment to minorities in Quebec? Not very, I suggest. I believe all the statements it has made about being fair to minorities is sugar coating. It is a vain attempt to draw in people who are not francophones in Quebec to vote for the Parti Québécois in the referendum. I believe it is vain.

Let us talk for a moment about why accountability with respect to the CBC is so important. Obviously accountability is important at any time, but it is especially so when the future of the CBC literally hangs in the balance. We have a \$550 billion debt and a deficit of about \$30 billion. It is an understatement to say that our fiscal situation is extremely serious.

In considering the whole issue we have to ask ourselves whether as parliamentarians we will be accountable and responsible. We have to ask ourselves why we need a CBC in the first place. Do people really want some kind of institution called the CBC, or do they really want interesting programs that deal with issues not dealt with by private broadcasters at this time at a cost that recognizes our fiscal constraints? That is the real question. I will talk more about it in a moment.

Let us talk about the different divisions of the CBC. People who listen are largely happy with what they receive on CBC radio. However, I firmly believe that the CBC's choice of issues to explore betrays a liberal bias and truly lacks balance on some social and political issues. If the CBC were to fix that it would have a larger audience than it has today.

I also believe all kinds of efficiencies could be built into CBC radio that would make it function a lot better than it does today. On the whole, however, relative to some of the other services the CBC provides radio is in relatively good shape.

The real problem is with CBC English language television. I commend a recent article in the Montreal *Gazette* to members of the House. It was by W. Paterson Ferns and is probably the best description of not only some of the problems with the CBC but also some of the solutions. I am mostly addressing English language television when I talk about this matter.

Mr. Ferns made four major points. He said that the CBC should start over, that it should start as if the page were blank, by a commitment to focusing programming. Mr. Ferns described Britain's channel 4 as a model and pointed out that it had a mandate to serve all of the people some of the time. Not all of the people all of the time but just all of the people some of the time, in other words to really sharpen that focus.

The question Mr. Ferns asked explicitly and implicitly in his article was: Why in the world should the CBC be broadcasting American programs? It makes no sense. Those programs flood over the border on cable systems. We do not need the CBC to rebroadcast them. To its credit I believe the president has recognized that it is a crazy idea. Certainly the chairman of the CRTC has talked about it. It is a crazy idea and we should move away from it.

(1305)

Another question is why we are broadcasting programs the private networks are already carrying. Why is the CBC so heavily involved in sports? Obviously TSN is more than happy and more than prepared to pick up carrying hockey games and is already doing so. Do we really need hockey on the CBC? Why is the CBC bidding to pick up Olympic coverage? Why is it bidding twice as much as CTV was prepared to bid to pick up Olympic coverage? It is a huge issue and at a time of fiscal

constraint it is an important issue. It is something the heritage minister and the leadership of the CBC have to address.

We have to ask ourselves and the CBC has to ask itself what types of valuable programming are not on the menu of private broadcasters right now. I do not think that has been done yet. We see a lot of programming that is currently covered by either the major networks, by the Americans or by the specialty channels. That should be a cue to us that we must move away from it.

Mr. Ferns also talked in his article about the need for thin administration. He pointed out that Britain's channel four limited its administration to 10 per cent of the total budget. It is very difficult to examine the CBC figures because they are just not available. When we look through the annual report of the CBC it is not obvious just how much money is spent on administration and it does beg the question: What is it attempting to hide? Why can we not see those figures?

The motion brought forward by the Bloc asks the right question and it should be asked of all the CBC: Why are spending decisions not being made public? Then the question that flows from that is: Why is the CBC not forthright about how it spends all its money?

The CBC's percentage of administration to budget is unclear, as I pointed out. However we know the CBC has a very old style hierarchy of management. It has several vice-presidents and several senior managers in Ottawa. It has more senior managers at the regional level. There has to be a lot of money spent on administration, given the type of hierarchy.

Mr. Ferns also raised that leadership in a network should be comprised of programmers. I must admit that at first I took issue with that point, being concerned about the fiscal side. However if safeguards are built in there is some sense in the idea.

I point to the private sector and the great success of Moses Znaimer who has brought tremendous success not only to City TV in Toronto but also to MuchMusic and the Bravo channel, one of the new speciality channels that can be found on networks around the country. I believe it is enjoying a measure of success.

Visionaries like Mr. Znaimer are probably better able to anticipate public tastes and better able to see needs than perhaps they are sometimes perceived by the public. That is why Mr. Znaimer has been hugely successful. Perhaps one of the reasons the CBC has not been successful is that it has been too administratively driven in the past. Even with people like Mr. Watson there was so much bureaucracy in the way and such a lot of baggage attached to the CBC that it was very difficult for the programming vision to get down to the field level and to drive the CBC agenda.

Supply

There is a lot to be said about what Mr. Ferns suggested with respect to the CBC and other public and private broadcasters around the world. A program maker should lead that institution.

My experience is as a broadcaster who came up on the programming side as opposed to the administration or the sales sides. I have seen many successful private sector operations being driven by people with a good sense of programming, a sense of what people want from programming. From a personal standpoint I think it is really true.

(1310)

A program producer who heads up an organization may indeed be the best choice as long as the organization is accountable. It has to be accountable not just to a board of directors but to its advertisers, its viewers and taxpayers. This is something that has not happened with the CBC to this point, nor with the government when it comes to not sharing information that is important to taxpayers, namely how their money is spent.

An institution such as the CBC must be accountable to Parliament not in name only but really accountable. There should be an annual review of the CBC by this body in a deep and probing way so that if things are going off track we have immediate recourse: We can jump in and make some changes as appropriate.

Also Mr. Ferns indicated that news and current affairs shows should be bought from a reputable source and all shows should be commissioned from the independent sector. That makes a tremendous amount of sense. He argues that the corporation should not make, that it should buy. The CBC invests a tremendous amount of resources—time, money and manpower—in producing programs when there is a huge creative sector out there that could provide and would compete to provide the CBC with all kinds of programming. It should avail itself of that.

That type of competition would lead to better programming. It would also lead to cheaper programming because people would go the extra mile to get their costs down to win the bid and ultimately get a program on the CBC. That makes sense. Why invest money in bureaucracy, administration, bricks, mortar and equipment when it can obtain programs directly from the makers of programs?

The analogy in the article was that book publishers did not hire authors to sit in a room and produce novels which they then published. Book publishers buy the finished product. It makes all the sense in the world. That is exactly what the CBC should be doing.

Supply

In summary, we cannot afford the CBC as it is now. To simply parrot what happens on other networks is a complete waste of money, talent and time. People do not watch the CBC as it is now. Advertisers do not support it. While there are a few popular programs, CBC English language television is generally not held in high esteem.

This impression is only compounded when the CBC and the government shroud themselves in secrecy. Given this veil of secrecy, who among us is not tempted to ask the obvious questions: What does it have to hide? What is it afraid of?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his remarks, which I listened to carefully. He mentioned at the start that he was surprised to discover we wanted to talk about television, when we were preventing the trains from running.

I think it is extremely important to remind him once again, —we said it a number of times this morning. It is not really relevant, but, since the subject has been raised—had the government accepted the Bloc's proposals, the bill would have been adopted a while back and the trains would probably have started running by now. So, do not blame us if the trains are not running and no one is looking after the economy.

Looking after culture is in fact looking after the economy. It is not only when the trains are running that the economy exists.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mrs. Tremblay: He also felt our motion was somewhat limited, because we referred only to the French network. Throughout his speech, my colleague talked only of the CBC. This is perfectly understandable. He knows the CBC better than I ever will, and I know the SRC better than he ever will. Since there are really two peoples, two nations, two cultures, two of everything in this country, and people want to deny this fact, it is not surprising that they find our motion limited when we talk of the French network.

(1315)

What I think is also important to point out, and I have the figures to back me up, in our concern about the famous cuts at the CBC, is what proportion each of the English and French networks will get. It is also perhaps important here for the people in this House and for everyone watching us on television to know that, for an hour of news, the SRC gets \$7,000, while the CBC gets \$18,000. For an hour of variety programming, the SRC gets \$30,000, the CBC, \$141,000. For a drama program, the SRC gets \$68,000, and the CBC gets \$99,000.

We can therefore readily understand that, with less money to begin with, there will be even less money to produce our

programs, if the cuts are made the same way. The problem is that the SRC's programs are popular. The BBM ratings for the SRC are positive. What program on the CBC can claim to have 4 million viewers?

Some hon. members: Not one.

Mrs. Tremblay: Not a single one. The best CBC programs barely reach a figure of 10 or 12 per cent of viewers. In round figures, in very very generous terms, this means some 2 million viewers. We are therefore definitely not talking about the same order of magnitude, other than to say that a lot of people watch television, and if we had the same resources as the CBC, even the anglophones would probably start watching the SRC, because they would find it interesting.

Does my colleague not think that we have reason to worry about the present situation, since we are told that the information highway is the answer which, in a way, is like saying that we will solve the question of the CBC in 20 years? But what about this year or next? It seems logical that we should worry about keeping a general interest television network since, according to statistics given at the heritage committee, there are places in the West, for example, where rural populations can get only one TV network, the CBC. The same is true for some parts of Quebec.

Then would it not make sense to try to find a way to reach that market? I have nothing against helping private enterprise, but should we not also try to maintain a general interest television network for the whole Canadian community, French speaking as well as English speaking? What does he think about that?

[*English*]

Mr. Solberg: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the hon member's question. She talked about several things but I would like to comment on what kind of service should be provided to people in remote areas.

It is a legitimate responsibility of the CBC to provide service in remote areas. I completely accept that. However, there is a larger question and one I posed in my talk which is, does it always need to be the CBC? Is it really important that it be a particular institution, or is it the service itself that is important?

Sometimes that service can be better provided by a private sector broadcaster. When talking about news and current affairs, there is no doubt in my mind that the private sector can and has produced shows which are as good as those on the CBC.

I would argue that people in some of those communities should have the choice of bringing in either a private sector broadcaster or the CBC. It should be ultimately driven by them.

While it is a legitimate role for the CBC, it does beg the bigger question: Is it really the institution we want there, or is it a certain type of programming? That is probably what people

Supply

really want. At the end of the day it should be up to them to decide what kind of service they want brought in.

(1320)

If it is something they cannot get otherwise, then it is something the government should provide for them. That is probably a good use for the CBC northern service. In talking about TV broadcasting, if people in a community would rather have CTV than CBC and it requires building a transmitter, then personally I do not see a problem with bringing that service in instead of CBC.

Mr. Alex Shepherd (Durham, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have great interest in taking part in this debate today.

It is seemingly unusual that only yesterday I was in the House arguing and defending the budget program of the government. At that time my hon. colleagues in the Bloc were saying: "Cut more. You need to cut more. You have not done enough. The province of Quebec is sitting in a sinking ship and we are not doing enough". Today, they are speaking the reverse argument. "You are doing too much. You are hurting us. Do not do that any more". What is it going to be?

It is clear to most people in Canada that the status quo is not good enough. As we approach the 21st century we have to change. We have to change as a government, as a country and as a people. The status quo which is being defended by the Bloc Quebecois is not satisfactory.

While talking about the status quo, it is interesting to note the problems we are having with our rail industry today. That is part of the same argument in some ways because some of these contractual agreements have matters in them that go back almost a century.

I was surprised to learn that blacksmithing is a job description which is still available in the CN. One has to be a blacksmith to get certain types of jobs. This is the kind of thing the Bloc Quebecois is defending, blacksmithing, as we approach the 21st century. I do not think that is good enough.

I can say that the people of my riding in which General Motors is a major feature are not at all impressed by the ability to manage this economy that the Bloc Quebecois has shown so clearly. We try to manage and people are stopping us from doing that.

We share the North American continent with our tremendously large neighbour to the south. This neighbour has tremendous resources, huge programming and cultural diversity. It is exporting its culture all over the world. Programs come easily across the border. Indeed as we go to better telecommunications devices it is going to be almost impossible to avoid that kind of culture penetrating the North American milieu. That affects our culture, both English and French.

I have always been a supporter of the CBC. I have always believed it is necessary to foster Canadian culture. What we have to do is to foster it in an affordable way.

Clearly the CBC has been a vanguard of supporting culture both in English Canada and French Canada. I note that Canada is an exporter of French programming and clearly therefore, it has been a success. It has been a success not only of the CBC but also of our federal system which has recognized the need to foster these industries, to get them going and let them flourish.

As we approach the 21st century, it is clear we have to change the way we conduct our government and the way we do business. It is clear that governments want to withdraw from direct management of different types of industry, whether they are cultural or direct industries like CN Rail and let others do that for them. It does not mean the government wants to abdicate Canadian culture, far from it. The object of the exercise is to find a better and more efficient way to deliver the same thing.

(1325)

The CRTC has a mandate which does just that. New licences have just been issued. The basis of that licensing program was to foster and assist Canadian culture.

I remember not too many years ago when the finance department brought in an incentive to support both the French and English Canadian film industry. I was a little pessimistic at first. I am always pessimistic about tax driven investments. However it was very successful both for the French and English people in Canada who developed a movie industry. Once again, Canada was an exporter of French language programming to the world.

We have now slowly moved out of the tax incentives for that. Once we get a child going, it is no different from a family. If we think about it, when our children reach a certain age it is time for them to go out on their own. It is time for them to do their own thing. That is really what we are saying about the CBC.

Even after these cutbacks the CBC will still have funding of \$1.4 billion. We can hardly consider that a small amount of money in support of cultural broadcasting in Canada regardless of what language it is in.

We are not saying to the CBC that it has to cut a lot of jobs, which possibly it will. We are saying that it has to redefine where it is going in this country. It has to define the things it can do well and rethink some of the things that perhaps it should not be doing any more.

I had a discussion with some journalists one day. They thought it was unusual that the CBC could have journalists in just about every town in this country whereas other private broadcasters had to rationalize that and make it more efficient. This is what we are asking the CBC to do, to become more efficient so it can be slowly weaned off the public payroll.

Supply

The motion very clearly is talking about the concern of the reduction in funding. I ask my colleagues in the Bloc, what would the alternative be? Would the alternative in meeting our deficit targets be to transfer this tax on the poor, the needy, the unemployed? Those are the alternatives. We have to get our deficits in order. That is the commitment we have made to the Canadian people. I can say that the Canadian people are very happy about the leadership we have taken in these areas.

I know there are many new broadcasting ventures. My colleague from the Reform Party mentioned CITY-TV in Toronto which has a tremendous array of new broadcasting programs. In other words it is not necessary to have publicly funded broadcasting companies simply carrying on with this type of production.

The bottom line is that it is necessary. The taxpayers are saying we have to get our economic house in order. The taxpayers are on the hook even after all of this is over for \$1.4 billion. Taxpayers want to be able to see what they are getting for that money. In some ways they are getting valued service for that.

Most people in Canada will continue to support cultural funding for broadcasting, but at a significantly reduced level. That is only reasonable. We have to focus on the things which possibly are missing, those things that perhaps need a bit of help right now, but those other areas which can stand on their own, we can let them fly.

In conclusion, it upsets me very much to see that members of the Bloc Quebecois simply want to carry on with the old systems of the past. They do not want to be flexible in seeing how we can change government financing. More important, they do not want to assist their cultural industries from the infancy stage to fruition.

(1330)

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on the motion of the hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata. I am a supporter of the CBC, of its domestic and international services, in both official languages.

I was shocked to see that the motion states that an ominous threat looms over the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and, in particular, the CBC French language network. In no way is the government threatening our public broadcaster. Far from it. The government has acted in a responsible fashion to balance the need of all Canadians to continue to receive high quality radio and television services in both official languages with the requirement to take immediate steps to put its fiscal affairs in order.

In addressing this motion, it would be extremely useful to compare the Canadian broadcasting model with examples of similar efforts in other countries. Canada is not alone in its search to develop answers to the questions facing public broad-

casting. All around the world countries and public broadcasters have been grappling with changing environments, changing technology and changing viewer patterns.

The sweeping changes affecting public broadcasting began in the 1980s. That decade was marked by a large increase in new terrestrial, satellite and cable channels. These new channels provided the public with an unprecedented range of options in their viewing choices. In Europe alone the number of terrestrial commercial channels increased from four in 1982 to 58 ten years later in 1992. In the 1990s the global broadcasting community began to come to terms with the arrival of new direct to home broadcast satellites. These new satellites have further explosive growth potential in the development of new television channels.

Let us be clear on one thing today. The world is not sounding the death knell of public broadcasting. Countries around the world are rethinking the role of public broadcasting and are seeking to adapt these broadcasting systems to meet the challenges created by the changing environments. In fact, we see few reasons to believe that the changing broadcasting landscape will mean that public broadcasting will be frozen from our televisions and our radios any time in the near future.

In the United States the organization representing public television stations recently issued a report summarizing its concerns surrounding the role of public broadcasting in the information age. According to the conclusions of this report, public television's strength in the multi-channel universe will derive from its position as an integrated production and distribution network for special interest programming. As in Canada, U.S. public television seeks to serve American audiences through high quality and informative programming which cannot be obtained elsewhere.

Clearly a role will remain for public broadcasting. Defining that specialized role will be the key for policy makers, like members of the House, in countries around the world. The new realities of the multi-channel universe have forced many of the world's public broadcasters, such as the BBC and Japan's NHK, to undertake comprehensive reviews of their activities.

In July 1994 a very comprehensive white paper on broadcasting was completed in Great Britain. This widely discussed document examined the many challenges facing one of the world's most venerable public broadcasters, the BBC. Like the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the BBC must confront increasing competition because of new technology and services. Like the CBC, the BBC must attempt to face these new challenges in an era of limited resources.

(1335)

The British government and the select committee studying the matter both agreed that the BBC in its present form cannot go on forever. But within that recognition for the need for change at

the BBC was a very real affirmation of the vital role of the British public broadcaster.

In the British government's view, a key objective for the BBC will be reflecting the national identity of the U.K., enriching the country's national heritage. Furthermore, the BBC is committed to providing diversity and choice in high quality programming which informs, entertains and educates the public it serves.

Japan has also recognized the worldwide challenges facing public broadcasters as a result of the expansion of broadcasting competition and technologies. The Japanese public broadcaster NHK has undergone an internal discussion concerning its role and responsibility as a public broadcaster. This review culminated in the publication in 1993 of NHK's "Future Framework" document which addressed the new challenges and prospects of broadcasting such as multi-media, multi-channel access, high definition television and satellite broadcasting services.

This report also reaffirmed NHK's commitment to quality journalism and to the provision of first rate information services. Furthermore, the Japanese public broadcaster has adapted to the growing globalization of the broadcasting industry by increasing its involvement in international co-productions and other initiatives.

NHK now has agreements with organizations in over 30 countries. In addition, NHK broke with its tradition of producing its programming almost exclusively in-house and began commissioning work from outside production firms.

Public broadcasters around the world are striving to fulfil their public mandates. In most instances they are fulfilling a unique purpose in their broadcasting environment, a purpose that the private sector will not necessarily ever feel the need to fill. This is because private broadcasters have entirely different goals from those of public broadcasters. Private broadcasters respond not only to the preferences of their audiences but to the expectations of their advertisers.

The Government of Canada will not stand by and let Canada's rich tradition of public broadcasting, in both official languages, stagnate or be overtaken by technological advances or other changes in the audio-visual environment.

The government has taken notice of the international precedence and finds the lessons learned by others highly instructive. But more than just watching how other countries are coping with change, the government has demonstrated its leadership by putting into place a forward looking strategy to find Canadian solutions to the challenges facing our distinctive, dual language public broadcasting system.

Supply

This strategy includes a fundamental review of the mandate of the CBC, the National Film Board and Telefilm Canada within the context of the entire Canadian audio-visual sector. It is a review that has been made urgent by technological and market changes. It is a review that has been made necessary because of the fiscal realities facing the country.

The Government of Canada is clearly demonstrating its confidence in the future of public broadcasting by examining the mandate of the CBC in the light of the new realities of the country's communications environment.

As I have stated already, our re-examination of public broadcasting is not unique in the world. It is our firm expectation that our approach to the challenges of public broadcasting will serve as a model and a source of inspiration for other public broadcasters and nations around the world.

I have received many letters and phone calls of support for the CBC from people in my riding and others. For example, Orra Henan, Alex Robertson, Floyd Howlett, Ricky Cherney, members of the Peterborough Symphony Orchestra, the art gallery, the theatre guild, teachers and students have approached me about the CBC. One of them, Alex Robertson, refers to the CBC as the glue which keeps this nation together. I want to say to all of those people that I appreciate their support. I agree with them about the role of public broadcasting in Canada.

(1340)

I disagree with the view of the Reform Party which says that its first option would be to put the CBC on the chopping block and sell it to the first comer. The Reform Party has no sense of what a nation is, no sense that we are here to run a nation, not a business. I do not think it has a sense of the role of government. The government should be involved in public broadcasting. I disagree with its point of view.

I also disagree with my colleagues from the Bloc. I do not think the CBC, a corporation which even after the proposed changes will still have a budget of well over \$1 billion, should be immune to the changes which face the rest of us in society, which face public servants, the private sector and all of us as citizens.

The CBC is an institution which should be supported. Like our other institutions it should be streamlined to deal with the present financial circumstances so we can have a smaller, more effective organization which contains the seeds or the foundations for future public broadcasting and which will be even stronger when its budgetary situation improves.

Therefore, I intend to vote against the member's motion.

*Supply**[Translation]*

Mrs. Tremblay: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for taking the trouble today to speak on the motion I presented this morning. I appreciate it very much.

I would like to ask him a question. You may have heard the numbers I gave earlier, illustrating the funding imbalance between the CBC and Radio-Canada. I will repeat them for the benefit of new viewers and listeners: for an hour of news, the SRC gets \$7,000, while the CBC gets \$18,000; for an hour of variety programming, the SRC gets \$30,000, the CBC, \$141,000; for drama, the SRC gets \$68,000, and the CBC, \$99,000.

Given the success of French TV programs across the board—for the audience to “La Petite Vie” to reach four million, some English speaking viewers must be secretly looking at it, otherwise it would be extremely difficult to find four million francophones who would feel like looking at the same program at the same time—would it not amount to penalizing SRC for its success to arbitrarily apply the same cuts to the French and English networks?

[English]

Mr. Adams: Madam Speaker, as the member knows, I have followed the debate as well as anyone else here today. When I spoke earlier I stressed the fact—as I will try to do in my remarks now—that I strongly support the CBC, the SRC and its services in both languages. I support that across the country, as I mentioned this morning.

I support the French language service in the north. I support it in the rural areas. I support the English language service in Quebec. I support and I enjoy the fact that the international radio service, Radio-Canada International, is distinct in the fact that we reach out to fellow Canadians when they are abroad and to other people in both official languages. I greatly support the existence of the services in both languages.

To answer her question, I deliberately used the word streamlining rather than downsizing. This really means that we are. We inherited a government which because of debt is functioning at two-thirds of its effective capacity because one-third of our money is spent on interest. We inherited that. I am not pointing the finger or laying blame. That is a fact.

In order to get rid of the debt we undertake a dangerous but very necessary exercise. We have to make the government which is already functioning at two-thirds capacity even smaller in order to get rid of the debt so we can come back as a fully effective national government. I believe that very strongly. All the cuts we make have to be such that they streamline what is left

so that in every ministry we leave the seeds for a future ministry which could be more powerful. In every program we leave the seeds, the foundations for a 100 per cent stronger program in the future.

(1345)

To answer the question about the CBC, we as a government have made very different cuts in all our ministries. We cut one ministry by 55 per cent. One ministry is growing by a small percentage and in the all the others we have very carefully decided what the cuts should be. That is streamlining.

When we get inside the ministries or inside the programs, I do not believe the House can do it. I believe we have to tell our ministries that with the budget we have given, they should do the same.

My answer to the member's question is the CBC should manage its own affairs and determine itself where the cuts should be made.

[Translation]

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu, BQ): Madam Speaker, I found it strange to hear the speaker before me say that he is for the CBC and the Société Radio-Canada. He says he is for them, yet he would cut their budgets. This is like a mute person saying to a deaf person: “Watch out, I think a blind person is watching us”. This is the kind of thing that the Liberals are saying today.

The issue is more complicated than that, when we reflect on the extremely important motion which the hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata tabled regarding the corporation. In fact, the current Liberal Party is behaving exactly as the party always has. That is, the party accedes to power using slogans which are tossed out completely once in office.

Let us quickly touch on the 1970s. One of Trudeau's weapons in his election campaign against Stanfield was the promise that he would never control prices and salaries. Six months after being elected, Prime Minister Trudeau announced price and salary controls. This is the doublespeak party.

A little later, along comes the election of the 1980s, which toppled the Clark government. We remember. They said that they would never raise gas prices. Six months after the election, gas prices were up 65 cents.

The Liberals made three big commitments during the election campaign. One was to reduce the deficit. After the election, the deficit had grown from \$13 billion to \$38 billion. They also said they would reduce unemployment. One year after the election, there were 1,5 million unemployed, when there were 800,000 before it. The party which says one thing and does another.

Supply

They said that they would clamp down on government spending. Within one year of the election, expenditures had risen from \$85 million to \$110 million.

What about the referendum in the beginning of the 1980s, on May 20. Keep in mind that they said that they were committed to meeting Quebec's traditional aspirations, and that they were willing to risk their seats. Two years later, Quebec was stabbed in the back. Who held the knife? The current leader of the Liberal Party, who has always been behind the post-election changes in tune.

During the referendum, they warned us that the dollar, which was then worth about \$1.03 American, would tumble to 80 cents. They published small dollars which had an 80 cent value and a drawing of Bérubé, a Quebec minister at the time. The so-called mighty dollar. But, what happened under the Trudeau government two years later? The dollar fell to 69 cents. With the Liberals, post-election facts always tell a completely different story than pre-election promises.

They also talked about unemployment and about a deficit that they would get under control. They threw all of it, everything they promised us so that we would say yes in the referendum, out the window and said they did not give a darn. Then, they proceeded to do the opposite. That is typical of the Liberals.

Now reconsider the 1993 election. What did they promise in their red book? What did they promise during the election campaign? Think about the free trade issue. They were vehemently against it.

(1350)

One month after the election, our friend the Prime Minister rolled over and made even greater concessions in signing the free-trade treaty in Ottawa. That is an example of the Liberals' double talk.

They used to stand against patronage and loudly denounce the Conservative Party's political appointments. However, after the election, they had to reward their friends. They had to prove Senator Rizzuto right. What did they do? For example, they gave Michelle Tisseyre, a Liberal candidate who was defeated in a Quebec riding, a nice little six month contract worth \$49,000 with the Privy Council. A little private contract equivalent to a \$98,000 annual salary. They made Camille Samson responsible for political appointments. They appointed Jacques Saada to a \$100,000 a year position with CIDA. What did the rat pack, those Liberals who used to denounce patronage, do while their party was busy rewarding its friends?

Whatever happened to the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell? As was said in a newspaper, the lion has turned into a mouse. He is now applauding and supporting these political appointments. He applauded when Mr. Dion, a so-

called constitutional expert, was quietly given a \$10,000 contract with the Privy Council. The only reason why we know about this is that a journalist managed to dig it up. Otherwise, we never would have known. Mr. Dion was used to objectively defend federalism on public affairs programs, while in fact he was only a salaried employee of the Prime Minister's Office, paid through the Privy Council.

Whatever happened to the rat pack? Where are they now? The new Liberal mice have remained silent. The language changed after the election. They used to talk about unemployment. The Liberal Party critic "rent his clothes" in protest against the Valcourt cuts. Ah! In the first budget tabled a few months after the election, the UI reform proposed by the current Minister of Finance called for ten times more cuts than under former Minister Valcourt, but the hon. members, including the rat pack, who used to shout their disapproval in this House, kept their mouths shut.

What could be said about our defenders of the farming community? What did the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell used to say when defending the farmers in his riding? That he would never accept cuts. Today, he finds it normal when a budget cuts subsidies and guaranteed income by 30 per cent each. He finds it normal. They said before the election that they would defend the public service. What did they do less than a year after the election? They cut 45,000 jobs. This is what the Liberals call normal and they are happy. Such is the Liberal Party. It makes two kinds of speeches: one during the election campaign and another one after.

The same is true when it comes to job creation. The Liberals campaigned by promising jobs, but there is no mention of job creation initiatives in the Minister of Finance's budget. The Liberals also claimed that they were the protectors of French culture outside Quebec. They promised to do everything possible. Now, these same Liberals remain silent when their government reduces by five per cent the operating budget of French-speaking and Acadian associations outside Quebec.

Where are the French-speaking Liberal members who were going to speak up for francophones within their party, so as to ensure that the French fact remains a reality in Canada? Where is the member for Restigouche—Chaleur? The member for Carleton—Gloucester? Why will they not speak up? Why do they remain silent? Where is the member for Nickel Belt? The member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell? The member for Cochrane—Superior? The member for St. Boniface? The member for Cape Breton? The member for Madawaska—Victoria? The member for Beauséjour? The member for Timiskaming—French River? Where are they? What are they saying now that the budget is reduced by five per cent? What about their election promises? Two speeches: one before the election and another one after.

S. O. 31

(1355)

Let us now look at the cultural sector, where the situation is even worse. Take the issue of copyright and the legislation imposed by the Liberals a few months ago. What did the Liberal Party say to the Canada Council? The official commitment made by the Liberals to the Canada Council regarding copyrights was that they would make it a priority to review the Copyright Act, since they understand the importance of copyright. They said that they would reorganize the administrative structure and review the decision made by the Conservatives to split this jurisdiction between two departments. The Liberals made this commitment and then, all of a sudden, they came up with a Copyright Act which was exactly like the Campbell legislation. Again, one speech before the election and another one after.

Then they addressed the cultural issue. What did they have to say about the Canadian Conference of the Arts? What commitment did they make? To representatives of the Canadian Conference of the Arts who asked them: "Does your party recognize the significance of our national cultural institutions, like the CBC, the Canada Council, and so on, and does it guarantee their survival?", the Liberal Party of Canada stated that the Conservatives, by cutting the budget of such national institutions as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the Canada Council, the National Film Board, and Telefilm Canada, really did hurt these agencies and show that they did not care a lot about our cultural development. A Liberal government, they said, would be keen to provide a stable multi-year budget to our national institutions. Again, we have two languages, one during the election campaign and something completely different once the Liberals were elected and in a position to govern. Two languages from the forked tongue Liberals.

Mr. Speaker, I see that you are indicating that I must stop for now and resume after the question period.

The Speaker: Dear colleague, you will be able to resume after question period. It being 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 30(5), the House will now proceed to Statements by Members.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint-Denis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, March 31 is the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, a day that challenges all people and their governments to take a stand against racism and racial discrimination.

[Translation]

In a pluralistic society such as ours, racism is one of the most destructive forces preventing people of all origins from sharing equally in the country's prosperity.

Canada is a country built on diversity. Young adolescents in my riding have understood this message clearly, and this is why I would like to draw attention to their efforts to promote cross-cultural dynamics. I am speaking of the Multi Media group, which, next Saturday, will present original works, such as poems, drawings, choreographies, photographs and songs reflecting their hope of living in a racism free world.

[English]

Whether we are going to live with each other in compassionate understanding and mutual harmony and then in collective prosperity is a matter that will be decided in the future by our actions today.

I urge all members of the House to join with me in carrying this message to the people of Canada.

* * *

[Translation]

PRESIDENT OF CANADIAN NATIONAL

Mr. Réjean Lefebvre (Champlain, BQ): The president of Canadian National, Mr. Paul Tellier, said on television this morning that the working conditions enjoyed by CN employees were too generous for the economic context of the 1990s. Mr. Tellier's attitude clearly indicates the bad faith of management in this dispute.

I find astounding that Mr. Tellier would make such a statement, since he amply benefits from Canadian National's generosity. With a salary of \$345,000 and an annual allowance of \$51,752, and not forgetting an interest free loan of \$300,000, Mr. Tellier is in fact the best paid public servant in the entire government machine.

This gentleman is in no position to be talking about the state's so called generosity toward its employees. Rather than make statements on television, he should do what he is paid to do and negotiate in good faith with his employees in order to reach a quick solution to the dispute that is affecting the entire Canadian economy.

* * *

[English]

RWANDA

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, after the genocide of last year when over one million people were murdered there exist half a million orphans inside Rwanda and 1.2 million refugees in camps in Zaire and Tanzania.

Of the \$22 million which Canada has already given, none has entered Rwanda because of conditions placed by donor countries that no humanitarian aid enter Rwanda until all the

refugees return. However, they cannot return because there is no food in the country. Furthermore, the refugees in the camps are under the boot of armed thugs of the defeated regime. They use aid as leverage to control these helpless refugees to retrain them for another war.

The government in Kigali is equitable and broad based, made up of both Hutus and Tutsis. However, they are receiving no help whatsoever to get up on their feet and produce a peaceful front to those outside the country who would like to restart the carnage.

I implore the government to convince the international community to help the government in Rwanda. To not do this makes a mockery of our justice and lays the groundwork for another genocide.

* * *

[Translation]

RAIL TRANSPORT

Mr. Gilles Bernier (Beauce, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, everyone in Canada is seriously affected by the rail strike. It has already taken its toll on the country's economy, with disastrous repercussions. Production losses in many sectors have been brought to our attention.

It is never desirable for the government to force people back to work with special legislation, but in this case, this exceptional measure is warranted. Let us hope that the major changes which are necessary can be made to rail transportation in a way that helps management reach all of its goals while helping unions protect workers' rights as much as possible.

The government should also update the Labour Code and propose mechanisms which ensure that essential services will always be provided while leaving room for management and workers to work out their differences.

It is certainly possible to negotiate in good faith after back to work legislation, and I encourage the government to introduce its bill as soon as possible.

* * *

[English]

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last night in Winnipeg, on the eve of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, I attended the 20th annual media human rights awards sponsored by B'Nai Brith Canada. The evening highlighted the vigilant role the media plays in protecting human rights.

Earlier today the 1994 annual report of the Canadian Human Rights Commission was tabled in the House. It states: "However diverse our species may be, all human beings remain worthy of respect".

The issue of human rights is about the integrity of any one person which, if violated, destroys the soul of any nation and the very essence of our humanity. Racial discrimination violates human rights.

Therefore on this day we must renew our national resolve to uphold human rights and eliminate all forms of racial discrimination, thereby ensuring human dignity and peace among all Canadians.

* * *

LEARNING DISABILITIES

Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as this is learning disabilities month, I would like to acknowledge the thousands of dedicated Canadian teachers and health care workers who devote themselves to improving the lives of those who face the challenge of a learning disability on a daily basis.

From infancy to old age learning disabilities affect Canadians of all ages in a wide variety of ways. Disabilities range from minor inconveniences to very serious physical, psychological and emotional limitations which must be managed if the affected persons are to maximize their potential and lead full, active and rewarding lives.

Today I salute all Canadians who struggle courageously with any form of learning disability. We thank those who so valiantly assist them in their fight, including my own wife, Evelyn.

* * *

ERIC WINKLER

Mr. Paul Steckle (Huron—Bruce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today we put aside party differences to remember the late Eric Winkler.

Eric Winkler served at all three levels of government during his 29-year political career.

He served as mayor of his hometown in Hanover, he was a cabinet minister at Queen's Park and chief whip for the federal Tories when the late John Diefenbaker held power.

During World War II he served in the bomber command of the Royal Canadian Air Force where he was shot down and held as a prisoner of war from 1942 to 1945.

In 1957 he ran federally and was elected as the MP for Grey—Bruce, where he was re-elected four times.

In 1967 he left Ottawa and was elected the provincial member for the Grey riding, a position he held until his defeat in 1975. During his time at Queen's Park he became minister of revenue under Bill Davis in 1971.

In the 1980s he served as a member of the Ontario Racing Commission.

S. O. 31

I extend on behalf of all my colleagues our deepest sympathy to his wife Frances, his children Mark, Tim, Jane and Mary, and his six grandchildren.

Eric Winkler served this country with pride and dignity and he will always be remembered as a great Canadian. May he rest in peace.

* * *

(1405)

[Translation]

BURUNDI

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last week, the Minister of Foreign Affairs said that he too was concerned, like the official opposition, about the unstable situation in Burundi, and he stated the following: "It is sad that the ethnic conflicts which occurred in Rwanda and ended in terrible bloodbaths could now surface in a neighbouring country and trigger a similar tragedy".

However, Canada's honorary consul in Bujumbura said today on the CBC that he was not worried and that there was no comparison between Rwanda and Burundi, since the ethnic breakdown of the population is totally different.

We must ask ourselves whether this analysis contradicts the minister's and whether it calls into question Canada's capacity to speak with one unified voice and to really promote preventative diplomacy.

* * *

[English]

ALBERTA

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to comment on a remarkable story of growth.

The province of which I speak surged ahead of all other provinces in 1993 and its real GDP rose 5.1 percent, more than double the national average of 2.2 per cent. Both international and interprovincial exports rose and record crop and livestock production lifted farm incomes substantially. Labour income also rose markedly, accompanied by a significant jump in consumer spending.

How did this happen? Was large scale government intervention in the economy the cause of this excellent growth rate? No, it was not.

The growth that has occurred in Alberta, a province which has cut its spending by nearly 20 per cent in the last two years, is the result I am talking about.

To all of the McCrackens, the Whites, the Hargroves and the Axworthys of the world, if you want growth that benefits all citizens in Canada, do not increase government spending, cut it.

It is time the Alberta advantage became the Canadian advantage.

* * *

RAIL STRIKE

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, the present railway strike has already had a severe impact on many manufacturers and producers all across the country.

In my province of New Brunswick there are many lumber mills dependent on rail. As well, our ports have been greatly affected as they also depend on the rail lines.

I ask the House to allow legislation to be passed with unanimous consent which will quickly put an end to this labour dispute. I also ask the government to undertake a consultative process between labour and management that would result in a settlement that is fair and equitable while at the same time ensuring CN and CP are not at a disadvantage compared with their transportation competitors in the U.S.

I recommend to the government that a human resources sector consultative study be established for the Canadian railway sector. This would allow both management and labour to jointly study the changing business environment and the challenges facing the railway industry in Canada now and to the year 2000.

* * *

RAIL STRIKE

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the railroad is the great symbol of Canadian unity. It provides commercial and personal access among all Canadians.

In spite of our great modern steps forward in the air, the progress of the railroad and our nation are inextricably intertwined.

Halifax needs the railroad. The Atlantic region needs the railroad. Ontario and the west need the railroad and Quebec also needs the railroad.

I call on all members of the House to remember that we represent all Canadians and get those trains running again.

* * *

RAIL STRIKE

Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is time to end this national rail strike which is crippling our economy. It is estimated that between \$3 billion and \$5 billion is lost from the Canadian economy in a single week by not getting our products to market.

National Gypsum, a company near Truro, produces 14,000 tonnes of gypsum a day which goes by rail, two trains a day, 7,000 tonnes a train, to the port of Halifax. From there it goes by

ship to the U.S. and to Quebec when the St. Lawrence Seaway is open.

National Gypsum is loading a ship at this moment, only partially and with great delay and extra costs because it does not have enough gypsum at the dockside. This company will have to lay off more than 100 men by week's end if the trains are not moving. The same may be said of companies throughout Nova Scotia as well as companies in Quebec and every corner of the country.

This is one case where a day really makes a difference. I urge the opposition and all members of the House to co-operate and end the railway strike.

* * *

(1410)

RAIL STRIKE

Mr. Bernie Collins (Souris—Moose Mountain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am extremely disappointed with the events yesterday wherein the Bloc, supported by the New Democratic Party, refused to allow the House to bring an end to the economic chaos that has enveloped our country due to the rail strike in progress.

What is frustrating about this is there is no honourable basis for the actions of the Bloc party. It is simply sticking to its agenda of separation by allowing the Canadian economy to take a beating. Bloc members will not lose any sleep over that. They might see it as helping their battered agenda.

As for the NDP members, they continue to close their eyes to the real issues, the needs of farmers, manufacturers and many others negatively affected across Canada.

What does the premier of Saskatchewan say about their actions? Does his NDP government support what they are doing to the economy?

We have had a chance to act together for the good of our country and the Bloc and the NDP let us down for an alternate selfish agenda.

My constituents, my government and I are extremely disappointed.

* * *

[Translation]

QUEBEC SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we learned today that a French speaking group in Ontario, concerned about social justice, denounced the position taken by the Fédération des communautés francophones et acadienne on the sovereignty of Quebec. The federation urged Quebecers to vote no in the referendum, something that this Franco-Ontarian group strongly regrets.

S. O. 31

Members of the Bloc Québécois reaffirm, like this group, that Quebecers have a sacred right to choose freely their own future. Members of the Bloc Québécois also believe that links between francophones outside Quebec and within Quebec should be maintained despite differences we may have occasionally.

We cannot deny that francophones outside Quebec have had to fight long and hard for their rights, their existence and their development. The fight of Quebecers to assume full responsibility for their future is just as important.

* * *

RAIL TRANSPORT

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois pretends to be defending the interests of Quebecers, but is opposed to ending the railway strike, thereby adding to the seriousness of the situation brought about by the failure of the Liberals.

Last week, the Reform Party asked the government to act in order to avoid such a crisis. As usual, it acted too late. A lengthy strike will have only negative economic consequences for all Canadians, including Quebecers.

Saturday, 1,000 people were left standing on VIA Rail platforms in Montreal. Canadian Pacific is losing about a million dollars a day.

The Reform Party supports an end to the strike and if the Bloc is sincere about protecting Quebec interests it should agree to it right now.

* * *

[English]

RAIL STRIKE

Mr. Ivan Grose (Oshawa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will address the national transportation stoppage, not exactly a unique idea today.

In my constituency 14,000 General Motors union workers will be idle soon. I do not want to speak only on their behalf, as I feel I represent not only the people who specifically elected me but also the interests of all my fellow Canadians.

My union constituents will not suffer due to their hard won union contract. However, we must realize that their continuing benefits while they are not producing diminishes their sub-fund and also draws on the UIC fund. This is a cost which must be borne by all Canadians through higher prices and increased taxes.

We also must consider the workers in supplier plants who do not have the good contracts auto workers enjoy.

In short, this transportation tie-up transcends the interests of any group, province or party. All Canadians deserve relief from this problem and at this time that can only be provided by people of courage in the House.

*Oral Questions**[Translation]***RAIL TRANSPORT**

Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday and again today, the Bloc Québécois refused to co-operate with our government in order to quickly legislate rail workers back to work.

The official opposition does not seem to understand the scope of the negative impact of this work stoppage on the Canadian and Quebec economy. Allow me to quote the Quebec transport minister who recently said: "There is nothing quaint about trains. Their role is critical for the economy and the industry".

(1415)

I will also quote its colleague for Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans who was recently pleading for the survival of rail services in these terms: "We cannot afford to lose the railroad. It would only weaken our economy further".

I urge the Bloc Québécois to abandon partisan politics and to support the government's initiative without delay.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD*[Translation]***RAIL TRANSPORT**

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Commissioner Hope's report on labour relations in the rail transport sector points out the federal government's troubling behaviour during the negotiations leading to the current impasse. Mr. Hope concludes that the government was guilty of interfering in this dispute by systematically supporting the employers' position.

Does the Minister of Transport admit that the federal government's partisan pro-management attitude during the talks is responsible for the failure of negotiations and for the current dispute?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think that solving the problem in Canada's rail system is in everyone's interest. We much appreciated the fact that CAW president, Mr. Hargrove himself, said that special legislation was the best approach.

Some people understand full well that Canada's rail system must operate so that materials and products like those of Ford, GM and Chrysler can be moved. I have no idea with whom the Leader of the Opposition is speaking because all those with whom we have spoken, without exception, told us that, after 18 months of talks, the time has come to find a solution allowing the Canadian economy to continue to grow.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, although the minister says that Mr. Hargrove supports the government's position and the bill, the CAW president does not want the bill to apply to his own members. What kind of support is that? Let the law apply to the others, but not to his union.

How dare the minister defend his government's role in these talks when Commissioner Hope stated, and I quote:

[English]

"The controversial and provocative aspects of the employers' demands are found in the partisan role played by the government in supporting the position of the railways".

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every Canadian recognizes that the Government of Canada has a responsibility to maintain a transportation system that is viable, that is competitive, that is affordable.

There is no doubt that over a long period of time every effort was made by the unions and by the employers to try to find a solution to this problem. They have not been able to succeed.

We regret very much that companies, farmers, people across the country are faced with a situation that is very unfortunate, very difficult to overcome.

All I ask the Leader of the Opposition to do is to listen to what Canadians are saying, listen to what Quebecers are saying, and make sure that we can get the railroads back in operation so that we can find a solution to the problem that has escaped the negotiators on both sides of the table for 18 months.

[Translation]

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Hope report clearly states that the real responsibility for the current labour dispute lies with the federal government.

Given the current deadlock and its serious consequences, will the Prime Minister agree to set aside House rules and pass this afternoon a back-to-work law imposing a 60 day mediation period between the parties without the right to strike or lockout employees, so that a negotiated settlement can be reached?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his offer. I think that the best solution is to pass the legislation immediately. Otherwise, if we wait 60 days, we will end up with the same problem. We will have lost a whole week, and will still end up with the same problem in 60 days.

(1420)

I think that public opinion in Canada at this time is clearly that these problems must be resolved quickly. I have received telegrams from Quebec aluminum plants, for example, some of which are located in the riding represented by the Leader of the Opposition, which have been forced to cut production. It is the same thing for Kruger Inc. in the Mauricie region and for the

lumber industry in the northern part of my riding, in Parent, and so on.

That is why we decided that, under the circumstances, the quickest way—and I give the hon. member the opportunity to co-operate by withdrawing his objection so that the bill can be passed this afternoon.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister was just offered in good faith by the official opposition an honourable way to settle the rail dispute once and for all.

How can the Prime Minister hide behind his trigger-happy minister's proposal? How can he hide behind this proposal and reject the official opposition's offer to settle the dispute this afternoon to the satisfaction of all interested parties, in compliance with work rules and without affecting workers' rights?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can understand the frustration of the opposition, which is trying to make up for the mistake it made yesterday. This government's priority is job creation. We must ensure that there is a rail transportation system to deliver the goods produced by Canadian workers to the markets, so that we can have more jobs in Canada, not fewer because of a strike that is against national interest.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, must the Prime Minister be reminded that our proposal has been on the table since yesterday and that it is a clear proposal? If he did not understand the proposal, that is his problem.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gauthier: It is now clear that the only ones to blame for the rail dispute dragging on are the Prime Minister and his government.

I have a question for the Prime Minister. Can he tell us frankly if he is being totally honest when he says he wants the matter settled—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please. Dear colleagues, the honesty of the members of this House is never to be questioned. I would therefore like the hon. member to withdraw his remark.

Mr. Gauthier: No problem, Mr. Speaker. You understood that I regard the Prime Minister as an honest man. No problem there. Being the honest man that he is—

Mr. Bouchard: We just wanted to remind the House.

Mr. Gauthier: —as I wanted to point out—can the Prime Minister tell us why the government has suddenly turned its

Oral Questions

back on mediation, which was accepted as an appropriate solution in the dispute affecting the port of Montreal? What is really keeping the Prime Minister today from accepting our proposal and settling the rail dispute this afternoon?

[English]

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all the means available to the government had been used earlier to try to settle this conflict amicably and now we are confronted with a national strike of all the railways in Canada. The government had to face up to its responsibilities and present a bill to settle the matter.

I realize the press is creating the impression that it is only the Bloc Québécois, but the NDP opposed unanimous consent too. Western farmers know that we are thinking of their best interests in settling this strike rapidly.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, Department of Finance officials will be meeting with Moody's to try to persuade them not to downgrade Canada's AAA credit rating. It is widely believed that what Moody's wants to know is the timetable and the plan for bringing the federal deficit to zero, something that was not contained in the finance minister's budget.

(1425)

My question is for the finance minister. What will his officials be telling representatives of Moody's?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have made it very clear to Canadians and to the investment community that our goal is to balance the books. We intend to get there as quickly as possible.

The best way to do this is to have a series of short term targets. That will allow us to hit our targets as we have done for the first time in over a decade.

At the same time, contrary to the doom and gloom on the other side, we shall be pointing out to Moody's that this country has one of the best productivity records in the world, that inflation is very low, that we are creating jobs at an unparalleled pace. In fact, we will be pointing out to them that Canada has the best growth record of any country of the G-7.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, to balance the books as the minister says, he will have to reduce federal spending by \$24 billion.

Oral Questions

There is no indication in the budget of how that is going to be done or when it is going to be done. In my discussions with lenders and investors last week the one question they all had was when and how is the federal government going to eliminate the deficit and not just reduce it.

I ask the Minister of Finance this question. When and how does the Canadian government plan to eliminate the federal deficit? Will he tell Canadians and Parliament what he is being asked to tell Moody's and investors? When and how?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have made it very clear that we intend to eliminate the deficit. I have also made it very clear that the best way to do that is to set a series of short term targets, not to allow the decision to be postponed by long term targets.

Surely to heaven the leader of the third party ought to know, having looked at what the Tories did for 10 years, that federal long term targets or targets such as those placed in his own budget based on faulty assumptions and false input, simply will not do the job. We are far more interested in results, not in incredible projections.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the markets are not asking for short term targets. They are asking a simple question. When and how will the minister eliminate the deficit and not just reduce it?

Given the uncertainty in the financial markets, the government should stop being coy and plainly tell the House when and how it plans to eliminate the deficit. If there is not a plan then the minister should tell us and we will help him develop one.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Is there or is there not a government plan and a timetable to eliminate the deficit? If there is will he tell his finance minister to disclose that to the Canadian people and not just to Wall Street?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the international financial community has made it very clear to us that what it wants is results.

It does not want a whole series of projections. It has had it with projections. What it wants is results and that is what it has received from the government.

I would ask a question of the leader of the third party. When he talks about the uncertainty in international markets he is very sincere. Does he really think that he helps his fellow countrymen and women when he goes outside the country's borders and casts doubt on the quality of the budget or the financial projections?

[Translation]

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in its report tabled today, the Canadian Human Rights Commission denounces the government's inability to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act so as to prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation. In its report, the commission calls this is a fundamental abdication of our responsibilities regarding human rights.

Considering that eight Canadian provinces out of ten already prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation and that the courts have confirmed that such discrimination was not compatible with the Canadian charter of rights and freedoms, I ask the Prime Minister: why does he refuse to act immediately, since he has made a commitment to Canadians and Quebecers?

(1430)

[English]

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the change to the human rights legislation to which the hon. member has referred is only one of many changes this government contemplates to the act, which is now almost 20 years old.

The report of the human rights chief commissioner quite properly pointed out that this is unfinished business. Let me emphasize to the House, as I have done on other occasions, that the government is committed to this change. It is committed to modernizing the statute and improving it. It is a commitment we will fulfil.

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, does the Prime Minister not realize that by keeping quiet and postponing his decision from month to month, he is showing his inability to silence the dissensions within his caucus and he is also indicating to the public that, as far as he is concerned, the respect of human rights and freedoms is far from being a priority?

[English]

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have made plain that our commitment to the changes in the Canadian Human Rights Act is a matter of government policy. These are questions in which we believe strongly. These are commitments we will fulfil.

*Oral Questions***LABOUR**

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the government and the Bloc party teamed up to defeat a Reform Party bill that would have alleviated the problems we presently have in the labour front.

When can this government bring forth legislation that will put an end to this sort of thing once and for all for the sake of the producers and farmers in this country?

[Translation]

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is currently in Canada a major crisis, and we are aware of it. This crisis has an impact on the economy across the country, and we are taking action. We tabled a bill in this House yesterday.

I want to thank Reform Party members for supporting this legislation, but the fact is that the Bloc Quebecois and the NDP are not helping us.

[English]

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister, but perhaps she missed the question. The question was: When can Canadians expect to see legislation that will deal with this situation in the long term? The back to work legislation has nothing to do with the long term.

[Translation]

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understood the question very well. What I said is that we have to solve a crisis in the short term. Once that is done, we can look at a long term solution, but we have to take action regarding the current situation.

* * *

ETHICS

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Canadian Heritage proudly announced that the chairman of the National Capital Commission is free to use his leisure time as he pleases, including participating in partisan activities in order to raise funds for the Quebec Liberal Party. The minister said that Mr. Beaudry would of course have made sure that his activities were compatible with his duties.

Are we to understand from the minister's comments that the participation of senior officials in partisan, political activities at the provincial level is considered consistent with the government's ethics rules?

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no Canadian statute or regulation preventing public servants from taking an interest in political

matters in their leisure time. I think that no one should be more aware of this than the opposition members from the Bloc, who recruited public servants to help them sell the referendum.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for reasons which will become clear, my second question is for the Prime Minister.

What explanation does the Prime Minister give for the fact that his ethics counsellor, the person responsible—responsible indeed—for the transparency of the government and the guardian of its integrity, yesterday refused to answer any questions with respect to Mr. Beaudry?

(1435)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is because he is the counsellor to the Prime Minister.

* * *

[English]

GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the controversy surrounding the appointment of Bob Fowler to the UN has been very prominent in the media. With all of this baggage, why did the Prime Minister appoint Mr. Fowler without first holding a public inquiry to clear the air?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not know about an attack like that. Mr. Fowler has been a great bureaucrat. He has been in foreign affairs for almost all of his career. He is a very competent person. He was a very good choice to be named as ambassador after the great service he has given Parliament and this country throughout different governments.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I believe the case of Robert Fowler illustrates the fundamental problems, both real and perceived, in the Department of National Defence.

The government has a perfect opportunity to open up the process as promised in the red book and to put an end to the controversy once and for all.

I ask the Prime Minister again, will he consider calling a public inquiry on a much broader basis than was announced this morning?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the inquiry will be comprehensive and everything can be discussed at the inquiry. We have chosen a course that will allow anybody in the department and the armed forces to be interviewed.

To use the House of Commons for innuendoes of that nature, I would invite the member who just spoke to make the same accusations outside and face the responsibilities. When he hides

Oral Questions

behind parliamentary privilege and attacks a bureaucrat who cannot defend himself as he is doing, it is shameful.

* * *

[Translation]

AIR CANADA

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

Air Canada recently put out an ad to hire staff for its Asian flights. In the French ad, a knowledge of both French and English is required, while in the English ad, only the knowledge of English is necessary.

As an Acadian himself, how can the Minister of Transport accept the fact that French-speaking travellers flying with Air Canada to Asia will not be guaranteed French-language service?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while operating as a private corporation, Air Canada must abide by the Official Languages Act. I want to thank the hon. member for asking this question. I will certainly have the opportunity to examine why Air Canada acted in this manner, but I still hope that we will be able to settle the issue, because Air Canada has gained access, since last year, to the Japanese market, something it has been looking forward to for the past 10 to 15 years, and will be allowed to fly to Hong Kong before the end of this year.

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, are we to understand from the attitude of the Minister of Transport who is hiding behind the autonomy of Air Canada to explain why the corporation did not respect the Official Languages Act to which it is subject, that this is all the enthusiasm the minister can muster in defence of the use of French in the skies?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can tell from the performance of the hon. member in this House that he has plenty of time to go over all the ads from Air Canada and probably from other companies.

As I told him earlier, Air Canada must abide by the Official Languages Act. I will try to find out why Air Canada acted in this manner and we will ensure that the Official Languages Act is fully applied.

* * *

RAIL TRANSPORT

Mr. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour.

Madam Minister, I think it is pretty clear we are all very concerned about the railway strike. Could you tell us what the consequences—

(1440)

The Speaker: My colleague, you should always direct your comments through the Chair. The hon. member may ask his question.

Mr. Paradis: Mr. Speaker, my question for the minister is as follows: What immediate consequences will this work stoppage have for Canadians?

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the concerns raised by the hon. member for Brome—Missisquoi are entirely appropriate. In the passenger transportation sector, more than 70,000 people in Montreal and Toronto had no commuter trains and at least 20,000 passengers had to do without the services of VIA Rail.

As for the shutdown of services at CN, we see its impact everywhere on our economy. Ford has already closed its plant in Ontario and wants to close two more. Movements of coal and grain have been reduced by half. Kruger Inc. in Trois-Rivières is closed. Pétromont in Varennes is closed. Alcan has also cut production. We are seeing a tremendous impact on the economy, even in Quebec, and the Bloc Québécois is preventing us from passing this legislation.

* * *

[English]

ETHICS

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

The ethics counsellor has condemned a recent junket of MPs to Cuba which he himself said was outside his jurisdiction. Did the ethics counsellor initiate this investigation himself, or was it at the request of the Prime Minister?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the ethics counsellor said it was not under his responsibility. He looked into that.

That is exactly why I rose in this House last week and said that I hoped a committee would be struck very soon in this House with the senators so that members would have some guidelines to follow. I hope the committee will come through with some fixed guidelines very soon.

It is the responsibility of members of Parliament and senators to make their own decisions. We cannot impose our views on members. We respect the fact that they have been elected and are adult enough to make their own decisions.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this question is one which will just not go away.

The president of Canada Post appeared at a well choreographed committee meeting this morning. Canadians are no nearer to understanding the complexities of the Perez affair.

Will the Prime Minister either instruct or at minimum not prohibit the ethics counsellor from thoroughly investigating and reporting on the Perez affair, a matter which most Canadians believe is within his purview?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there were members of different parties on the trip, including one from the Reform Party.

It is up to members of Parliament to make their own decisions as to whether to participate. If members see that this type of trip is forbidden, then it is up to members to say so. However, every member involved in this trip went to the registry and indicated in good faith that they had accepted this trip.

If members should not have accepted this trip, fine, but I was not involved in it. The members followed the rules which existed at that time. If some members want to change the rules, then change them. I cannot impose them on the House.

* * *

[Translation]

U.S. TELEVISION CHANNELS

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Canadian Heritage. Yesterday, we noticed that once again, the Minister of Canadian Heritage does not know what is going on in his department. On March 7, the Minister for International Trade promised his U.S. counterpart that no new action would be taken by the CRTC against U.S. television channels, as had happened in the case of the country music channel last year.

Could the Minister of Canadian Heritage explain why the Minister of International Trade made this commitment on his behalf to the Americans?

(1445)

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, we should determine whether a commitment exists. It does not. I saw the letter that was sent by my colleague, and I fully agree with its contents. The minister was referring to various reviews and investigations going on at this time, and I have nothing to add to the wisdom of the remarks he made to Mr. Kantor.

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am really surprised at the minister's reply, when we consider what is reported in the media. Once again, could the minister say what is the truth, or should I say politically correct: what he says in this House or what he said yesterday to the journalists?

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has a problem: she has wax in her ears.

Oral Questions

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Plamondon: Wax is all you have between your ears!

Mr. Dupuy: Yes, her ears are probably plugged. What I said yesterday, and what I said again today in response to a number of questions I was asked, is that the government does not intend to instruct the CRTC on what to do about the channels. I repeat, that is what I said, and there is no contradiction between what I said and what the Minister for International Trade wrote to his counterpart.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence confirmed that Canada was negotiating the sale of 39 CF-5 war planes to Turkey.

My question is for the Minister of National Defence. What guarantees has the government received that Turkey will not use the CF-5s against civilians?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is true that some interest has been expressed by the Government of Turkey to purchase the CF-5 planes that are surplus to our needs. It bought some a number of years ago.

I understand that a number of other countries are interested. In any sale our first obligation is to our NATO allies but, as the Minister of Foreign Affairs said publicly yesterday, any sales of arms are subject to certain very strict criteria.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like the defence minister to go a little further in answer to the following question.

Not more than a year ago Turkey bombed Kurdish villages killing many civilian women and children. This morning Turkish war planes and 35,000 troops resumed their offensive against the Kurds in northern Iraq. Given the state of tension it is unlikely that Turkey would refuse to use CF-5s in a future campaign regardless of any written guarantee.

Will the government live up to its red book promise and refuse to sell arms to any country suspected of human rights violations?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the question is premature because there is no deal between Canada and any country for the sale of the CF-5s.

Obviously some inquiries have been made and some information discussions have gone on, but should any sale be made of any surplus military equipment it will be according to the strict

Oral Questions

guidelines to which our party has subscribed for a number of years and as outlined in our party documents.

* * *

BREAST CANCER

Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health and concerns breast cancer. Credible scientific evidence and numerous studies show a possible link between abortion of a first pregnancy and breast cancer.

Could the minister ensure Canadians that the possible link will be thoroughly investigated? Will the minister tell the House what steps she is taking to ensure the potential risk factor is explained to all Canadian women?

(1450)

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, studies to date have not provided evidence of a link between breast cancer and abortion.

Breast cancer is a very devastating disease for Canadian women. According to Statistics Canada 18,000 women in Canada will be diagnosed with breast cancer and approximately 5,500 women will die as a direct result of the disease in 1995.

There are many possible risk factors. Tobacco was raised yesterday as a possible risk leading to breast cancer. There are risks factors with diet, genetics and many others. Not enough work has been done in the area and I intend to do something about it.

* * *

[Translation]

NATIONAL FORUM ON HEALTH

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

The minister declared on Friday that the federal government, despite the large cuts in transfer payments to the provinces, holds all of the strings needed to ensure that the five great principles, the untouchables of the Canada Health Act, will be respected.

Must we gather from the minister's statements that the national forum on health will unilaterally review the Canada Health Act and identify the changes to be made, without giving the provinces, who are responsible for administering the health system and who will have to absorb these budget cuts, the right to negotiate anything?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have said this many times, and so has the Prime Minister: the principles enshrined in the Canada Health Act are not negotiable. The national forum on health is studying the future of the health care system and of the health of Canadians.

The forum will make some recommendations, which we might accept, and the provinces will be given the chance to review the same issues. Both parties want to help each other, because we both know that we have one of the best health care systems in the world and we want to keep it that way.

Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Prime Minister, because I am no closer to understanding than I was before that answer.

Does the Prime Minister, who is also the chairman of the forum on health, have any explanation for the fact that the provinces are not participating in the forum other than that he intends to impose national standards on them which they will never have had the opportunity to negotiate?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if I recall correctly, we discussed this issue when the forum was announced, and we determined that we were not interested in having the provinces participate. Later on, we invited each one to have a representative on the forum. They all declined.

We offered them a spot but they refused to take part. It is a forum; there are no conditions, and all are free to express themselves. Canadians know that I listen a lot. So every time I go there, I listen. It would have been my pleasure to listen to the provinces, but they denied me this pleasure.

* * *

[English]

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, environmental extremist Paul Watson who allegedly was attacked by concerned residents in the Magdalen Islands was widely reported as saying he held off his alleged assailants by using a stun gun and his fists.

Considering that his fists were probably not lethal weapons, my question is for the justice minister. Stun guns are prohibited weapons under section 90(1) of the Criminal Code. Mr. Watson admits to having the prohibited weapon in his possession. Would the minister confirm if the gun was confiscated and if Mr. Watson was charged with having an illegal gun in his possession? If he was not charged, why not?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I admire the hon. member's familiarity with the firearms legislation and I commend him for it.

I also remind him that the enforcement of such provisions is entirely a matter for provincial authorities to which I invite his attention.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, speaking of enforcement, my question is for the revenue minister.

In his view is the anti-smuggling initiative working when a publicity seeking, U.S. based environmental extremist admits to having an illegally smuggled, prohibited weapon in his possession when he clears customs and the weapon remains in his possession one week later?

(1455)

Could he explain to law-abiding Canadians who will be required to register guns what the use of registration is if this environmentalist can walk around with absolute impunity?

Ms. Susan Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member well knows, customs officials do their utmost at the border to ensure that all the laws are kept. They will continue to do so in the future.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

If the Liberal government goes ahead with its planned legislation, wealthy Canadians will be compensated for estate taxes paid in the U.S. under a new agreement signed in August. The agreement is retroactive to 1988 and will cost Canadian taxpayers over \$2 billion in compensation, by giving families with estates worth over \$600,000 in the U.S. a foreign tax credit in Canada.

Does the minister have the courage to say no to this outrageous legislation, or does the Liberal government plan to create a new \$2 billion tax loophole for the wealthy?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, primarily because of some of the noise and static around the member I had a little difficulty understanding. However I understand the question referred to the tax protocol that was signed with the United States. The member is nodding.

We have made sure that Canadians are not subject to double taxation. Yes, Americans are not subject to double taxation as well arising out of the same piece of legislation.

The member will understand that it is very important for the Government of Canada to protect Canadian citizens. I am sure he will understand, when he talks about the large amounts of money involved which he says we should be saving, that the amount is roughly what the railway strike will cost us if we do not deal with it. One might ask the member why he is not prepared to support the government.

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the same minister.

Oral Questions

This has become more and more curious. The Mulroney Conservative government supported this tax break for the wealthy. The Liberal government opposite supports this tax break for the wealthy. It is a \$2 billion tax break for very wealthy Canadians who have estates in the U.S.

Will the minister give Canadian taxpayers a break and cancel this deal of a lifetime for wealthy Canadians?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a result of this piece of legislation we are now able to tax Canadian snowbirds who have gone south and we are able to prevent double taxation.

As the hon. member knows, in the last budget and in the one before we probably closed more loopholes than any Canadian government has done since the Prime Minister was finance minister.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Alex Shepherd (Durham, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

Much of the recovery in the economy has been driven by export markets. Durham and Oshawa have benefited since automobile production is a big feature in the area.

When can other small and medium size businesses, their employees and consumers generally see some relief?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member once again confirms his reputation for articulate economic comment. He is absolutely right when he points out that the recovery has been largely export oriented and to that extent has been one legged.

I must say we are beginning to see the signs of increasing consumer confidence. The statistics this week from Statistics Canada demonstrate that consumer confidence is up sharply. Retail sales were up again in January for the fifth time in six months.

We are beginning to see that because of the tremendous productivity and hard work of Canadians confidence is once again back into our economy after the long desert of the last recession.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Finance. It has been reported that after meeting with Calgary mayor Al Duerr last Friday he has agreed to review his government's decision to end the private utility tax rebate.

Supply

Is he reviewing the decision and when might the House expect the results of the review?

(1500)

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there were two newspaper reports on that meeting, one of which was the indication the member is referring to. The other newspaper report citing the mayor made it very clear the government is not reviewing that decision. It is the second newspaper report that is accurate.

* * *

[Translation]

CONVENIENCE FLAGS

Mr. Jean Landry (Lotbinière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. On March 17, the minister responded to a question from the official opposition by stating that the privatization of Marine Atlantic Inc. would resolve the matter of this company's foreign flagging of its ships.

Is the minister not aware that, by not bringing all of the ships of Marine Atlantic Inc. back under Canadian flag before the corporation is privatized, he is condoning this practice, which is followed by many Canadian shipowners, contrary to our economic interests?

[English]

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the question of foreign flagging at Marine Atlantic is one we wanted to address once the matter was raised.

We have determined it has been ongoing, depending on the vessel, for a number of years. As I indicated to a colleague of my hon. friend in the House yesterday, we have asked the president of Marine Atlantic and the board to look into the potential for the commercialization of all the activities of Marine Atlantic.

Certainly we will be addressing the question my hon. friend has put to me one way or another. If the commercialization proceeds, we will have to take into account the implications of reflagging the vessels prior to sail. If the commercialization does not go forward, we will review the matter in the light of my hon. friend's question.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER**RAIL STRIKE**

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speak-

er, in view that Canadians are continuing to lose their jobs as a result of the rail strike, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House for the following order:

That, notwithstanding any standing order, immediately after the completion of Private Members' Business on this day, the House shall revert to Government Orders for the purpose of considering Bill C-77, an act to provide for the maintenance of railway operations and subsidiary services at second reading stage, in committee of the whole, at report stage and at third reading stage, provided that the House shall not adjourn this day except pursuant to motion by a minister of the crown.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify to the House that while the opposition denied consent, it was not the Reform Party that denied consent. We would support any back to work legislation the government introduces.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

SUPPLY**ALLOTTED DAY—FUNDING FOR CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION**

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu, BQ): Mr. Speaker, due to question period, I was interrupted for an hour since we are to follow Standing Orders, which we agree to do. I was discussing the official opposition's motion concerning funding for the CBC, along with the amendment proposed by the Reform Party.

(1505)

I recalled my surprise at seeing the Liberal Party renege on commitments it made during the election campaign. I must say it was not an entirely unexpected surprise. Traditionally the Liberal Party has always sung two tunes: one for the election campaign and one for after the campaign, and the two are diametrically opposed.

In my introduction, I recalled the agricultural double talk. For example, when the Liberals were in opposition, they were committed to supporting the dairy producers, defending article XI and maintaining subsidies. Well, once they are in office, what do they do in their budget? They cut aid to farmers and to dairy producers by 30 per cent. They also cut the income support program by 30 per cent.

I also mentioned unemployment. During the election campaign, they said that their priority was to fight unemployment and create jobs. Once they are in office, the language and the

speech change. The latest budget speech contained no job creation measures whatsoever. It has become a joke.

I was at the Sorel and Bécancour employment centres last week. What was the joke of the day? The question went: What is the difference between a Liberal MP and an unemployed person? The answer: The unemployed person has worked in the past.

We have reached a point where people no longer believe in this government. They do not believe the government will make good on its promises. It was the same thing when it came to defending the Acadians and the francophones outside Quebec. We saw francophone MPs from the rest of Canada claiming during the election campaign that they would defend the French fact here in the House of Commons and throughout Canada. But when there is a 5 per cent cut in the operating budget of their association, they say nothing. Not one francophone MP from outside Quebec rose to denounce the policy of the Liberal Party once it took office.

The same thing happened in a number of areas. With respect to copyright, for example, they made a written commitment in a document submitted to the Canada Council to take action to bring copyright under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Department of Canadian Heritage. Once elected, they turned this responsibility over to the Minister of Industry, and gave the heritage minister power to make recommendations only.

The Liberal Party always sings two different tunes: one when it is going after the vote and another when it is in power.

It was the same thing with free trade. They fought against free trade for years and denounced it during the election campaign, but once in office, they were not only all for it, but wanted it extended to other countries. The Liberal Party has always operated this way: it sings one tune before it is elected and another tune after.

I could give other examples. There is patronage, for instance. They criticized the Conservatives for making patronage appointments, but once in office they turned around and in less than six months gave out more than 300 appointments to friends of the party, under the expert guidance of Senator Rizzuto. And I mentioned the example of Michelle Tisseyre, Camille Samson and others.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): You are a very experienced parliamentarian; you should always comply with the Standing Orders of the House and avoid identifying members of the other place.

Mr. Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, I did not refer to the Senate but to one particular senator. I think that the Standing Orders allow me to identify one particular senator but not, as you pointed out, to refer to the Senate, that must be called the other place.

Supply

In any case, I will drop the word "senator" and use only the name "Rizzuto". This individual, who made the recommendations regarding patronage, is still the party's bagman and advisor on appointments like those of Camille Samson, Michelle Tisseyre and Jacques Saada, who was appointed to a \$100,000 a year post with CIDA.

It is typical behaviour for the Liberal Party to use a completely different language after coming to office. Even though they promised to do away with patronage and political appointments, they have since enthusiastically embraced this practice. The party still engages in double talk, especially its leader who, throughout his years in office in the 1970s and 1980s and since 1993, still says one thing before the election and another thing after. They think voters are fools.

(1510)

This review of Liberals' unkept promises and double talk is clearly reinforced today by our discussion of the funds allocated to the CBC. In this regard, I would like to quote the red book commitments made by the Liberal Party during the election campaign. The red book says on page 88: "Canada needs more than ever to commit itself to cultural development. Instead, the Conservative regime has deliberately undermined our national cultural institutions".

The Liberal Party said, and I quote: "Funding cuts to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the Canada Council, the National Film Board, Telefilm Canada, and other institutions illustrate the Tories' failure to appreciate the importance of cultural development". That is what it said before the election, but after the election, it was the first one to cut, to the tune of \$300 million, financing on which the CBC depends, attacking CBC's French network in particular.

Here is what the Liberal Party promised in its red book: "A Liberal government will be committed to stable multiyear financing for national cultural institutions such as the Canada Council and the CBC". This is a far cry from what is going on. Yet, the minister continued to claim in this House that he did not know exactly how extensive the cuts would be at the CBC; it could not be that much. Perhaps it was a little more than that. He contradicted himself at least five times in the past two months regarding possible cuts at the CBC, when a solemn and specific commitment had been made in the red book to stable multiyear financing. This goes to show once again the difference being in an election campaign or in office makes when you are the Liberal Party.

I will conclude on this as I am almost out of time. I know this will make my colleagues opposite very sad because they would like to hear more—I can see them hang their heads in shame for sacrificing their principles, the ideals they stood for and their red book to the party line. They will stop at nothing to be in power. They take after their leader. Power at all cost: make all the promises necessary to get there, but once in power, never

Supply

mind about making good these promises. Sooner or later, they will face the same reaction they faced in 1984, that is to say complete rejection from Halifax to Vancouver of this kind of behaviour, this double talk they have cultivated.

I will leave you with a recommendation the CRTC made concerning the CBC, stating that it will be imperative that the policy proposals to be developed in the coming months focus on a central and fundamental objective, which is to promote and preserve the identity of French Canadians; at present, our broadcasting system demands from its partners that they allow Canadian content to take up much room, which has encouraged the expression of our cultural identity and made possible the development of audiovisual production in both official languages of this country. It concluded that we should not give up any ground in this respect.

That is what the CBC should focus on, and the current minister is away off the track in refusing to give serious thought to maintaining stable financing, at the expense of the CBC's French network in particular, which is the highest performing. They crack open a bottle of champagne on the English side when they reach one million listeners, while on the French side, this many people listen in daily.

(1515)

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the comments made by the Conservative or rather the Bloc member, since he has a tendency to change his mind, who accuses the Liberals of singing two tunes. Coming from that member, and particularly that political party, this is quite a statement.

Mr. Speaker, today we heard the Bloc Quebecois raise an issue with which you are very familiar, namely the situation of French-speaking Canadians outside Quebec. This is the last straw. The hon. member and his colleague, the member for Rimouski—Témiscouata, are now telling us that they are defending French-speaking Canadians outside Quebec who have a right to be heard. However, yesterday, when some French-speaking Canadians outside Quebec made comments which they did not appreciate, they said that these people did not have a right to speak on the issue and should mind their own business.

Have you noticed that those who talk about the Liberals singing two tunes are doing precisely that? Rather than allude to the two different tunes of the Bloc, it might be more appropriate to refer to the two faces of that party. Those who sing two tunes have two—you guessed it, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member opposite claims to be CBC's protector—and I am pleased to see that Bloc members support anything with the word Canadian in it—and accuses the government unfairly and unreasonably. Is he aware that us French-speaking Canadians outside Quebec, at least where I come from, enjoy RDI, CBC's French-language network, la Chaîne française, and Quatre

Saisons? Indeed, French-speaking Canadians from Ontario can listen to all these channels, in a united Canada.

The member opposite, who talks out of both sides of his mouth, wants to deprive us, French-speaking Canadians living outside Quebec, of these bilingual institutions which allow us to enjoy these cultural vehicles to which we are entitled. Why, on the one hand, does the member claim to protect CBC and French-speaking Canadians outside Quebec while, on the other hand, both he and his fellow Bloc members do their utmost to deprive us of what we have gained?

Mr. Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the comments made by the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, especially when he said I could not make up my mind. He was critical of the fact that I was first a Conservative and that I am now a member of the Bloc Quebecois. Well sir, at least I have the courage—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order. In his previous comments, the hon. member for Richelieu seems to have been right about the other place, and I appreciate his comments, which show his experience, but at this point I must remind him to speak through the Chair.

Mr. Plamondon: Thank you for calling me back to order. I was going to say I was amazed when the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell said I was someone who could not make up his mind. I changed parties but I did not change my way of thinking. The principles that led me into politics were no longer compatible with the principles of the party to which I belonged. The party had changed, and to remain true to my principles, I had the courage to cross the floor of the House and sit on this side, first as an independent member and subsequently as one of a group of eight members who formed a political party.

When the hon. member saw his party renege on its commitments regarding unemployment, renege on its commitments regarding agriculture, renege on its commitments to protect French culture in Canada by cutting 5 per cent of funding, renege on its commitments to maintaining the public service, renege on its commitments with respect to the CBC, did he have the courage to cross the floor and sit down on this side of the House, as I did in 1990 when the party I served failed to live up to my principles?

(1520)

That is what I did, but the hon. member, according to an article in *Le Droit*, "this lion in the opposition is now a mere mouse". Indeed he is. That is my response.

Now if he really believes in the CBC, I also believe in the CBC's French network, but if he really believes—when he mentioned the RDI, I commented that some areas do not have it yet, but because there is a French network, because there is an

Supply

RDI, why would his department jeopardize their existence? That is what today's debate is all about.

Why would the government not guarantee funding? Why not guarantee funding for the CBC over a five-year period? That is what it is not doing and that is what we want it to do. We want the government to stop operating on the sly and to stop contradicting itself from one day to the next. That is what we want from the minister. Give us the facts, give us stable budgets, maintain what has been achieved by the French network, consider that the CBC's French network is more productive than the English network, provide the same funding for the news on French and English radio stations, provide the same funding for variety programs and for all sports programming.

What we want from the minister is a fair deal and the same guarantees he, his party and his prime minister promised the corporation during the election campaign and in the red book.

That is what we are asking today. Why does the hon. member who asked me a question not have the courage to say: "Yes, I did promise that, yes, we were supposed to do that and we will support the Bloc's motion to put pressure on the minister who no longer has a clue what his department is all about".

[*English*]

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Oakville—Milton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as important as the question of future funding levels of the CBC is, I feel that a more fundamental issue must also be addressed in the House today, namely, the importance of public broadcasting in Canada.

I intend to use this opportunity to remind my colleagues on both sides of the House about why we remain deeply and fundamentally committed to public broadcasting in Canada.

It is widely recognized that the CBC television services of tomorrow must necessarily play a much different role than the role they were intended to play over three decades ago. Today, Canadians enjoy a wider range of programming and services than ever before. Although these changes are significant, they are only a preview of what we can expect in the broadcasting industry in the future.

In recent months we have been the recipients of many new services through cable and as the hearings before the CRTC on convergence attest, much more is to come. Indeed it is legitimate for members to wonder when we hear so much about the so-called death stars and the 500 channel universe, what the role of the public broadcaster will be in this environment of increasing choices.

As surely as the CBC is a vital topic today, so it will be even a decade from now. True, the government has a historical position of supporting the CBC and of supporting Canadian culture. At a time when a virtual communications revolution is taking place, Canada needs more than ever a strong cultural identity. No single instrument is more vital to the development of that national identity than the CBC.

The corporation is the single most important employer of writers, actors, musicians, dancers, film makers, directors and many other talented, creative people who shape our vision of ourselves. Nowhere else on the television dial can one see the commitment to quality Canadian programming that one can see on both the English and French language networks of the CBC.

With two mainstream broadcast television networks, one French and one English, a television wing of the northern service and 24-hour all news cable service in both English and French, CBC television brings Canadians together. The CBC has the awards, both domestic and international to prove it.

(1525)

In a country as vast as ours the CBC alone provides some remarkable services. In addition to the television services already mentioned, it operates four mainstream radio networks, AM and FM in French and English plus a northern service transmitting in many native languages, including Cree and Inuktitut to name but two. These are the only radio networks in Canada and they reach about 98 per cent of the population.

If one visits some of our more remote corners it is easy to understand how much it can mean to a librarian in Iqaluit, for example, to know that her sister in Chester, Nova Scotia and her father in Nanaimo, B.C. are all listening to "Morningside", are all sharing that common Canadian experience. It is that sense of connectedness that is the essence of public broadcasting today. It is this commonality of experience which we must be able to continue to share. We live in an era of increasing specialization but Canadians can obtain almost anything they want on demand.

The question is, are they sharing experiences the way they once did? Our ability to record what we want and to watch it later, almost any time, can make for very selective and singular, some would say isolating, interpretations of our identity. As our national public broadcaster, the CBC must be strong enough to produce the quality Canadian programming that Canadians want to watch, the kind of programming that provokes discussion the next day, the kind of programming that helps Canadians share experiences that make us Canadians.

The former chairman of the CBC, Patrick Watson, said it far better than I can when he addressed the Paul Nitze Centre of Advanced Studies at John Hopkins University in Maryland in

Supply

1994. At that time he said: "Canadians, like Americans, will be spending a tremendous amount of time whizzing out to the outer reaches of this new communications universe".

More than ever, if the particular kind of civil society that we have put our money on is going to survive, we are going to need a foundation to start from and return to, something like a media hearthstone, so that whenever we select one of the channels that belong to our own public broadcaster, it will be so clearly ours that Canadians will be able to say to themselves: "We are home".

After all, that is what good public broadcasting is about: providing a sense of home in a universe that is expanding all the time. It does not mean that the CBC can expect increased levels of public funding. To expect that in light of the fiscal situation the government is facing would be neither realistic nor responsible to the future generations who must pay our debts. Likewise, it does not mean that the CBC must perform exactly as it has in the past, for this too would be ignoring reality.

Times have changed and so have our tastes and our expectations. The Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage has heard from many excellent witnesses about the importance of public broadcasting and about alternative ways of doing things. It is time for the government to take the next step, to review the legislated mandate parliamentarians have conferred on the CBC to ensure that we are not asking it to perform tasks which are no longer necessary, given the new services that are available to us or possible, given the resources available today. We must decide how best the CBC can enhance our feeling of connectedness as we enter the new millennium. I look forward to the upcoming announcement by the Minister of Canadian Heritage in this regard.

In closing, I would be remiss if I did not salute the men and women who serve the CBC today and have done so in years past. Their enduring commitment to public broadcasting and public service are valued deeply by the government. As we endeavour to resolve the challenges facing the CBC in the days ahead, we will do our utmost to act with wisdom, diligence and respect for the cultural treasure they have so painstakingly created.

(1530)

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in listening to the member as she spoke about the responsibility of the CBC generating the quality of programming that Canadians want.

I was also interested that the hon. member is continuing with the age old idea the Liberals have had that if anything is good it is going to have to be created by the government, that there must be government intervention into the creation of the Canadian identity and that there must be government intervention into

creating a feeling of connectedness. These are wonderful terms but at a cost of \$1.1 billion, I wonder how connected Canadians really feel.

I wonder if the hon. member could help me understand this concept. We are spending this gargantuan amount of money to create the quality of programming Canadians want and at the same time, the number of viewers, particularly of English language television, is dropping through the floor. Does she really feel we are getting the kind of value for the taxpayer's dollar we should be if she is after quality of programming that Canadians want yet the CBC is dropping viewers by the bucket-load?

Ms. Brown (Oakville—Milton): Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised by the opposition member's response to my remarks in the sense that I did speak strongly about the government's role in providing public broadcasting and the importance of public broadcasting.

Unlike the opposition member, I do not share his utmost faith in the marketplace delivering everything of value to all the citizens of this country. As a matter of fact, in this particular industry, that is broadcasting, while the private marketplace provides a service it has failed miserably to provide the kind of Canadian programming the CBC has managed to do in both official languages.

There is nothing preventing private broadcasters from creating more Canadian programming. However, particularly on English television, which he chooses to highlight, it is clear they can make a lot more money, according to the rules of the marketplace which they follow, by importing American sitcoms and simply rebroadcasting them.

Mr. Abbott: The CBC can.

Ms. Brown (Oakville—Milton): No. Eighty per cent to 85 per cent of CBC's programming in prime time is Canadian programming. Just about the same percentage is American programming on the private networks.

By the latest figures released, we know the market does not help us to create a national vision of ourselves and does not help us tell our stories to each other. Therefore, I and this government still believe there is a role for government in the broadcast industry and in the creation, encouragement and evolution of Canadian culture for both francophones and anglophones in this country.

The member mentioned a gargantuan expenditure of money on the CBC. I guess that would depend on where one's values lie. Perhaps the member believes as I do that this country has a leading role to play in the development of a higher level of civilization in this world. We have not done a bad job of it having been named number one in the world by the United Nations. Perhaps the member values the things that Canadians

have valued over time, things like caring for each other, a sense of community, an abhorrence for useless war. If he did, he would not see the expenditure of money on the public broadcaster as gargantuan.

Some in this country would encourage us to spend more, believe it or not, and to reduce the gargantuan expenditure of money for example on our military. To some that is an obscene expenditure of money. They think the creation of arts and culture, which makes for a more highly civilized nation, is a valuable expenditure of money. I guess it all depends on one's viewpoint as to value for dollars spent.

This nation wishes to retain its identity, to hold on to the things that make us different from our friends to the south. They are our friends but we do not want to imitate them, their social structures, or their social problems for sure. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary that we strengthen our identity as Canadians.

(1535)

It is necessary that we know who we are and that our children know who they are and that they are different. They are not English as the English in England. They are not French as the French in France. They are not North Americans as those citizens in the United States. They are different and they are special. We are poised between Europe and the United States as our main cultural influences. Therefore, it is more important than ever that we take strong measures as the representatives of the people in this government to ensure that the public broadcaster continues to play a strong role, a publicly funded role, in helping us to determine the vision of ourselves today and a better one for the future.

[Translation]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Madam Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for her presentation and for clarifying her position and her replies. It is very gratifying to realize that on the Canadian heritage committee, we have a member across the way whose position is not that far from the position of the Bloc Québécois on the need to defend public broadcasting, the CBC—SRC as we have known it, with whatever adjustments will be necessary because of changing technologies.

I have a comment and a question. What separates us is the concept of Canadian identity. This is a recent invention. There is not just one Canadian identity. There are two Canadian identities, two founding peoples here. More than two, if we include all our First Nations. In this bilingual country, which is French speaking and English speaking, there are two national identities and two cultures, which is reflected in our television programming. So that is what separates us, and nothing is going to change that. That is why we want to leave. We want to leave you with your Canadian identity and assume our Quebec identity. Those are all fundamental reasons, because we will never buy this Canadian identity concept.

Supply

That being said, I wonder whether the hon. member— Mr. Cauchon, let me say what I have to say.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): There is a time and a place for such conversations, but meanwhile, I would appreciate it if hon. members would speak through the Chair. The hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata.

Mrs. Tremblay: You are right, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you for calling me to order. I would also ask the hon. member for Outremont to speak through you.

This is what I wanted to ask the hon. member. Does she see public broadcasting as based on the system we know today, as an entity that will eventually absorb new technologies, or does she see a PBS style network?

[English]

Ms. Brown (Oakville—Milton): Mr. Speaker, I think from the committee my colleagues opposite know I am never going to be satisfied with a PBS style public broadcaster.

I find it appalling that at regular occasions what are probably fine upstanding citizens have to stand up with a tin cup and beg for donations. I find it appalling that our neighbour to the south does not value the PBS programs, which indeed many of us and many of its own citizens enjoy, sufficiently to fund it without having the tin cup approach. I would certainly fight against that to the death. You can count on it.

I cannot let the hon member's comments go unchallenged from the point of view of the identity issue. My colleague says there is no single Canadian identity but rather, there is a francophone one, an anglophone one, and an aboriginal one. She says that is why she wants to leave.

The thing is, the government does not want to allow that to happen because when my colleague says they want to leave, she is referring to those of her people with a francophone identity who live within the confines of the province of Quebec, which after all is only a geographic designation.

(1540)

There are many other Canadians who see themselves with a francophone identity and live outside the borders of Quebec. I ask my colleague why she would want to abandon those who share her sense of identity by leaving them and creating a new country from which they would be excluded.

I have just one other point. The fact is that all identities and all nations evolve and emerge with time. While we all have the identity of our roots, there is such a wonderful opportunity here for me to try to understand my colleague's identity, the identity of her birth and for her to try to understand mine and for all of us together to try to understand the identity of the aboriginal people and indeed of our newcomers. It is as we understand each other that perhaps that search for understanding becomes the foundation of what is truly a Canadian identity for all of us.

Supply

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member preceding me commented on identity saying that our identity in Quebec was simply a matter of geography. I think other factors have to be taken into consideration. It must be remembered that we are the people who arrived from Europe first bringing a French culture to America, with Quebec as its focus.

There was also a French America in North America as a whole. The first French to arrive in Quebec, the ones who settled in Canada, followed the Mississippi, reaching as far as Louisiana and the Rockies.

If, today, the number of francophones in Canada is less than what it was 125 or 130 years ago, it is perhaps more because they were denied the right to be educated in their own language and to grow in their own language. This happened in Manitoba and Alberta, among other places, at the end of the 19th century. Had they enjoyed this right, Canada could have become a truly bilingual country. We could have avoided the present situation in which we discover two completely different realities. We could live as neighbours in harmony. The only way, in our opinion, is for us to opt for sovereignty and for Canada to find a way to deal with its American neighbours.

Did the hon. member in her presentation not limit our identity by making it a matter of geography, in a very restrictive and rather embarrassing way for Quebecers, when we are in fact as much a part of Canada's history as the anglophones and the aboriginal peoples? Is this not limiting us to very little and admitting that the Liberal Party's knowledge of Canada is limited to the image handed to it, particularly by the picture the Prime Minister can paint of it?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The period for questions and comments is over. At 3.40 p.m. the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup began his speech for a maximum of 20 minutes.

Mr. Crête: I am sorry, I got confused in my presentation.

I will now go back to the motion presented by the member for Rimouski—Témiscouata. It reads as follows:

That the House condemn the government for the refusal by the Minister of Canadian Heritage to publish the government's decision concerning funding for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) for the next three years, thus causing an ominous threat to loom over the CBC's French-language network.

This motion got my attention and my support right from the start for various reasons. First of all, it clearly identifies the Minister of Canadian Heritage as being responsible for the very ambiguous situation the CBC-SRC is in at the present time, which affects both its listeners and employees. There is great

uncertainty regarding the future role of the corporation and the Minister of Canadian Heritage is to be blamed for it.

The minister's attitude discredits any expertise that might have developed within the Canadian public service and the CBC-SRC. It also discredits the function of the minister since we have repeatedly and systematically been told by the president who resigned, Mr. Manera, and by the vice-president, Mrs. Fortin, that there will be significant and drastic cuts at the CBC-SRC. These statements were not made on the sly. Mrs. Fortin held a two hour televised teleconference which was broadcasted across the country, during which she explained the impact of the cuts to all the services of Radio-Canada. One of her listeners said that Mrs. Fortin had shared her anguish and feelings of powerlessness with her audience. She said she did not know what the future holds for the French network of the CBC.

(1545)

Therefore, following this evaluation by an employee which reflects the feelings of people following this presentation, the official opposition asked the minister to tell us what the impact of the cuts would be. The only answer we got was that no cuts were planned when, in fact, documents available from the CBC show that a program of cuts is in the works. They mention cuts of \$44 million for 1995-96, more than \$96 million for 1996-97 and \$165 million for 1997-98.

Such cuts are already part of the CBC's future and it must plan its actions accordingly. When dealing with television or radio production, decisions must be made months in advance to determine which serials will be shown in the years ahead and what will be the direction followed by the corporation. The vagueness of the minister and the lingering uncertainty he is fostering are doing tremendous damage to the future of the corporation.

Why did the official opposition consider important to draw the attention of the House on this subject on a designated day? It is because we realized that, after all is said and done—and there is a lesson to be drawn here for both networks of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—because of the quality of programming, because of the way Radio-Canada has managed to identify with Quebec, there is during prime time about 87 per cent of Canadian programming and only 13 per cent of foreign programming. Its impact was that TVA, a private network, followed suit and used a mix of 73 per cent Canadian and 27 per cent foreign programming. TQS made sure it had 65 per cent Canadian content. We realize that Radio-Canada really has the power to promote Canada's and Quebec's culture because of the content of the programs it airs and makes known.

The English network is much less able to do this because it does not capture as much of its potential audience and, for example, networks like Global carry 80 per cent foreign content during the same time slot, from 7 to 11 nightly. Pay television carries 94 per cent foreign content. The CTV network, which is

in some ways an overblown take-off from TVA, carries 75 per cent foreign content. Therefore, there is a significant difference in the audiences' perceptions, which Radio-Canada has been able to use to develop a complicity with its audience and to ensure the propagation of the country's culture in a way that the English network has not necessarily been able to do.

Some may believe that higher budgets made it possible to obtain these results. The opposite is true. If we look at the spread in production costs, the average amount allocated per hour of programming at the Société Radio-Canada is \$18,390; at the CBC, the amount is \$37,496. The average cost of one hour of news on Radio-Canada is \$7,000; on CBC, the same thing costs \$18,000. The average cost of one hour of French variety shows is \$30,000; in English, it is \$141,000. Therefore, we cannot attribute Radio-Canada's success in capturing a bigger audience and in propagating Canadian culture to its budget. There are other reasons.

(1550)

If we stubbornly continue to cut the CBC's French-language network, this will eventually have a direct impact on the quantity and quality of production. We are no longer cutting fat and looking for surpluses. This will have a direct impact on production and, among other things, on the ways we collaborate with the cultural community.

In the past, the French network often contributed to the dissemination of all art forms by giving contracts for concerts, dance performances and other cultural activities. In the future however—as was announced at Mrs. Fortin's press conferences—spending cuts will have a negative effect on cultural production and the potential for adequate cultural dissemination. The CBC's French-language network is being unfairly penalized, since cutting 25 cents out of every dollar does not have the same effect as cutting 35 or 50 cents from \$4 or \$5. The cuts will have a much more detrimental impact on the French-language network. In this regard, I think it is important for the House, which is preoccupied with sound budget management, to ensure that the cuts are fair.

The cuts currently planned at the CBC do not reflect a commitment to the fair distribution of public funds. The first person responsible for this misinformation is the minister himself because, by refusing to give us the real figures, he is adding to the insecurity of CBC employees and of all those who want this network to continue providing in the future the type of collaboration for cultural dissemination that it used to offer in the past.

Mrs. Fortin also said during the closed circuit TV program in which she explained the impact of the cuts that national televi-

Supply

sion would never be the same, because there will indeed be major consequences for francophones in all Canadian provinces. CBC's French-language network is somewhat like an umbilical cord linking all French-speaking Canadians to the national production made in Quebec, while also allowing the broadcast of regional productions.

During consultations on the social program review, I travelled across the country last year and I can tell you that, in several regions, the French network only has the bare minimum to survive. The decisions to be made regarding CBC's French-language network could have the effect of depriving, in a significant way, access to information in French for part of Canada, and that could go two ways, in the sense that, for example, French-speaking people in Vancouver, Edmonton or Charlottetown would neither have access to information from Quebec, nor be able to familiarize the rest of Canada with their reality.

The cuts will result in a less varied and more limited programming for these people, given the drastically reduced budget of the corporation. Choices will have to be made and the whole French-speaking community outside Quebec may end up paying the price, possibly even more so than the majority in Quebec.

(1555)

Mr. Manera resigned from CBC because the commitments made to him when he joined the corporation were not adhered to. After the public announcement of cuts by the vice-president of CBC's French-language network, and after the minister's claims that he is not sure whether cuts will be made, the employees of these networks are even more disheartened.

I much prefer the attitude of Mrs. Fortin, who says they will sit down together and see if they can still make interesting things in spite of the cuts to be made, to that of the minister, who refuses to provide the exact numbers. Indeed, Mrs. Fortin seems much more aware of the needs of the corporation's employees, that is those who ensure the daily production.

What can we do to ensure that, in the future, CBC's French-language network can continue to fulfill its mandate without being adversely affected to the point where it would no longer be able to provide the same quality programming for the Canadian public? I think the minister should provide the accurate figures regarding the cuts to be made and then ask employees of the corporation, those who work there, to tell him where these cuts could be made and what their impact will be.

For example, I was told that, each year, or on a regular basis, CBC must spend \$15 million to get CRTC's approval for its programming. Considering the anticipated cuts—we are talking \$45 million for the first year, 1995-1996—\$15 million could significantly help reduce the impact of such cuts.

Supply

People might be willing to make cuts at corporate headquarters because, as is the case with other organizations, it is obvious that in the different branches, different service points of the CBC, staff is already at the minimum required to ensure adequate production and adequate coverage of information, whether it be in the cultural or other sectors.

Would it not be possible for the corporation to make a special effort at headquarters? Could we not, as a result, possibly delay the effect the cuts might have on production in the short term? I think that these are avenues that could be studied in the future. Maybe we could ask the minister to consider these suggestions. And let us remember that this is happening in a context where the federal government is saying that francophone minorities in Canada are important to it. They want to make sure that they receive quality services. They want the French fact to be alive and well everywhere in Canada. On the other side of the House, and on this point I concur with the hon. member for Richelieu who spoke before me, they sing two different tunes. There is one for the election campaign, the election platform, and another, which is the reality that the Liberal Party is promoting as a government.

If we take away from the French communities of Canada the possibility of expressing who they are, we are going to widen the gap between elements to a point which will not leave the French fact in Canada enough vigour to survive. By taking even more from them we would be like depriving them of oxygen. I think that the Minister of Canadian Heritage, who is in a way responsible for culture in Canada, should ask himself very serious questions before taking such action.

(1600)

We have the feeling that, after telling us during the first weeks following the election that he was a good friend of the CBC and would ensure that the corporation had all the resources needed to develop, the minister became a lackey to the finance minister whose job is to cut expenditures.

His inability to properly defend culture in Canada and his narrow vision which encompasses only one Canadian culture are enough to convince him that we do not necessarily need two healthy television networks and that we could cut the oxygen supply to one of them so that we would only have one Canadian identity. We could come back to the bilingual television network we had in the beginning, but that would not reflect the reality in our country.

I think it is important for this House to consider the motion before us today and to ensure, first of all, that the minister clearly indicates where the cuts will be made—what seems to me like a responsible thing to do—and second, that no cuts will be made in areas that could hurt production and the delivery of adequate services to Quebecers and Canadians alike.

[English]

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. member. Is culture in Quebec so fragile that it takes Radio-Canada to keep the culture together? I suggest the culture has not been built by a radio or television station or network. The culture has been built by centuries of people working, playing and living together.

After all those centuries is the culture so fragile that we need a government owned television and radio network to sustain it? That seems absurd to me. I would like the member to respond to the question.

[Translation]

Mr. Crête: Mr. Speaker, there are more than two oceans in Canada. There is also an ocean of difference between the hon. member's position and my own. I am starting to understand some of the identity problems of English Canada. If a member of this House considers that culture is not transmitted by the media, by radio and television and the information highway and the rest, all the different ways we communicate, I am beginning to understand why some people have trouble distinguishing the border between Canada and the United States.

What I have just heard gives me the impression that they could live anywhere on this planet, that being Canadian or American is the same thing. And I realize why they are so afraid we will leave. They think that after we have left, the Canadian identity will cease to exist.

Before the advent of the printed media and the electronic media, culture was transmitted orally. A people was distinctive in terms of its artistic endeavours, its inventions, its scientific progress and its trading traditions. These are the elements that together represent the culture of a people.

Media like the CBC, both the French and the English networks, use images to show us the country we live in and the people who live there with us. Wanting these media to survive and produce quality programs does not mean our culture is fragile. It proves the importance of communicating that the culture.

That is why, for instance, we have networks like TV5 that group francophone television channels from all over the world. The English networks do the same. I think it is important to realize that in the global village of the future, in the world of tomorrow, networks like the CBC are the tools of the future. Wanting to maintain the CBC does not mean our culture is fragile. It means ensuring that it has a future and that it can take its rightful place, in Quebec or in Canada, depending on what Quebecers decide.

(1605)

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it seems that the government has decided to axe the CBC. We are told that cuts of about \$375 million will be made over the next few years.

Supply

The minister also seems unwilling to disclose these cuts, but we do not know why. That is the question that we are asking ourselves today.

As a member of Parliament who is promoting the sovereignty of Quebec, and seeing that the current government is axing the CBC, I ask myself this question: Would it be preferable for the government to simply privatize the CBC, so that the money saved could be used to reduce taxes in Quebec and to allow the government of Quebec to support Radio-Québec? Radio-Québec could then respond to the needs of Quebecers the same way as the CBC has done it before, since it will not be able to do so in the future.

What does the hon. member think of this suggestion?

Mr. Crête: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is strictly a question of privatizing the national network. In Quebec and Canada, there is the issue of production. For example, in order to ensure an adequate coverage and the broadcasting of programs reflecting what we really are, it was decided long ago in Quebec that we would create Radio-Québec. Because Quebecers had worked for the CBC, they also wanted to be involved in a television which would picture Quebec adequately in the future. That probably brought about much higher expenses than what should have been.

The solution probably lies in better defined jurisdictions. It should be clear who is responsible for an area, who will have the power to levy taxes and who will have the spending power. Someone should have the authority to sign international treaties, on networks like TV5 for example, in order that we may be sure the money is really spent on production and not on some competition which is not always appropriate and which causes useless expenditures and squandering.

Today, we refuse to question the principle of the existence of the CBC, but we are cutting its air supply at the source. Well, why not try to seek the solution elsewhere? Perhaps we should first understand that there are two cultures in Canada and that each of them must have the adequate tools to ensure its own development.

It is also easy to see the ripple effect of the CBC on the quality of programs and on the fact that the French network airs many more Quebec content programs during prime time hours. These programs promote what we are and, for various reasons, they are quite superior to whatever is shown on the English network. Therefore, we can be proud of the results, at least on the Quebec side.

Mr. Martin Cauchon (Outremont, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I had a chance to read the motion introduced by the hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata and I can say that I was not surprised at all.

Members across the aisle have a philosophy which is behind all the actions of their party. I have said and I repeat that the

members of the Bloc Québécois are not in this House to defend the interest of Canadians and Quebecers. They are here for one reason only, their own interest, which is the separation of Quebec at any cost.

(1610)

Once this leitmotiv and this philosophy are understood, it is not surprising to see motions like the one we now have before us. Why such a motion? It is simple. It is because the CBC has for many years promoted the Canadian identity and our culture and it has promoted what we are. The CBC has played a role in our unity and in the development of the French fact in Canada, not only in Quebec but also outside Quebec, because there are indeed francophones outside Quebec, a reality that very much frightens the Bloc Québécois. Therefore, it is not surprising to see that kind of motion which is an attempt to adversely affect the CBC, this national monument and institution of which I am extremely proud.

Indeed, we are in a period of fiscal austerity. The federal government is in a period of fiscal austerity and so are the provinces. The Minister of Finance's budget, and may I remind you that this budget has been tremendously well received by all Canadians, which proves that this government is a responsible government, has lightly touched the budget of the CBC in an effort on the part of the minister to put some order in the government's fiscal house.

There is some bad faith on the other side of this House. I think that this budget indicates clearly the intentions of this government regarding the CBC that we want to preserve. There was a small reduction in the budget. As you know, the budget of the CBC is in excess of \$1.1 billion. There is a budget reduction for 1995-96. What we are saying is that we want to go ahead with a reform of the CBC that will take into account the evolution of Canadian society, of our political context and of our country as a whole.

When we talk about reform, we always talk about changing the institutions so that they can evolve at the same pace as the rest of our society. That is what we intend to do with the CBC.

It is not in the interests of the official opposition that we go ahead with our reforms. Their sole objective is to show that the system does not work so that they can eventually bring about the separation of Quebec. They create a very destructive climate that unfortunately serves no one's interests.

When we were elected to form a new government, we said that we would proceed with major reforms. Such reforms can be implemented if everybody works together and pulls in the same direction. However, that is not good enough for the official opposition. Of course, they take their orders from their party's head office in Quebec City and since their party is in power in Quebec, the orders are not to co-operate with the federal government. They are afraid that co-operation could lead to a solution to the present situation and to a slide toward Canadian

Supply

federalism which would be in the best interests of all the provinces and in line with the Canadian reality.

(1615)

Quite the contrary, they chose to withdraw from the process, unfortunately. The head office, the Parti Québécois in Quebec City, has unfortunately done so in many areas, such as the environment. In that area, they have withdrawn from a Canada-wide consultation committee—Quebecers should know these facts—a committee set up to fine tune the relationships between provincial governments, to fine tune Canadian federalism and to make Canada grow and also, by the same token, to make Quebec grow.

Those are the actions taken by these people who want to go backward instead of moving forward. You know, when we say we want to go ahead with reforms, and also to strive to create a better system, this is possible. The Minister of Finance demonstrated that in his budget.

Let us consider, for example, the issue of social program reform. How many provinces asked us, in the area of social programs, for some decentralization in order for them to gain more autonomy and to be able to shape programs, to a greater degree, according to local, regional and provincial realities? It was nearly a unanimous request.

When we look at the finance minister's budget, we find a positive answer. We see that there is some decentralization and that we created a new Canadian social transfer, a transfer that gives provinces more autonomy and that invites provinces to sit down with the federal government and develop national standards that would apply coast to coast.

That is what Canadian federalism, an evolving federalism, is all about. That is the new political reality. It is a reality that requires politicians throughout Canada to work together in co-operation. But those people do not want to function, they do not want to move forward.

Instead of spending their energy on improving Quebec's position within the Canadian federation, they choose to waste public funds. That is something. In 1995, instead of trying to get the public finance in order, instead of trying to take measures so that Quebec can still have a place within the federation—an enviable place, an important one—and be influential internationally, the newly elected government in Quebec simply tries to achieve one goal, separation, and to do so, it uses public funds and wastes them shamefully.

The regional commissions on the future of Quebec are a good example of that kind of waste of public funds. They represent not only a loss of money, but also an incredible loss of time. I can assure you that I am a true Quebecer and that when I see members opposite do what they are doing now, I know deep in

my heart that we are not making any progress with them. They have a negative vision of things.

Canadian federalism did contribute to the development of the French language in Canada and to the development of the French-speaking people living outside Quebec. And the federal government will keep on doing so, it will keep on improving Canadian federalism.

(1620)

And that is not all. Not only does Canada permit the francophone community within its walls to reach out, but, as the Minister of Foreign Affairs mentioned, Canada is also involved in the international francophone community and enables the francophone face of Canada to shine internationally.

We do it and we do it alongside the Province of Quebec, since the Province of Quebec sits at the table of the international francophone community at the invitation of the federal government. We are so successful at this that we recently established TV5 with other francophone countries. Is there any finer international success than TV5? Is there any finer success for the francophone community than TV5? Therefore federal government actions shine forth not only nationally but internationally.

In closing, I would like to say that, if we work hand in hand, we could protect our invaluable CBC and, doing so, could also enable it to provide the same services in the future it has provided in the past. These services have enabled the French language to shine forth and allowed Canada to express its linguistic and cultural duality not only coast to coast, but around the world.

In conclusion, I would point out that we do not have to listen to anyone who is not working constructively and who is bent on destroying the country. We also do not have to listen to anyone who, when it comes time to act in their own bailiwick, does something far worse than we can do. Take, for example, the issue of Radio-Québec. To go back to the beginning, for all of these reasons, you will see that the hon. member's motion was predictable when we look at the principles underlying their political actions, and I find it quite unfortunate that they take nobody's interests into consideration. The only interest they serve is their own, and their interest is to see the day Quebec separates. If we work together, let me tell you because I have travelled in the province of Quebec many times, we can give Quebecers what they want, a progressive and constructive society.

Mrs. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I will be here a long time if I say everything I have to say about what was just said. In any case, I probably will use up the five minutes I have at my disposal. On to my reply.

He says that there is a philosophy behind each of our actions. So much the better. This is what gives us depth and allows us to think articulately. I just heard a bunch of unrelated comments on

Supply

various issues, but almost nothing about my motion. He seized the opportunity to talk about everything and anything.

Francophones outside of Quebec, of course we know they exist. We have reminded the House of their existence since we were elected. The Liberals forgot about them for the nine years they were the opposition. They forgot about Quebecers. They forgot about Francophones outside of Quebec. They did not even speak French in the House anymore. It was us who put French back on the map. We were the ones who built it up again, not the hon. member for Outremont, not the Liberals opposite who forgot about French for nine years. They have nothing on us when it comes to this issue.

He did not realize that the budget cuts Radio-Canada's funding by \$679 million over three years. He did not even read the whole thing through. That is only for the Department of Canadian Heritage, and half of it would have gone to the CBC. The member accuses us of acting in bad faith. He talks about a reform. We have nothing against progress. I believe that everyone should have access to the information highway. But in the meantime, can we continue to walk on a gravel road? Can we keep our television? The member also said that if we all worked together, and went in the same direction—this is beginning to sound like the ewe the minister spoke of the other day.

(1625)

On a more serious note, he says that the CBC reflects a Canadian reality. This may be true for the English-language network, but the French-language network reflects the Quebec reality. Just ask Mrs. Fortin who, when she appeared before the heritage committee, was told to try to better reflect the Canadian French-speaking reality. For example, with adequate funding, CBC's French-language network could produce soaps from the Prairies.

The member referred to the head office. He said that we work for the head office, or as some would say, the mother house. I was brought up by nuns and I have no problem with the concept of mother house. In the context of multinational corporations, we often refer to head offices. But what do they do with their subsidiaries, with Michel Bélanger, Daniel Johnson and Stéphane Dion? This is no better. It is exactly the same thing. The head office in this instance is Power Corporation.

The member also referred to what he called—hear me out, I want to get this right—the NCST, the new Canada social transfer. I hope this will not turn out to be what we anticipate. The member alluded to the costs incurred by the commissions. He said the exercise was a waste of time. To respect democracy and consult people is now a waste of money. This is preposterous. How much is spent on Canadian unity? Two hundred dollars

a day for each of the spies in each of the commissions. You can figure out the total, Mr. Speaker.

The member crows about the international Francophonie, which is in fact the result of the efforts of the leader of the opposition when he was Canada's ambassador to France, as well as then Prime Minister Brian Mulroney and then Quebec Premier Pierre-Marc Johnson. These three true Quebecers cared about the future of Francophonie, not about seeing French-speaking Canadians disappear through assimilation.

Mr. Cauchon: Mr. Speaker, I did not realize I had annoyed the hon. member so much. We will return to a situation of calm and talk about serious things, that is, the CBC.

I will be brief. When they say there is a philosophy behind their thinking, which gives them vision, it is unfortunate that this vision is not shared by anyone in Quebec, because they see things only one way and that is from the standpoint of separation, which I find unfortunate.

She talks of the hearings of the regional commissions, but we could say a few things on the subject. All that they have done is prove the vision of the present federal government right. People told the opposition member's head office that they wanted attention to be paid to the debt and to the deficit, that they wanted attention to be given to the issue of job creation and that they wanted attention to be paid to economic development.

How is it that only the hon. members opposite have failed to understand? For the past year and a half we have been busy organizing public finances and reforming government machinery, and I must add, successfully. The latest budget of the Minister of Finance is remarkable.

In opposition, they refuse to hear what the people are saying. It is quite simple, however. They have to let go of something that dates from bygone days, from the 1960s. Quebec has changed.

(1630)

Quebec now has its own instruments of economic development. Quebec is a Canadian power, which now is felt worldwide. These people are acting as if we were still in the 1960s. They are reacting as if they had been colonized. I do not feel they are part of my generation.

In conclusion, I am proud to be a Quebecer. I have no complex. I am proud to belong to the big Canadian family and to go forth together with these people.

[English]

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to other government members talk about the importance of the CBC and what great friends they are of the CBC. With the government and its members having

Supply

introduced a budget that severely cuts the CBC, one could say that with friends like that who needs enemies.

I listened particularly to the member talk about the need to reform, the need for a new CBC and how the reform should take place in a co-operative way. I agree that there are new realities, modern realities and a need for change, but I would like to ask the member: Is the government not going at this a little backward?

Before introducing cuts and changes to the budget, it has to first think through where it wants to see the CBC end up. Everybody agrees that with the cuts the CBC cannot fulfil its legislative mandate.

Why has the government not first thought through what type of public broadcasting it wants before it introduced the cuts? Could government members explain what the CBC should be like with these cuts? What is the vision of the member and the government of a new “reformed CBC”?

Mr. Cauchon: Mr. Speaker, my colleague’s question is quite interesting. He says that we are going ahead with major cuts. I believe we did not read the same budget.

The budget says that we are reforming the CBC budget as a whole for 1995–96 but we did not talk about cuts afterward. We are doing exactly what the hon. member would like the government to do. We are going ahead with major reform of the CBC’s mandate because the government is aware of the financial situation of the country.

We have to take care of the financial situation. At the same time we have to look into the future. In so doing we have to look at reforming the whole system. We have to look at the social safety net and at reforming the system. We will do the same with the CBC.

I believe my colleague’s question is a bit premature at this stage because we did not announce any major cuts to the CBC. There is \$1.1 billion a year in the budget for the CBC. There is something for the year 1995–96 but thereafter we are doing exactly what the member would like us to do. We are reforming the system.

I am sure the Minister of Canadian Heritage will come back to the House after the standing committee looking at the reform of the mandate makes a decision.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will try to get back to the motion without getting overly excited. The motion says the following:

That the House condemn the government for the refusal by the minister of Canadian Heritage to publish the government’s decisions—

I would like to start from that point. The member for Richelieu made a brilliant speech regarding the double talk of the Liberals these last thirty years. He gave us numerous examples where pre-election decisions are not implemented after the

elections, where pre-election promises are not kept after the elections. This is in fact double talk, but there is also a lack of transparency when one refuses to tell the facts, when one prefers to remain silent. It is the thrust of the motion introduced today in the House.

(1635)

I would like to read one or two little paragraphs from the red book, because they make an accurate description of the CBC’s present situation. In the little red book, a few sentences relate to the CBC—this one, for example: “At a time when globalization and the information and communications revolution are erasing national borders, Canada needs more than ever to commit itself to cultural development. Instead, the Conservative regime has deliberately undermined our national cultural institutions”. So this was a criticism this government was making then of the Conservative government.

I go on: “Funding cuts to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the Canada Council, the National Film Board, Telefilm Canada, and other institutions illustrate the Tories’ failure to appreciate the importance of cultural and industrial development”. I draw the attention of members to the fact that the government is doing now exactly what he considered unacceptable on the part of the Conservative Party.

This is what Liberals wrote in their little red book, before the elections, of course: “Liberals recognize not only that the promotion of cultural industries contributes to enhancing Canadian identity, but also that cultural products create jobs at home and bring in revenues from abroad”. What do we see later on? Job losses, lay-offs and also, probably, losses of revenue. Here is a last little sentence, again from the red book: “Finally, a Liberal government will be committed to stable multiyear financing for national cultural institutions such as the Canada Council and the CBC”. That is, the opposite of what we are doing now. “This will allow national cultural institutions to plan effectively”. We can see the consequences of the decisions made today.

This is why Mr. Manera resigned. Because he could not plan for the long term. When you are a high level manager wishing to manage public affairs in a coherent manner, you demand coherent funding, which was not given. The cuts to the CBC—SRC fly in the face of the position stated in the little red book. We are denouncing the discrepancy between the decisions being taken and the government’s stated position, as we have done every time it has not been true to its position.

I would like to point out that we are not the only ones to do it. Some government members also denounce this kind of activity. I will mention, among others, my hon. colleague, the hon. member for Gander—Grand Falls, who spends the greater part of his time haunting the corridors at Revenue Canada and who, every couple of months, explains either in this House or in the press, how his government refuses to go and get the money where it should, in the pockets of rich Canadians who are not

Supply

paying any taxes. It is not the Bloc Québécois who is saying this, but the member for Gander—Grand Falls.

I will also mention the remarks made by my hon. colleague, the member for York South—Weston, who tells us that every time the government goes after or wants to go after social programs, it is doing exactly the same thing it was denouncing when the Tories were in power. It is not the Bloc Québécois who is saying this, it is the Liberal member for York South—Weston. I am also coming back to the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, who delivered a cutting speech in this House on how Canada's social programs did not cause the country's deficit. He concluded his speech on this issue by saying that he would probably vote against the budget. We will see what happens when the time comes.

This means that this method of doing things, which we denounce today, was amply decried by the hon. members of the current government. Of course, the minister does not wish to disclose anything when answering questions in the House. He has answered about 10 questions already, I think, regarding the CBC's budget versus the statements made outside of the House by the management of the CBC. The minister refuses to get his feet wet. The CBC's president is forced to resign, saying that \$350 million will be cut, yet the minister refuses to confirm this figure.

Ms. Fortin says that 750 positions with the French network will be cut or abolished, yet the minister refuses to confirm the figure, claiming that it is all still hypothetical. Lastly, the media state unanimously that the minister's statements are inconsistent.

(1640)

We are not the ones saying it, it is the newspapers who are saying it every day. There will be major cuts which will have a dramatic impact on both networks, but will probably hit the French network harder than the English one. There are actually great discrepancies between the two networks. I am referring to what the hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata explained to us so well when she said that, in general, television programs produced for the French network cost less than those produced for the English one, and have a bigger public.

I am also referring to a report submitted to the committee by the Coalition pour la défense des services français de Radio-Canada. This coalition represents producers, artists and others involved in producing French-language services for the CBC. According to a summary of its agenda—I believe the House should hear this—the coalition for the defence of CBC French-language services denounces the disproportionate distribution of program resources between Canadian public television pro-

grams, depending on whether they are going to anglophones or francophones.

Further, Canadians are not entitled to public services of equivalent quality, if they are French speaking or English speaking. This is not only unfair, but in violation of the CBC-SRC mandate, as stated in the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Act. The coalition's support to the renewal of the French and English networks licences is conditional upon this iniquity being remedied. It recommends that the CRTC attach to the renewal of CBC-SRC licences the obligation to provide both networks with equal program budgets by the year 2001.

In its report, the coalition identifies three specific areas that require particular attention and to conclude asks that the CRTC step in to force the CBC-SRC to act on these problems as a matter of priority. We know where all this leads: to drastic cuts. All under the pretext of having a budget to produce and an enormous debt to deal with.

The Minister of Finance has in fact tabled recently in this House a budget with teeth. This budget does have teeth, but not for just anyone. It does not have teeth when it comes to family trusts for example. Family trusts will finally be abolished, but only in four years from now, to give those who have an interest in family trusts to get their most trusted tax consultants and review the whole gimmick that enables them to avoid taxes.

This budget has no teeth when it comes to tax havens. There are still tax havens and those who use them to keep their profits outside of the country do not pay a cent in taxes in Canada.

This is not exactly a budget with teeth for the banks either. Banks will be required to make a small effort. Peanuts, really, considering the astronomical profits they made this year. While individual taxpayers are asked to tighten their belts to the last notch, the banks get away with doing hardly anything.

On the other hand, this budget definitely has teeth as regards the little people. That is obvious. It bites into the tender flesh of our farmers, milk producers and wheat producers. Of course, it calls for some assistance to be provided to allow Western wheat producers to adjust, but nothing for Quebec.

It bites into UI. The UI system is not for the rich, but they bite off huge chunks of it anyway, without even swallowing the deficit. That is the beauty of it that if we have drastic cuts affecting the little people, it is because we have a growing deficit and debt.

All the cuts made this year will not prevent this deficit and debt from growing, which means that more cuts will be required next year. The effects of the cuts announced this year will not be felt for another seven or eight months.

Supply

(1645)

This budget also compromises the future of our young people by forcing them to pay more to enrol in school in the hope of getting the few jobs that will be left when they graduate—and young people came to the Hill to show us that they understood this. So we end up with well-educated unemployed workers who are 80 per cent in debt. That is their lives. A big budget, indeed.

They are already salivating over their proposed reform of the old age pension plan. A 72-year old man came to see me yesterday in my office. As a good Canadian taxpayer, he had just filed his income tax return. This individual earns \$23,000 a year. Because he claimed a capital gains exemption this year as a result of selling his house on paper, he will have to pay back his old age pension benefits, which amount to \$4,600 for the year. There are now many people in the same situation who, while preparing their tax returns this month, will realize the extent of the cuts that have been announced but will only be felt in a little while.

I heard my hon. colleague tell us with a smile up to his ears that this budget had been well received throughout Canada. I am not sure that we read the same newspapers. Some fairly well-known people were quoted in the newspapers. The day after the budget was tabled, Roy Romanow said that it was “un-Canadian”. And he used this term repeatedly. An indignant Bob Rae claimed that health care and social assistance budgets would be cut. All the newspapers headlined that Bob White was in a state of shock. And the CBC president resigned just after the budget was tabled.

In the meantime, alone in Quebec in the shadow of Michel Bélanger, the so-called great defender of Quebec’s interests, Daniel Johnson does not say a word. To stay on the subject of sheep, this could be called the silence of the lambs.

All these measures do not change anything. The debt will continue to grow and the government will have to cut even deeper next year, just to fill in the holes. And the CBC’s budget will be affected.

That is why we tabled this motion, to stress that the heritage minister should undertake to give us accurate figures in order to avoid creating an unhealthy climate. The minister himself claims that he is responsible for this portfolio and that he is a friend of the house. I think it would be in the House’s interest to be given accurate figures and to know exactly what decisions have been made by this government.

Mr. Guy H. Arseneault (Restigouche—Chaleur, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, in this House, French-speaking members from outside Quebec were criticized on a few occasions. We also heard the Bloc Québécois claim to be the protector of Francophonie outside Quebec. I wish to correct that view and make a comment based on an article published yesterday in a New Brunswick newspaper, *L’Acadie Nouvelle*, and written by the editor, Mr. Nelson Landry. The article is entitled *The flower and the pot*:

Following the war of words involving the Fédération des communautés francophones et acadienne du Canada, the FCFA, and Bloc Québécois member Suzanne Tremblay, the two sides respectively deserve the flower and the pot.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order. When we read an excerpt from a newspaper or other document, the rules are the same as if the words were our own. Consequently, we have to say “the member for”, instead of naming the person.

The hon. member for Restigouche—Chaleur.

Mr. Arseneault: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The flower goes to the Fédération des communautés francophones et acadienne du Canada.

Even if the stand taken by the FCFA on the referendum issue is not as firm as it should be, it is now clear that the federation is on the No side, something which was not quite clear a few weeks ago.

The FCFA hopes that Quebecers will vote no but, unfortunately, it will not go any further in its efforts to convince them of the virtues of federalism.

The federation deserves a flower for clarifying its stand, but only one. It will get the bouquet when it takes on the role that it should assume regarding this issue and actively participates in the No campaign, as is the wish of the vast majority of French-speaking Canadians outside Quebec.

The pot goes to the Bloc member for Rimouski—Témiscouata.

That member should think twice before opening her mouth. That could prevent her from talking nonsense as she did last week, when she said that the only way to save the French language in Canada is through a sovereign Quebec.

Such comments clearly show how little Quebec politicians know about the French fact outside Quebec.

As for the “meddling” argument, it is getting pretty thin. The Quebec referendum is a national issue, no matter what the hon. member and others say, and francophones outside Quebec have as much right to speak to this issue as Quebecers.

Francophones outside Quebec have kept silent for too long, which explains why it took so long before they obtained their language rights in some provinces. From now on, they will be heard loud and clear on issues which affect them, including the Quebec referendum.

The article is signed by Nelson Landry.

(1650)

Mr. Pomerleau: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if that was a question or a comment. My hon. colleague just talked about interference, but I do not know if he is making this quote his motto or if this statement reflects his opinion. Obviously, there is one thing which is clearly recognized by everybody in Quebec, which is that the future of Quebec will be decided by and only by Quebecers. I want to remind you of a famous statement made by Mr. Bourassa who is not a die-hard sovereignist: “Quebec is now and for ever free to make its choices and master of its own destiny”. This is exactly our position.

The hon. member for Restigouche—Chaleur—a marvellous riding I had the opportunity to visit and where a lot of Acadians make you feel very welcome—quoted an article where it is said that were are wrong to argue that the only way for a nation to survive is to become sovereign and that one of my colleagues should think twice before making such a statement. But I would

heartily agree with such a statement. The survival of Quebecers will only be accomplished through Quebec's sovereignty.

You only have to think about all the minority groups throughout French Canada. In almost every part of the country, they were gradually assimilated over a number of years, and if there are French-speaking Canadians living outside Quebec nowadays, it is because with Quebec in the Canada confederation, these people can have a real political balance. However, we no longer think of ourselves as Canadians. We are Quebecers, and Quebec is our only country. So, we will become Quebecers.

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as we all know, we are debating a motion on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the cuts it has suffered in the last budget.

The comment I would like to make, and my colleague will have the opportunity to add to that when I am finished, is that the budget as a whole does not seem to be based on a corporate plan. What I mean by that is that the cuts appear to have been made at random. The CBC has had its share, as well as other government agencies and programs. There are consequences to all of that. The Americans have an expression for this type of random cutting and the consequences that follow.

(1655)

They call it dynamic scoring. What is it exactly? Well, it has been discovered that when cuts are made in one place, there are macro-economic consequences elsewhere. It means that in trying to save money here, we force people into unemployment there, which creates, in the economic cycle, a decline whose effects we do not always take the time to measure in advance. So, do we know how many businesses who provide services to the CBC will see their sales reduced because of these budget cuts that will force the CBC to buy fewer services from them?

Do we know how many people will be laid off? Do we know how many of these people will be unable to find a new job in their area of expertise or in another area? Do we know by how much welfare costs will increase in each of the provinces? We have to realize that what happens with all these cuts—and the cuts to the CBC are no exception—is that the federal government is saving some money but is forcing the provinces to spend more on welfare. Not only have we shifted the problem, but we may well have made it worse.

No macro-economic study supports the effects of what the Americans call dynamic scoring. We are making cuts at random, we do not have specific targets, we do not know where that will lead us and I think it is something that Canadians have a right to

Supply

know. I would like my colleague to comment on my perception of the way we are not being governed.

Mr. Pomerleau: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to tell my hon. colleague that this is the first time I hear the phrase "dynamic scoring". If I understand well, this is a little like skeet shooting, or shooting on the fly, at random, haphazardly. I think there is at least one conclusion that can be made in this House for the information of everybody here: a government cannot be run like a business. We often hear business people telling us that the government should be run like a business.

Unfortunately, that is not possible, strictly speaking. While a company can lay people off and get rid of a problem because it has too many employees, the government, acting on behalf of a nation, can never do that without getting stuck with the problem. In other words, the government will have the people laid off on its hands in one way or the other, whether through unemployment insurance or social welfare; and, in the absence of major social measures, there will be increased violence and more social problems, people will go without medication or have incredible problems.

Therefore, the government can never be totally run like a business, and I think dynamic scoring works even less for a government than for a business. Indeed I think budgets are made and cuts are made here and there—anyway it has been indicated in a document here—somewhat equally across the board, whereas we should have very specific cuts, as if made with a surgeon's blade.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The hon. member for Ontario, Multiple Sclerosis; the hon. member for Québec, the Advisory Council on the Status of Women; the hon. member for Charlesbourg, National Defence; the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Land Claim.

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in this debate. While I agree with much of what the motion before us states, I must also hasten to add that I agree with the amendment introduced by the Reform Party that would strike out the words after the phrase "for the next three years".

(1700)

I must chide the Bloc members. As the official opposition they must also concern themselves with the whole country. The government has done a disservice to the CBC not just in Quebec but to the CBC and public broadcasting across this country. Therefore, I hope the amendment introduced by the Reform Party will be accepted by the House so we can vote in favour of the whole opposition motion.

Supply

The need for public broadcasting like that of the CBC is greater today than ever before. Both government members and Bloc members have mentioned this. Reform Party members have basically spoken against the CBC suggesting that it should be privatized and sold. I find them to be a bit sinister or really naive.

Historically, every political party in Canada, whether from the left or the right have agreed there is a need for the state to intervene and to play an activist role in order to maintain a sense of national identity and a sense of cultural identity. The reality of a small, populated country like Canada living next to a very large, dynamic country like the United States means that if we are going to maintain a sense of who we are, we are going to have to do something in a collective way.

As I have mentioned before, all the political parties, whether it was the Conservative Party, the Liberal Party, the New Democratic Party or the old Social Credit Party, whether they were parties to the left or the right, have agreed on this basic premise, except of course for the Reform Party. That is why I wonder whether the Reform Party really understands the national interest in this sense or whether it is naivety or sinister intent.

If we did not have institutions such as the CBC, if we did not have a more interventionist government policy when it came to cultural issues, imagine what Canada would be like. Imagine what Canada would be like if we did not have the CBC. We would be totally Americanized. We would not have the jobs. We would not have the ability of Canadians to hear and see each other.

It is in the national interest to maintain a strong Canadian cultural policy and a cultural identity so that we as citizens can hear and see each other. To let the market decide in the way the Reform Party advocates is doing a disservice to the country because we will not be able to hear and see each other.

Market forces will operate and market forces are such that it is cheaper to have an American program on television during prime time than it is to have a Canadian program. The economics are such that it does not make any sense in terms of profit to have and produce Canadian programs. I would think that Reform members would understand that.

Let us turn to the record of this government. It has not been a good one when it comes to cultural matters. It started off with Ginn publishing. It has the inability or lack of desire to stand up for Canadian publishing companies to ensure they remain in the hands of Canadians so that Canadian writers will have their works published.

Then we come to the budget. The minister of heritage had given public assurance to the CBC that its funding would not be cut, that it would have stable funding for the next three years. Despite that fact, lo and behold on budget night we realized, it realized and the country realized the dimension of the cuts.

It is now obvious from the budget that the CBC cannot carry out its legislated mandate. The government and the minister particularly have done a disservice by giving a false sense of security to public broadcasting and the CBC by stating that its funding would be assured for the next three years. It gave public broadcasting in this country that assurance. It was a false assurance and the government and the minister have done a disservice.

(1705)

Instead of the government thinking through what type of new public broadcasting should be initiated before it announces cuts, it instead has done the whole thing backward. It has announced cuts and who knows, maybe more will be coming. Rumour has it that we might see a budget this coming fall with more cuts.

Rather than having a vision as to what a new form of public broadcasting should mean in Canada and how we can get the resources together to fulfil that, the government starts from the opposite direction. It decides how much it is going to cut and then lets the pieces fall where and how they may. That is not careful planning. It is not smart management. It is mismanagement. It is running the terrible danger of public broadcasting destroying itself in this country.

The reform and changes government members talk about occurring out of blind cuts and slashes rather than something that is being done in an intelligent manner are now occurring within the CBC. The debate within the CBC now is whether it can adjust to the cuts other than just by cutting and cutting or by starting first to rethink what public broadcasting can and should be and then working from the ground up.

In other words, the government is starting in the wrong direction and in the wrong way. Rather than rethinking things through and starting from the bottom and working up, it is jumping in with cuts and cuts. It is not thinking through what those cuts will mean and how they will be implemented. There is no blueprint, no vision about what public broadcasting should be.

I do not have much time in this debate but I would like to put on record some of my suggestions and my vision of what public broadcasting should be.

It should start from the ground up. The regions and regional broadcasting should be the heart and core of public broadcasting. I would be furious if all the cuts were done at the regional

level and the head office was not touched at all. I am critical of past CBC cuts for not attacking the head office and instead attacking the regions as was done in the 1980s.

I think we all agree and I think the people within the CBC also agree that the head office remains bloated. It does not need the hundreds and hundreds of people in the financial section. I believe there are 200 people dealing with the relationship of the CBC, the CRTC and the government. It can be much meaner and leaner on that level.

The CBC has to be based on the regions, the alliances and the networking in which producers, creators and reporters can work at the regional and local community level. The national system should be an alliance, a bringing together of the different regions forming a national system.

The internal relations between management and employees have to change. They are changing. It is already happening. It has to be accelerated. Sitting in on the committee, I heard some very positive things of what the CBC is doing.

For example in Windsor, a station that was shut down, the CBC and the employees got together and said: "Okay, let us reopen this". It is operated in an entirely different way. Producers, technicians, reporters and performers are all working together in a non-adversarial, non-hierarchical way. Lo and behold, even the reporter or the producer will carry the camera, or plug in the lights. There is not a strict code that differentiates the jobs that the different unions and the different technicians and people do. It is a whole different way of operating a station.

(1710)

I understand this is working well and it is exciting. It is a way the new creative juices can flow. That is exciting. As I see a reformed public broadcasting and a reformed CBC, I would like to see the winds of experiment done all across the country.

In the same vein, another point I would like to bring forward is a more syndicalist approach as a solution to the problems of the CBC. I know in the first round of cuts in the 1980s the CBC shut down the Saskatoon station. I understand that the employees in Saskatoon wanted to run the station. They tried to buy the equipment to run the CBC station in Saskatoon themselves.

This should be highly encouraged. The workers within the CBC should have the ultimate control, not some hierarchy in head office in Ottawa or Toronto. It is the local actors, the local producers, the local reporters, the local technicians working together in a co-operative way operating our television and radio stations. A more syndicalist approach is what I would advocate as a model for the CBC to seriously consider.

Supply

In closing, I must mention my disappointment with the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. I am an associate member and not a full time member on the committee. This committee has been meeting since last fall and it still has not tackled the fundamental issues. It keeps going around in circles. Part of the problem is that this government has no sense of leadership and no vision to present to the committee.

If anything, I would tend to think that the government members on that committee are more divided among themselves as to what direction public broadcasting should be going in. There is no understanding that the degree of cuts the CBC is facing will necessitate a total change in the mandates. We have not had a discussion in terms of seriously looking at the mandates. I would tend to think that much of the work the committee has done has now been made obsolete by the speech the Minister of Finance delivered on budget day. We have to go back to square one and look at what the legislated mandate of the CBC is and start from there.

The government's lack of vision and lack of direction when it comes to public broadcasting is doing a disservice to the CBC. This government is being driven by the finance department, not that we do not have a serious problem when it comes to debt and deficits. Politics in Canada will be defined in terms of how different political parties propose to deal with the debt and deficit.

This government's reaction to public broadcasting is not a wise one. It is not an intelligent one. It is not one that has been thought through. It is being driven by the finance department. In the end, it might cost Canada even more money or loss of the resources we have built up over the years in our public broadcasting system.

Hopefully, the House will accept the amendment of the Reform Party and that we will be able therefore to support the motion as presented to us by the Bloc Quebecois.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It being 5.15 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt these proceedings and put every question necessary to dispose of the supply proceedings now before the House under the provisions of Standing Order 81.

Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Supply

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Call in the members.

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

(Division No. 171)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Althouse	Benoit
Blaikie	Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Cummins	de Jong
Duncan	Epp
Forsyth	Frazer
Gilmour	Grubel
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hayes	Hermanson
Hoepfner	Jennings
Johnston	Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Penson	Ramsay
Ringma	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Silye
Solberg	Solomon
Speaker	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson
Wayne	Williams—44

NAYS

Members

Adams	Arseneault
Assad	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bergeron	Bernier (Beauce)
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bélair	Bélangier
Bélisle	Calder
Campbell	Caron
Catterall	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Cowling	Crawford
Crête	Daviault
Debien	de Savoye
Deshaies	DeVillers
Dingwall	Discepolo
Dubé	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Dupuy	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finlay
Flis	Fontana

Gagliano	Gagnon (Québec)
Galloway	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gerrard	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Jacob
Keyes	Kirkby
Knudson	Kraft Sloan
Lalonde	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Leroux (Shefford)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacDonald
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	Nault
Nunez	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Paré	Parry
Peters	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Proud	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Ringuette—Maltais	Robichaud
Robillard	Rocheleau
Rock	Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Serré
Shepherd	Sheridan
Skoke	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi	Thalheimer
Tobin	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri	Vanclief
Venne	Verran
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
Young —165	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bouchard	Brien
Canuel	Chamberlain
Chan	Culbert
Dalphoné—Guiral	Easter
Fry	Gaffney
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Jackson	Marchand
Mercier	Peric
Picard (Drummond)	Sauvageau
Simmons	Szabo
Ur	Volpe

(1745)

The Speaker: I declare the amendment negatived.

The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

I understand that the whips of the other parties will be indicating how their colleagues are voting.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members will support this motion.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, most Reform Party members will vote against this motion, except those members who would like to vote otherwise.

[*English*]

Mr. Solomon: Mr. Speaker, the New Democrats present in the House today will vote no on this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, the independent member for the riding of Beauce will vote against this motion.

[*English*]

Mrs. Wayne: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting nay.

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

(*Division No. 172*)

YEAS

Members

Bellehumeur
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Daviault
de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Jacob
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Leroux (Shefford)
Ménard
Paré
Pomerleau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne—37

Bergeron
Caron
Crête
Debien
Deshaies
Duceppe
Fillion
Gauthier (Roberval)
Guay
Lalonde
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Loubier
Nunez
Plamondon
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Rosemont)

Supply

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Arseneault
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Benoit
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bélair
Calder
Catterall
Clancy
Collenette
Comuzzi
Crawford
de Jong
Dingwall
Duhamel
Dupuy
English
Fewchuk
Flis
Forseth
Gagliano
Gerrard
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Guarnieri
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harvard
Hermanson
Hoepfner
Hubbard
Jennings
Keyes
Knutson
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peters
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Reed
Richardson
Ringuette—Maltais
Robillard
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré
Sheridan
Skoke
Solomon
Speller
Ablonczy
Althouse
Assad
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bernier (Beauce)
Bevilacqua
Blondin—Andrew
Bonin
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Brushett
Bélanger
Campbell
Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)
Cohen
Collins
Cowling
Cummins
DeVillers
Discepola
Duncan
Eggleton
Epp
Finlay
Fontana
Frazer
Galloway
Gilmour
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Grubel
Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hayes
Hickey
Hopkins
Ianno
Johnston
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Lee
Loney
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Meredith
Milliken
Minna
Morrison
Murray
O'Brien
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Penson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Ramsay
Regan
Ringma
Robichaud
Rock
Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)
Shepherd
Silye
Solberg
Speaker
St. Denis

Private Members' Business

Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
Strahl	Telegdi
Thalheimer	Thompson
Tobin	Torsney
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Walker
Wappel	Wayne
Wells	Whelan
Williams	Young —172

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bouchard	Brien
Canuel	Chamberlain
Chan	Culbert
Dalphond—Guiral	Easter
Fry	Gaffney
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Jackson	Marchand
Mercier	Peric
Picard (Drummond)	Sauvageau
Simmons	Szabo
Ur	Volpe

The Speaker: I declare the motion negatived.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

CANADA STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE ACT

The House resumed from March 16 consideration of the motion and of the amendment.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made Thursday, March 16, 1995, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions on the motion of Mr. Manning relating to Private Members' Business.

The question is on the amendment.

(1750)

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

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: The members of the Bloc Québécois will vote against the motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reformers vote against the amendment.

Mr. Solomon: Mr. Speaker, as whip of the NDP caucus, the NDP caucus members present this afternoon vote no.

Mrs. Wayne: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting yea.

Mr. Bernier (Beauce): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Arseneault: Mr. Speaker, as this is Private Members' Business, I go on record as supporting the amendment.

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

(*Division No. 173*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Arseneault
Assad	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumont
Bellemare	Bernier (Beauce)
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bélair	Bélanger
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Collins
Comuzzi	Cowling
Crawford	DeVillers
Dingwall	Discepolo
Duhamel	Dupuy
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Gagliano	Galloway
Gerrard	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Keys
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacDonald
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peters
Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Proud
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Ringuette—Maltais
Robichaud	Robillard
Rock	Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Serré
Shepherd	Sheridan
Skoke	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi	Thalheimer
Tobin	Torsney
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Walker
Wappel	Wayne
Wells	Whelan
Young —129	

Private Members' Business

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Althouse	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Blaikie	Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Bélisle	Caron
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Crête
Cummins	Daviault
Debien	de Jong
de Savoye	Deshaies
Dubé	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Epp	Fillion
Forseth	Frazer
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gilmour	Godin
Grubel	Guay
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hayes	Hermanson
Hoepfner	Jacob
Jennings	Johnston
Lalonde	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Ménard	Nunez
Paré	Penson
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Ramsay	Ringma
Rocheleau	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Silye
Solberg	Solomon
Speaker	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Venne	Williams—80

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bouchard	Brien
Canuel	Chamberlain
Chan	Culbert
Dalphond—Guiral	Easter
Fry	Gaffney
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Jackson	Marchand
Mercier	Peric
Picard (Drummond)	Sauvageau
Simmons	Szabo
Ur	Volpe

The Speaker: I declare the amendment carried.

The next question is on the main motion as amended. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried on division.

(Motion, as amended, agreed to.)

The Speaker: It being 6 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

* * *

COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY ESTABLISHMENT

The House resumed from December 13, 1994 consideration of the motion and of the amendment.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this evening we are debating a motion put forward by the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River. The motion states that the operations of the Communications Security Establishment should be reviewed by another body, notably the Security Intelligence Review Committee or SIRC.

The Communications Security Establishment or the CSE carries on two functions. It listens to other people's communications and tries to ensure that no one listens to us. It is a spy organization supposedly involved in foreign intelligence. This sounds very interesting, knowing the kinds of technology out there, which allow the spies to gather all sorts of private information.

Today it is possible to intercept any telephone call, any telex or any fax. In fact, with a fairly inexpensive piece of equipment in the back of a van it is possible to reproduce through electromagnetic radiation emissions what somebody is typing on their computer screen three blocks away. This is called electromagnetic eavesdropping.

According to a House of Commons special committee report entitled "In Flux But Not In Crisis" dated September 1990, this technology has important implications—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order. I wonder if we could ask the co-operation of the House. So we might proceed with Private Members' Business in an orderly fashion, would those members who have business outside the Chamber please take it outside the Chamber.

Mr. Penson: Mr. Speaker, thank you. For a moment I thought I was still in question period. The report that was commissioned by the House of Commons special committee entitled "In Flux But Not in Crisis" dated September 1990 said that this technology has important implications with respect to individual rights and freedoms.

The report states that it is likely that CSIS uses this technology in its operations. The CSE is capable of employing it as well and that it shares information with CSIS. The report questions whether these intrusive techniques are used against Canadians and landed immigrants. There is even some question whether electromagnetic eavesdropping technology constitutes an offence under the current provisions of the Criminal Code. People

Private Members' Business

using this technology can go undetected because there is no need to break and enter or trespass other people's property in order to use it.

The report goes on to state that the committee believes the CSE should get a judicial warrant before using electromagnetic eavesdropping. Does the CSE do this before beginning its investigations of foreign governments, foreign companies or foreign individuals? Who knows?

There are a lot of things we do not know about this taxpayer-funded operation. We do not know how much it spends because its budget is buried somewhere in the Department of National Defence expenditures. We do not know how many people work there because those numbers are not published. We do not know whether the CSE is doing what it is supposed to do because it has no mandate. All we have are educated guesses.

In a background paper entitled "The Communications Security Establishment: Canada's Most Secret Intelligence Agency" dated September 1993, a parliamentary researcher concludes that in 1991 the CSE's budget was in the \$100 million to \$125 million a year range. This figure did not include an additional \$150 million in personnel and other support provided by Canadian forces.

The same background paper places the number of employees at 875 in June 1993 although that does not include the 1,100 persons assigned from Canadian forces to operate in various monitoring stations in Canada, Bermuda and Germany.

The cold war is over. We may be involved in some minor external skirmishes over fish and some major internal battles over who stays in Canada and who does not and what stays in the federal budget and what does not. The rationale for keeping the Canadian public in the dark about this secret agency no longer exists, if it ever did in the first place.

The bigger danger is that this agency gets involved in something that it has no business in, like spying on Canadians, or that it does something illegal.

Right now the CSE is accountable to no one. It is true that the Minister of National Defence approves the major capital expenditures of CSE and its annual multiyear operational plan and its major initiatives that have significant policy or legal implication, but the CSE reports to the deputy clerk of security intelligence in the Privy Council on policy and operational management. The right hand cannot be held responsible for what the left hand is doing and vice versa.

No government agency should escape review. Every government agency should be accountable to someone or some body that is accountable to the Canadian public. Canadians have a right to know whether the CSE actually spent \$125 million or even \$275 million in 1991. Right now we do not know that.

Furthermore, they have the right to know how much was spent last year and what the budget will be for next year.

The CSE has 875 listeners on its payroll who are intercepting communications of foreign government, foreign companies and foreign individuals. Someone should be watching and listening to the listeners.

My colleagues and I will support the motion made by this member on Private Members' Business and any amendments that will make this body more accountable to the Canadian public. My understanding is there are two amendments to this motion. The first is by the member for Bellechasse which asks the CSE to table an annual report in the House on its activities.

The second is by the member who proposed this motion in the first place. The second amendment changes the motion so that an independent body rather than SIRC reviews the Communications Security Establishment. This amendment serves to further strengthen the motion. I commend the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River for putting forward this motion and I hope he gets the support from all of his colleagues in the House.

Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak on this subject.

I am aware that my colleague is going to prepare an amendment to the motion, which I am very pleased to see. Without actually mentioning the amendment I believe he will pose it by a point of order perhaps after I finish speaking.

I want to make three definitions. I will be using them quite frequently. CSE is the Communications Security Establishment. CSIS is the Canadian Security Intelligence Service. SIRC is the Security and Intelligence Review Committee.

I am very pleased about the amended wording. It puts the intent of what the hon. member wants to do in better perspective. It is important at this stage because it is really essential to the understanding of why the amendment to the motion was put forward.

I want to define foreign intelligence. Foreign intelligence refers to information or activities concerning the capabilities, intentions or activities of foreign states, corporations or persons in relation to the defence of Canada or the conduct of international affairs of Canada.

(1805)

It may include information of a political, economic, military, security or scientific nature. Canada, unlike most of our allies, does not have an offensive foreign intelligence service.

However, like most countries Canada has established modest means to collect and analyze foreign intelligence. Since World War II the main departments of the Government of Canada that have been major actors in the foreign intelligence sectors have

been the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade and the Department of National Defence.

The Canadian Security Intelligence Service was established in 1984 under the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act. It has a specific mandate as our domestic intelligence agency. It is charged with protecting Canada's security and is to provide security intelligence respecting potential or actual threats to Canada or to Canadian citizens.

There are two principle threats to national security that CSIS was established to investigate under the authority of the CSIS act. These threats are espionage directed against Canada by foreign states and seriously politically motivated violence that can take the form of terrorism.

The CSIS act establishes a strict regime for CSIS investigations to ensure that the rights and freedoms of Canadians are preserved while protecting Canadians from these threats to their safety and security. It is evident there will be problems with the Security Intelligence Review Committee's looking at the Communications Security Establishment.

The Security Intelligence Review Committee was established specifically to review the Canadian Security Intelligence Service which, unlike the CSE, does not have a direct role in the foreign intelligence sector.

The CSIS act spells out exactly what SIRC is meant to do. The CSE mandate under its SIGINT program is the collection, analysis and reporting of foreign intelligence in the context of the government's foreign intelligence policy.

Therefore it would not be appropriate at this time to amend the CSIS act which falls under the responsibility of the Solicitor General to incorporate within SIRC's mandate an institution like CSE which after all falls under the responsibility of the Minister of National Defence, whose accountability is established through other means.

Moreover, SIRC already has a variety of investigative duties. It deals with complaints and acts as an appeal board with respect to security assessments and security influenced decisions under the Citizenship and Immigration Act.

The sensitive intelligence responsibility of both organizations needs separate and distinct oversight mechanisms. CSIS therefore is Canada's domestic intelligence agency, with SIRC which has a mandate and the expertise to oversee such activities.

CSE is a foreign intelligence organization and the skills and knowledge base required to review foreign intelligence activity is totally different.

CSE has two programs. First, it provides technical advice, guidance and service on the means of federal government telecommunications security, including aspects of electronic

Private Members' Business

data processing. The elements of this program are referred to in the business as INFOSEC, information security.

The other aspect is signal intelligence, SIGINT as it is known in the business. There has been concern raised in some quarters that CSE operates without adequate accountability. It may be useful to outline in more detail what I understand to be the accountability stature of CSE in place right now.

The Minister of National Defence is accountable to Parliament for CSE. The minister approves CSE's capital expenditure, its annual multiyear operational program and, with appropriate deputy minister level consultations, approves major CSE initiatives with significant policy or legal implications.

The chief of CSE is responsible to the deputy minister of national defence for financial and administrative arrangements and to the deputy clerk, security and intelligence and counsel in the Privy Council Office for policy and operational matters. Both of these deputy ministers report directly to the Minister of National Defence for these CSE matters.

In addition, arrangements have been put in place that CSE responds to the government's foreign intelligence requirements in a manner that is lawful, effective and sensitive to changes in international relations. That is very important and it includes the following provisions.

It has an in house legal counsel from the Department of Justice and consults with senior justice officials on legal issues. It submits strategic plans and all new policy proposals for review by the interdepartmental committee on security and intelligence. It is subject to Department of National Defence administrative review mechanisms.

(1810)

CSE operates within all Canadian laws, including the Criminal Code, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Canadian Human Rights Act. Furthermore, it is fully subject to review by the offices of the Privacy Commissioner, the Official Languages Commissioner, the Auditor General and the Canadian Human Rights Commission. A broad accountability system for CSE is thus in place.

The special committee on the CSIS act, while recommending that SIRC oversee CSE, also stated it had found no evidence of abuses by CSE. Obviously the government would consider appropriate means to strengthen oversight for the CSE if a clear need were demonstrated.

CSE is an integral part of the foreign intelligence sector I have described and plays a crucial role in that sector. What it does not do, as the Minister of National Defence and the Prime Minister have already assured the House, is target Canadians. We must take care that whatever course of action we decide does not

Private Members' Business

weaken CSE's ability to support our national interest. That is the decision which faces us now.

We want to create an efficient, economical and appropriate form of oversight for this agency, one that enhances current accountability mechanisms without impeding the intended and mandated function of CSE or SIRC.

The proposed amendment by my colleague will lead us in the right direction. I look forward to the support of my colleagues in the House which I hope and believe is forthcoming.

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in relation to this motion there has been significant consultation back and forth across the House. I think you would find the consent of the House to make the following amendments.

I believe we will have the consent of the hon. member for Bellechasse for the withdrawal of his existing amendment proposed in connection with this motion; second, that the motion be restated to clarify intent and to incorporate the intent of the amendment made by the hon. member for Bellechasse.

Therefore, the amendment would read as follows. I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all of the words after the word "should" and by substituting the following:

Establish an independent external mechanism to review the operations of the Communications Security Establishment, CSE, similar to the role played by the Security Intelligence Review Committee for the Canadian Security Intelligence Service and table a report annually in the House.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): First of all, I would like to know whether the hon. member for Bellechasse wishes to speak on his amendment. Does he withdraw the amendment?

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I agree to the withdrawal of my amendment the way the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River described it.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Amendment withdrawn.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as someone said earlier, the member for Bellechasse withdraws his amendment and subscribes to the amendment presented by the

member for Scarborough—Rouge River, which we, members of the Bloc, intend to support, as I have already said.

(1815)

Listening to the speech made earlier by the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of National Defence, I asked myself a few questions on the meaning of what the member said about the CSE being accountable to the Department of National Defence at the administrative level and to the clerk with respect to its role and its latitude, so to speak. I find it a bit strange that we count on the Department of Defence to monitor the administration of the CSE.

I made the effort to do some research in the Defence budget and I will give you a few examples which are very obvious when we find out that it was the Department of Defence which monitored the CSE.

I noted a case concerning the acquisition of a Secure Telephone System—Phase 1 for which the estimate was established at \$8,824,000. When the acquisition was made, the cost rose to \$14,151,000, 61 per cent higher. It was the role of the Department of Defence to monitor the CSE's administrative costs.

Here is another example. From April 1 to March 31, 1993, money was invested in a Restricted Access System for which the estimate was initially established at \$23 million. When the acquisition was made, the system's cost shot up to \$51 million, 117 per cent over budget. And it was still under the administrative responsibility of the Department of Defence.

One more example. On March 31, 1994, work was finished on an integrated teleinformatics network, approximately 75 per cent of which was for the use of the CSE. The projected cost was \$41,650,000, but it ended up costing the modest sum of \$78 million. That was also a project under the administrative control of the National Defence.

I have many more similar examples of purchases of highly sophisticated electronic surveillance or telephone equipment, software, etc. Like many other stakeholders in this issue, we have determined that the CSE was to serve the Department of Foreign Affairs, the RCMP and also the Department of National Defence, that its main function was to collect information from communications outside Canada, but that it was not ever supposed to collect information from communications happening within Canada. However, the official opposition signalled several cases where it had done so and the Prime Minister denied it at first. Afterwards, he said that orders had been given so that it would never happen again and that was corroborated by the Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence.

The Minister of Defence also said that the CSE was under his trusteeship, and that of his deputy minister, and that no other form of control was necessary since we knew very well what was the role of the CSE, the Communications Security Establishment, and that in no way, shape or form could there ever be some

Private Members' Business

eavesdropping into communications between Canadians or within the boundaries of Canada. And now, a Liberal member presents a motion for the review of the CSE operations and the Bloc Québécois and the Reform Party support it. I support this motion wholeheartedly and I will even add that, in my opinion, this motion is a very positive statement that should lead to the monitoring of the CSE operations. That is very important.

I would also like to add that this is only a motion.

(1820)

Will we take the discussion further and really pass legislation to monitor the actions of the Communications Security Establishment? As I was illustrating with some examples, on the administrative level, I am not sure that the monitoring by the Department of Defence is adequate.

I have quoted four or five examples where spending of millions of dollars had almost doubled on three occasions, and more than doubled on a fourth one. When this motion is unanimously passed in the House, it will be important to follow it up and to pass legislation which will allow for the management of the administrative aspect as well as the specific role of the CSE. We will then be able to monitor its interference in Canadian communications in order to insure that it does not intrude in the private lives of citizens, parliamentarians, business executives or other prominent people who may be asked to make decisions and whom the CSE could follow closely and sometimes monitor or report on, providing information which, under our Canadian system, is not acceptable.

In conclusion, I would like to say that we support this motion. However, I would like to indicate that, unfortunately, we will have to return, in this motion, and probably in this bill, to the administrative deficiencies within the Department of Defence which the Auditor General has raised on several occasions.

When we see in the budget of the defense department that the costs allocated to the CST may vary between \$200 and \$255 million because Defense budgets contain some sophisticated material which will be used by the CST and for the communications of the defense department, I believe that a separation of some sort between these two elements should be integrated in the bill which will follow this motion. This will allow for a better control of the CST spending which, I believe, is sort of lost and not well administered by the Department of Defense since in the maze of acquisition of certain material too modern or ultramodern, it is impossible to say if the material is used at 100 per cent by the CST or at 20 per cent by the Department of Defense for the Navy or the Air Force.

I have read the last five year budgets and I had some difficulty understanding in each case what was linked to the CST. I believe

that situation should be clarified in order to avoid that a budget be assessed at \$200 or \$250 million and be confronted, after an evaluation for the acquisition of material, to increases of more than 112 to 117 per cent at the time this material is acquired.

[English]

Ms. Shaughnessy Cohen (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today on Canada's national security system and on the unique role played in that system by review agencies.

The amended motion before us calls for the establishment of an independent external mechanism to review the operations of the Communications Security Establishment or CSE.

I agree with the motion. It is my view that Canadians would be well served and would feel safer and more comfortable if they knew that this component of our national security system was overseen by both a cabinet minister and by an independent oversight committee.

Experience gained over the last decade with the Security Intelligence Review Committee which oversees the Canadian Security Intelligence Service may hold important lessons for the future.

The Security Intelligence Review Committee or SIRC was designed as a unique body to provide review for one particular agency, CSIS, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service. It provides an appeal mechanism as well for matters involving security clearances that are from time to time required under certain statutes.

SIRC was to fulfil its responsibilities within the framework of a national security system that is wider than SIRC and wider than CSIS and includes the Communications Security Establishment.

(1825)

If the motion before us is to be successfully implemented, care must be taken to ensure that any new review body would have an appropriate role with respect to CSE. It must contribute as well in a positive way to what I would suggest is a delicate balance between the national interest and individual human rights, the hallmark of Canada's national security system.

In 1984 the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act and the Security Offences Act were established. In these statutes a new legislative framework was created to govern Canada's national security system. The new legislation was designed to create the balance I talked about, a balanced and accountable system for the protection of Canada's national security interests and for the preservation of the democratic way of life of its people.

Private Members' Business

Balance must be a distinguishing feature of any new legislation involving CSE, just as it is a distinguishing feature of the CSIS–SIRC legislation. I should like to categorize some balances that we need to maintain.

First, we need to protect national security that has to be balanced by respect for individual rights and freedoms.

Second, we need to provide the service with sufficient powers to produce effective security intelligence which we should then balance by statutory controls and strong policy direction.

Third, as with CSIS there is a need to employ certain intrusive techniques. These should be balanced by the requirement for a prior authorization by a minister of the crown and the Federal Court, or at the very least that is what we do under the CSIS act.

Finally the need for secrecy must be balanced by ministerial accountability and informed independent review. The principles of ministerial control and accountability are central to Canadian parliamentary democracy. The CSIS act ensured that the Solicitor General would have full knowledge and power of direction over policy. The act also equipped the minister with the means to direct and guide the service.

There is also independent review through SIRC. Responsibility for the independent external review function was given to the Security Intelligence Review Committee that reports to Parliament through the Solicitor General. The unique role of SIRC is an innovative and important component of our national security system in the CSIS act. SIRC's review role is a cornerstone of the accountability framework established by the CSIS act and an important element of our national security system. SIRC has a mandate to review the propriety of CSIS activities with emphasis on the delicate balance between national security and individual freedom.

Given SIRC's importance as presently constituted, it is my view that it would be inappropriate to expand its mandate to encompass review of CSE. Such a change would have the effect of either diffusing SIRC's functions with respect to CSIS or of diminishing ministerial accountability.

I am certain hon. members would not wish to see SIRC's effectiveness diminished by such outcomes. To expand SIRC's mandate to review CSE would almost certainly mean increasing significantly the present number of SIRC members. This would require adding to SIRC's staff that has acquired an enviable expertise in the domain of security intelligence on a domestic basis. The skills and the knowledge base required to review foreign intelligence activity are totally different from that needed to review a domestic security service like CSIS.

We need to examine closely the significant implications of what is being proposed in the motion before us. We are not

without guidance. The experience we have acquired over the past decade with the existing national security system can stand us in good stead by looking at CSIS and by looking at the roles that the minister and SIRC play in relation to CSIS. I would suggest that we look closely at those lessons and apply them to the motion before us today.

The proven effectiveness of the national security system designed more than a decade ago is an excellent foundation upon which we can build. As we consider the motion our intention should be to continue the good work that has gone before, to build on that experience, and to create satisfaction within the community and within our country that the Communications Security Establishment is also accountable.

(1830)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River has given indication that he would like to have the final response under right of reply. The House must understand that no one will be able to speak to this motion after he speaks. He will close the debate because I must put the question at no later than 6.34 p.m.

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is our hope that the motion we will pass here today will prove to be a benchmark in terms of parliamentary accountability.

Under the rubric that nobody in this Parliament does anything by themselves, I want to note a number of members who played a part in developing this matter to the present. Among them are colleagues of ours on the national security subcommittee: the member for Bellechasse, from the Bloc Québécois; from the Reform Party, the hon. member for Surrey—White Rock—South Langley; on the Liberal side, the member for Scarborough West, the member for Windsor—St. Clair and the member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine.

I also acknowledge the co-operation and participation of the Minister of National Defence and his parliamentary secretary, the member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception. There is also the fact that the Prime Minister was not disinterested in this issue and I acknowledge his role.

I acknowledge members of the last Parliament, the national security subcommittee and in particular its chair, Mr. Blaine Thacker of Lethbridge, and various other parties, journalists both print and electronic, and other soldiers on the issue. They have worked hard to bring us to the present. Hopefully they will continue to work in this area. I thank my colleagues in the House for their support today.

(Motion as amended agreed to.)

*Adjournment Debate***ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS***[English]*

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

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

Mr. Dan McTeague (Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in my recent question to the Minister of Health, I indicated that many Canadians suffer from multiple sclerosis. In fact, 50,000 Canadians have MS. However, through medical research a number of drugs have recently been developed which have proven to be effective in the treatment of multiple sclerosis.

One of these drugs is betaseron. In the United States this drug has been used to treat certain forms of MS for well over one year. Here in Canada there are over 15,000 Canadians with MS who could benefit from betaseron.

Unfortunately, access to betaseron in Canada has been impeded because the health protection branch of Health Canada has yet to conclude its review of the drug. Betaseron is currently only available from the federal government's emergency drug release program at a cost of \$17,000 or more for a year's supply.

In the province of Ontario, the provincial government recently announced that it will soon be expanding its drug funding program to help those who require expensive medication. However, while those who require betaseron would then qualify for assistance, the drug itself will not be eligible until the review has been completed.

I realize the health protection branch has specific guidelines to follow when any new drug is submitted for its approval to be distributed in Canada. Moreover, I am not suggesting that the integrity of the review process be compromised in any way, shape or form.

The reviews undertaken by the health protection branch of any new drug are vital to ensuring the safety of Canadians. Nonetheless, Canadians who suffer from MS are understandably anxious to obtain greater access to affordable betaseron. They are also frustrated by the slowness of the review, especially since the health protection branch has agreed to use the so-called fast track approach.

Berlex Canada Inc., the company which applied for the betaseron review did so back in February 1994. Yet over a year later, the review is still ongoing.

(1835)

It was my hope from the question I asked the Minister of Health that she could provide additional information on the progress of the review of this drug. Given the important role this review plays in bringing about greater access to affordable betaseron, I know the minister would agree that the sooner this

review is completed the better it will be for those Canadians who suffer from MS.

Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to my hon. colleague, the timely approval of a new drug treatment is a concern we all share. In this context I wish to emphasize that the drug he talks about, betaseron, has not yet been approved for the Canadian market.

The drugs director of Health Canada is currently reviewing this drug on a priority or fast track basis. The manufacturer did not submit betaseron for approval in Canada at the same time as it did in the United States where the drug has already been approved. However under special circumstances, the Department of Health authorizes the sale of drugs that are currently marketed in other countries but have not yet received a notice of compliance in Canada.

When a medical emergency exists and standard therapy is ineffective in treating the condition, some drugs, including betaseron, can be made available through the Health Canada emergency drug release program.

While safety is the primary concern for Health Canada, the Patented Medicine Prices Review Board is responsible for regulating the prices of patented drugs. The board's jurisdiction applies not only to patented drugs sold under a notice of compliance, but also to those drugs sold under the emergency drug release program.

Betaseron is a patented medicine. Therefore, the price of this product is being reviewed by the board.

In conclusion and in response to my hon. colleague, I wish to assure him that Health Canada's drug approval process is aimed at ensuring that safe and effective medicines are made available to all Canadians in the most efficient and quick manner possible. Every effort has been made to expedite the review of betaseron without jeopardizing the health and safety of Canadians suffering from multiple sclerosis.

[Translation]

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on March 16, I asked the Deputy Prime Minister how she could justify abolishing the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women. My amazement and that of many women's groups at the government's decision was caused by the fact that this agency is known for its excellent research in areas of concern to women.

As you know, the CACSW also analyzed the impact of policies and legislation on the status of women. Furthermore, it had acquired an excellent reputation as an independent agency that, although it was largely dependent on public funding, managed to maintain an arm's length relationship to government.

Adjournment Debate

In reply, the Deputy Prime Minister mentioned the following to justify her government's decision, and I quote: "Women's councils across the country were telling us that they were in a better position to do political analyses than people appointed by order in council". This reply was surprising on two counts. First, I will deal with the so-called preference expressed by women's groups for doing their own political analyses.

I urge the Deputy Prime Minister to reveal the names of these groups to the House. My request is perfectly reasonable, since all the reactions we have heard so far would indicate that the opposite is true. Whether we are talking about the Fédération des femmes du Québec and its affiliates or the groupe relais-femmes of the Association des collaboratrices et partenaires d'affaires, whether we are talking about the biggest national women's organization in Canada, the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, better known as NAC, the AFEAS, the University of Ottawa and Carleton University, grouped under the aegis of the joint department of women's studies, and finally, about certain editorial writers, they all regret the decision made by the Secretary of State for the Status of Women and her government.

So where are the groups that supported the government when it announced this decision? Women's groups and the official opposition would be very interested to know who these groups are.

They also want to know where the funding needed to resume research will come from. The government may have claimed that it decided to merge three agencies in order to save one million dollars, but when we realize that the budgets of existing organizations will not be increased in any way, we have every right to ask where the money needed for research will come from and where it will go.

(1840)

In concluding, I must mention the other reason given by the Deputy Prime Minister in answer to my question. She said it was important to let research be done by people who were not appointed by order in council.

We were absolutely flabbergasted. The question automatically comes to mind whether the present government intends to get rid of all organizations and councils whose board members are appointed by order in council.

There will be a revolution. One also wonders how open-minded her department will be when research findings fail to reflect what this government wants in terms of progress on issues concerning the status of women.

Ms. Mary Clancy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the amalgamation of the Advisory Council on the Status of Women and Status of Women Canada took place as the result of a program review undertaken by the government. Aimed at streamlining government operations, eliminating overlap and rationalizing re-

sources, the program review looked at the three principal government agencies concerned with women's equality: Status of Women Canada, the equal opportunities for women program of Human Resources Development Canada and the Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

We considered that an amalgamation of the three would, for the government, provide the best opportunity to concentrate and reinforce its ability to promote women's equality. Furthermore, by creating a single window, this amalgamation would improve communications and interaction between government, women and their associations. The rapports enjoyed by the equal opportunities for women program at the local level with women's associations will permit a direct link between the people and the policy development process.

Transfer of the communications and research functions of the advisory council to Status of Women Canada will reinforce these bilateral exchanges. It will also eliminate the expense of a number of order in council appointments.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on March 14, I asked the Minister of National Defence about the dwindling enrolment in the Saint-Jean Royal Military College. His reply, which surprised me, was extraordinary because of its contradictory nature.

In fact, in the first part of his reply, the minister says that the state of the economy is causing enrolment to decline. A far-fetched argument which does not jive with reality or with the history of Canada's three officer cadet colleges, because during an economic crisis the proportion of enrolment requests for officer colleges compared with the number of requests to become a soldier changes. As usual, the minister is trying to compare apples to oranges.

In the second part of his reply, the minister really went too far by blaming the weak enrolment on the official opposition and the Government of Quebec.

I think it is time to render unto Caesar what is Caesar's. I will explain. On February 22, 1994, the Minister of National Defence announced that the Saint-Jean Royal Military College and the Royal Roads of Victoria would be closed under the pretext of savings, although, of all three colleges of the kind, the Saint-Jean Royal Military College was the least expensive to run.

The day after, on February 23, the minister shed crocodile tears over the closure of Royal Roads and the Saint-Jean Royal Military College and said that it was necessary to close them for the good management of national defence. If this really were the case, neither the Government of Quebec, which was Liberal then, nor the official opposition could have had any influence whatsoever on this decision. The decision to close the Saint-Jean Royal Military College was and still is entirely in the hands of the Minister of National Defence. He should stop playing

Adjournment Debate

childish political games and assume full responsibility for the decision he and his government have made.

The defence minister and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs are really laying it on thick when they try to blame the Quebec government and the Bloc Québécois. Many English-speaking officers have already pointed out that it was a bad decision. Those who make a bad decision and are not mature enough to accept responsibility for it blame others, as the minister is doing.

(1845)

Furthermore, the minister contradicts himself in his March 14 responses. In his first answer, he says that recruitment is down because the economy is buoyant, adding that “the normal group of people who would be attracted to the armed forces has found other options”. In his second answer, he says that “because of the uncertainty surrounding the disposition of the site of the former college at St-Jean, the advertising—was delayed a number of weeks—[but] recruitment is picking up”.

The buoyant economy given as one of the reasons for declining enrolment in his first answer does not appear in his second answer. This buoyant economy must have been very fragile since it only lasted two minutes. For example, the Minister of National Defence also says, at the end of his second answer, and I quote: “Twenty seven per cent of members of the armed forces are francophone and fully 24 per cent of all senior officers are francophone”. A senior officer is not a corporal or a sergeant, but a colonel, a lieutenant-colonel, a brigadier-general, a major-general, a lieutenant-general or a general.

Only 14.7 per cent of generals and 21 per cent of colonels are French-speaking. I wonder where the minister's figure of 24 per cent comes from, unless he is referring to non-commissioned officers. This shows once again that the minister says what he pleases, without bothering to check the facts.

In conclusion, the minister is inviting me to visit the department and the Headquarters here in Ottawa, and see for myself that people work in French as well as in English. I ask the minister to stop making fun of French-speaking Canadians by uttering such nonsense. I did visit the department on several occasions and what he says is not true, nor is it true as regards the Kingston College, which is not bilingual and which will not become so.

Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to stress that Canadian Forces have always recruited French-speaking personnel and that they continue to do so. Our latest statistics show that about 27 per cent of members of the Canadian Forces are French speaking compared to 15.8 per cent in 1966. This is a substantial improvement. Also, about 24 per cent of commissioned officers are French speaking.

As the Minister of National Defence was saying in this House a few days ago, recruitment for the training program of regular armed forces officers is lower everywhere in Canada and not just in Quebec. In the case of Quebec, the uncertainty surrounding the closure of the Royal Military College in Saint-Jean, uncertainty created by the refusal of the Government of Quebec to accept the umbrella agreement of July 19, 1994, has certainly played a role in the fact that we did not meet our recruitment objectives.

The new institution, which will be born when this agreement between the federal government and the Saint-Jean region is signed, will offer preparatory courses to about 100 officer cadets, French speaking and English speaking. In order to meet its objectives regarding the proportion of French speaking officers, the Department of National Defence has extended the recruitment period for the training program until the end of April. We believe that it is still possible to attract the required number of recruits and that we will meet our objectives.

I would like to stress that the recruitment campaign is not over yet and that it is still too early to draw final conclusions. I would also like to say that future French-speaking officer cadets will receive a very high level of education, in the language of their choice, at the Canadian Military College in Kingston.

[English]

LAND CLAIM

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an issue which was brought to my attention the morning of March 17. It was reported that the Six Nation Indian Band has recently filed a lawsuit against the province of Ontario and the federal government. The suit reportedly seeks compensation for lost land, money from land sales, revenue from mineral rights, money taken from trust accounts and compound interest on these amounts dating back to 1784.

(1850)

A chief councillor of the band estimated the total lawsuit claim at about \$400 billion. Let us put this legal suit in perspective. \$400 billion is about 80—some per cent of the total current federal debt. The Six Nation Band is also seeking an inquiry and demands detailed accounting for all transactions involving assets, funds and real estate since 1784 to present.

During question period on Friday, March 17 I asked the government for clarification on this issue with the specific intent of discovering whether the federal government was going to finance the Six Nation reserve lawsuit.

I was told on Friday that my question would be taken under advisement and a response would be coming from the appropriate minister. I have made inquiries at the office of the minister of Indian affairs and I have been assured that a response would be available yesterday or at the latest today.

Adjournment Debate

To this moment, I have yet to receive a response. This is a very serious court challenge and I am astonished that the government, considering \$400 billion estimate, was unable to respond to my question on Friday. I am shocked by the fact that I have yet to receive a response from the minister's department as I was promised. However I suppose this is typical of how the government and many provincial governments have been dealing with native issues. They prefer the response of simply no response.

Questions are left unanswered. Public debate is quashed. Negotiations are held in private and the taxpayer is left to pick up the bill. The taxpayers of Canada are seeking accountability. They want to know what these land claims will cost. They want assurance that the programs of Indian affairs will be reformed and altered to make them more effective.

They want to know how the government can proceed with a self-government and land claims settlement agenda without first giving a clear indication of how much these land claims will cost, how much land is involved and clearly defining the term inherent right to self-government.

These questions have been asked in the House and are yet unanswered. It is time for this Liberal government to come out of hiding and reveal to the Canadian people its actual agenda in respect of native land claims and self-government. Canadians deserve no less.

In conclusion, the Department of Indian Affairs has sacred cow status among Liberals. I point to the recent budget as evidence of this claim. I have no fear in taking up the dagger of accountability and leading this sacred cow to the altar of public scrutiny in order to determine exactly where these billions and billions of dollars in the Department of Indian Affairs go.

On behalf of the Canadian taxpayer, I will continue to press for clear and precise answers with respect to the expenditure of public money concerning native issues. Finally, I will press this case in the House, in the media, in my riding and wherever there is a concerned Canadian about how federal tax dollars are spent.

Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley on behalf of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

The hon. member has inquired whether the department has advanced funds to the Six Nations for a legal action against the province of Ontario and the federal government. Our hon. colleague from Haldimand—Norfolk has also expressed a real interest in this issue.

I would like to first of all answer the very specific question posed by the hon. member. No funds have been provided to the Six Nations by the federal government for this legal action. I would now like to provide some clarification.

The Six Nations Band served Canada with a notice of intention to commence an action against Canada and Ontario in December 1994. No statement of claim had been formally filed against Canada as of March 20, 1995, yesterday.

Based on the notice of intended action the litigation deals with alleged breaches of fiduciary duty on the part of Ontario and Canada. These alleged breaches are in relation to land transactions dating from the Haldimand land grant to the Six Nations in 1784, as the hon. member said, and extending to the present day.

The matters now in litigation have been the subject of approximately 24 specific claims which the Six Nations have been pursuing with Canada. No dollar amounts for damages are cited in the notice of intended action and no information has been provided to substantiate the estimated \$400 billion quoted by the hon. member.

The Six Nations have apparently chosen to pursue litigation rather than negotiate the outstanding specific claims. Under the specific claims policy, claims cannot be pursued in court and considered under the claims policy at the same time. The board has been informed that all Six Nations claims had to be held in abeyance and that the files would be closed.

Since 1982 Canada has funded the Six Nations Band under the native claims contribution program. The program provides research funding to bands to allow them to pursue claims under the specific claims policy. Until the filing of the notice of intended action in December 1994 there was no indication that the band did not intend to proceed under the specific claims policy to resolve its grievances.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to Standing Order 38 the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6.56 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 21, 1995

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Commission of Inquiry into the Deployment of Canadian Forces in Somalia

Mr. Collenette 10751

Canadian Human Rights Act

Mr. Rock 10751

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Milliken 10751

Maintenance of Railway Operations Act, 1995

Bill C-77. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted. 10751

Mrs. Robillard 10751

Rail Strike

Mr. Milliken 10751

Petitions

Dangerous Offenders

Mrs. Ablonczy 10752

Canadian Armed Forces

Mr. Frazer 10752

Bill C-240

Mr. Frazer 10752

Human Rights

Mr. Adams 10752

Bill C-41

Mr. Adams 10752

Discrimination

Mr. Adams 10752

Gun Control

Mr. Gilmour 10752

Justice

Mr. Gilmour 10752

Assisted Suicide

Mr. Harb 10753

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Milliken 10753

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Supply

Allotted Day—Funding of Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) 10753

Motion 10753

Mr. Adams 10756

Mr. Abbott 10757

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) 10757

Ms. Guarnieri 10757

Mr. Benoit 10759

Mr. Lebel 10760

Mr. Hanrahan 10761

Amendment 10762

Ms. Guarnieri 10762

Mr. Ringma 10762

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) 10764

Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) 10764

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) 10767

Mr. Duhamel	10767
Mrs. Lalonde	10768
Mr. Rocheleau	10770
Mr. Dupuy	10771
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	10772
Mr. Solberg	10774
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	10776
Mr. Shepherd	10777
Mr. Adams	10778
Mr. Plamondon	10780

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Racial Discrimination

Mrs. Bakopanos	10782
----------------------	-------

President of Canadian National

Mr. Lefebvre	10782
--------------------	-------

Rwanda

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	10782
---	-------

Rail Transport

Mr. Bernier (Beauce)	10783
----------------------------	-------

Racial Discrimination

Mr. Pagtakhan	10783
---------------------	-------

Learning Disabilities

Mr. O'Brien	10783
-------------------	-------

Eric Winkler

Mr. Steckle	10783
-------------------	-------

Burundi

Mrs. Debien	10784
-------------------	-------

Alberta

Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge)	10784
--------------------------------	-------

Rail Strike	
Mrs. Wayne	10784
Rail Strike	
Ms. Clancy	10784
Rail Strike	
Mrs. Brushett	10784
Rail Strike	
Mr. Collins	10785
Quebec Sovereignty	
Mr. Fillion	10785
Rail Transport	
Mr. Harper (Calgary West)	10785
Rail Strike	
Mr. Grose	10785
Rail Transport	
Mr. Discepola	10786

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Rail Transport	
Mr. Bouchard	10786
Mr. Young	10786
Mr. Bouchard	10786
Mr. Young	10786
Mr. Bouchard	10786
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	10786
Mr. Gauthier (Roberval)	10787
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	10787
Mr. Gauthier (Roberval)	10787
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	10787

The Economy

Mr. Manning	10787
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	10787
Mr. Manning	10787
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	10788
Mr. Manning	10788
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	10788

Human Rights

Mr. Ménard	10788
Mr. Rock	10788
Mr. Ménard	10788
Mr. Rock	10788

Labour

Mr. Johnston	10789
Mrs. Robillard	10789
Mr. Johnston	10789
Mrs. Robillard	10789

Ethics

Mr. Duceppe	10789
Mr. Dupuy	10789
Mr. Duceppe	10789
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	10789

Government Appointments

Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	10789
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	10789
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	10789
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	10789

Air Canada

Mr. Guimond	10790
Mr. Young	10790
Mr. Guimond	10790
Mr. Young	10790

Rail Transport

Mr. Paradis	10790
Mrs. Robillard	10790

Ethics

Mr. Epp	10790
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	10790
Mr. Epp	10790
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	10791

U.S. Television Channels

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	10791
Mr. Dupuy	10791
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	10791
Mr. Dupuy	10791

National Defence

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	10791
Mr. Collenette	10791
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	10791
Mr. Collenette	10791

Breast Cancer

Mr. Wappel	10792
Ms. Marleau	10792

National Forum on Health

Mr. Daviault	10792
Ms. Marleau	10792
Mr. Daviault	10792
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	10792

Gun Control

Mr. Abbott	10792
Mr. Rock	10792
Mr. Abbott	10792
Ms. Whelan	10793

Taxation

Mr. Solomon	10793
-------------------	-------

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	10793
Mr. Solomon	10793
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	10793

The Economy

Mr. Shepherd	10793
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	10793

Taxation

Mr. Chatters	10793
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	10794

Convenience Flags

Mr. Landry	10794
Mr. Young	10794

Points of Order

Rail Strike

Mr. Milliken	10794
--------------------	-------

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Supply

Allotted day—Funding for Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

Consideration resumed of motion	10794
Mr. Plamondon	10794
Mr. Boudria	10796
Ms. Brown (Oakville—Milton)	10797
Mr. Abbott	10798
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	10799
Mr. Crête	10800
Mr. Benoit	10802
Mr. Leblanc (Longueuil)	10802
Mr. Cauchon	10803
Mr. de Jong	10805

Mr. Pomerleau	10806
Mr. Arseneault	10808
Mr. de Savoye	10809
Mr. de Jong	10809
Amendment negated on division: Yeas, 44; Nays, 165	10812
Motion negated on division: Yeas, 37; Nays, 172	10813

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Canada Student Financial Assistance Act

Consideration resumed of motion	10814
Amendment agreed to on division: Yes, 129; Nays, 80	10814
(Motion, as amended, agreed to.)	10815

Access to Information

Consideration resumed of motion and amendment	10815
Mr. Penson	10815
Mr. Mifflin	10816
Mr. Lee	10818
Amendment	10818
Mr. Langlois	10818
(Amendment deemed to have been withdrawn.)	10818
(Amendment agreed to.)	10818
Mr. Jacob	10818
Ms. Cohen	10819
Mr. Lee	10820
(Motion as amended agreed to.)	10820

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Multiple Sclerosis

Mr. McTeague	10821
Mr. Mifflin	10821

Advisory Council on the Status of Women

Mrs. Gagnon (Québec)	10821
Ms. Clancy	10822

National Defence

Mr. Jacob	10822
Mr. Mifflin	10823

Land Claim

Mr. Harris	10823
Mr. Mifflin	10824