CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 133 • NUMBER 020 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Monday, March 25, 1996

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, March 25, 1996

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

DANGEROUS OFFENDERS

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should amend Part XXIV of the Criminal Code—Dangerous Offenders—to provide:

1. that where an offender is convicted of

(*a*) a sexual offence involving a child, or

(*b*) an offence set out in

(*i*) section 271 (sexual assault) that has been proceeded with by way of indictment,

(*ii*) section 272 (sexual assault with a weapon, threats to a third party or causing bodily harm), or

(*iii*) section 273 (aggravated sexual assault),

or an attempt to commit any of these offences, the offender shall, before being sentenced, be examined by two psychiatrists to determine

(*c*) in the case of sexual offence involving a child, whether the offender is likely to commit or attempt to commit such an offence in the future, and

(*d*) in the case of an offence referred to in section 271 that has been proceeded with by way of indictment, or section 272 or 273, whether the offender is likely to cause or attempt to cause death, injury or serious psychological harm to another person through a failure in the future to control his or her sexual impulses; and

2. that where the psychiatrists conclude

(*a*) in the case of a sexual offence involving a child, that the offender is likely to commit or attempt to commit such an offence in the future, or

(*b*) in the case of an offence mentioned in section 271 that has been proceeded with by way of indictment, or section 272 or 273, that the offender is likely to cause or attempt to cause death, injury or serious psychological harm to another person through a failure in the future to control his or her sexual impulses,

the Attorney General of the province in which the offender was tried shall direct that an application be brought to have the offender declared a dangerous offender.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the safety of all Canadians. M-116 is a motion to amend part XXIV of the Criminal Code regarding dangerous offenders.

The motion is a culmination of an effort by my colleague the hon. member for Calgary Southeast and myself, to find a way to protect Canadians from sexual predators. This motion will make Canadians safer in their homes and in their streets.

With this motion an individual convicted of a serious sexual assault against an adult or any sexual offence where the victim is a child must be examined by two psychiatrists. If the two psychiatrists conclude that the convicted offender is likely to reoffend, the attorney general must direct that a dangerous offender application be initiated. The convicted offender would then proceed to a dangerous offender hearing. The offender would be declared a dangerous offender if the crown proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the offender was likely to reoffend.

There is nothing draconian about this motion by any stretch of the imagination. This motion would only apply to individuals convicted of serious offences. By having a convicted offender reviewed by psychiatrists, we are providing the crown and the courts with the most comprehensive information possible about the likelihood of this offender reoffending. There is nothing arbitrary or unconstitutional about this. The motion respects accepted judicial practice while protecting Canadians against dangerous offenders. What this motion would do is perhaps identify a Paul Bernardo, a Clifford Olson, a Fernand Auger or a Mitchell Owen after they had committed their first sexual offence.

● (1105)

Auger is the man who kidnapped, assaulted and murdered Melanie Carpenter. I have already introduced a petition to the House from the Melanie Carpenter campaign. Over half a million people signed this petition calling on Parliament to enact legislation to keep dangerous offenders, especially dangerous sex offenders, off our streets.

What is particularly disturbing about Auger's murder of Melanie Carpenter is that it could have been prevented. Almost 10 years

before Auger killed Melanie, he was convicted of two brutal sexual assaults on teenage prostitutes. Because the victims were prostitutes, Auger only got a sentence of two years less a day.

It was not until some five years later, after being convicted on a robbery charge and receiving a federal sentence, that Auger was closely observed by psychiatric professionals. Once they had an opportunity to assess Auger, they realized that they had a walking time bomb on their hands but under our current laws he had to be released. As a result Melanie Carpenter is dead. If Auger had instead been assessed by professionals after his sexual assault convictions of the two teenage prostitutes, maybe the courts and corrections would have known what they were dealing with: a dangerous offender.

This motion is a response to the demands of Canadians who are fed up with the failure of our justice system to protect women and children. We are not suggesting that we should randomly lock people up. We are talking about convicted sexual predators.

Another example is Mitchell Owen, the man who murdered 16 year old Pamela Cameron in October 1994 just two blocks from my constituency office. Owen had previously been incarcerated for the brutal sexual assault of a female in an underground parking lot. When he was sentenced the judge called him a walking time bomb. When he was released Corrections Canada advised that he was at high risk to reoffend. Would Pamela Cameron still be alive today had the contents of this motion already been in place?

What about Clifford Olson? Here is a man who had a lengthy criminal record before his murderous rampage which left 11 Canadian children dead.

It is time for the justice system to consider the seriousness of sexual assault and realize that this type of behaviour is a clear indicator of a pattern of future violence. We are not trying to lock people up and throw away the key. A dangerous offender designation simply means that an offender is kept in custody until the parole board is convinced that the offender does not pose a serious threat to society. Parole eligibility would be after three years and then every two years. If rehabilitation and treatment were successful, the offender would not be incarcerated forever.

Motion M-116 would increase the odds that we would capture those offenders who pose a serious threat to the safety of every Canadian should they be released prematurely. This motion ensures that the correctional system is not pressured to release offenders who show no potential for rehabilitation.

Motion M-116 meets the Reform Party's objective of ensuring public safety. I would expect the motion to receive considerable support by all the parties in this House who are concerned with the safety of Canadians.

The Bloc Quebecois justice critic has frequently expressed her concern for the safety of women and children. I hope she is as concerned with protecting them from sexual predators as she is in protecting them from firearms.

I must admit that when we debated this motion on December 13 last year, I was very surprised by some of the comments from the government side. It seems the government member for Hamilton—Wentworth does not see the need for this motion because he ''cannot accept that a Paul Bernardo necessarily will offend again''. I found these comments from the government side to be shocking. I am not sure what could possibly make the member utter a comment like this. I am certain that Canadians are relieved he is not sitting on the National Parole Board. I doubt there are many Canadians who believe Paul Bernardo should ever be released because the member for Hamilton—Wentworth believes that he may not reoffend.

• (1110)

Then we have the comments of the member for Kingston and the Islands who criticized me and the Reform Party for our obsession with law and order issues. I do not apologize for my so-called obsession with crime prevention and the protection of Canadians. Perhaps if some of the government members were obsessed with law and order issues, they would be more willing to support motions such as this to protect Canadians against sexual predators.

In its red book the Liberal government devoted an entire section to safe homes, safe streets. It surprises me that the government would not wholeheartedly support Motion M-116 which is designed to protect Canadians and to ensure their homes and streets are safe. In fact, we are actually helping the government to keep its own red book promises.

On page 84 of the red book the Liberal government claims: ''Dealing with the growing incidents of violent crime will be a priority for a Liberal government''. According to the red book: ''Every person has a right to personal security and a Liberal government will move to protect that right''. Also on page 84 of the red book, the government claims to be particularly concerned with protecting women and children against violence. This motion would help the government fulfil its own promise. Motion M-116 specifically targets sexual predators and pedophiles.

Given this, I do not see any reason why the government would not strongly support this motion. Once again this government plays partisan games rather than putting the interest and safety of Canadians as a priority.

Unlike some of his colleagues, the Minister of Justice did express concern about the situation of dangerous offenders in our communities. According to the minister, the government is in agreement with the objectives of this motion. The minister indicated by his comments on this motion that the government recognizes there is a problem with dangerous offenders being released and possibly reoffending. He said that the courts may

indeed need extended powers to deal with these cases in order to protect the safety of Canadians.

I am pleased to see the minister at least recognizes that Parliament needs to enact legislation to protect Canadians against sexual predators. Given that the minister recognizes the need to protect Canadians against violence, we would expect the government to be eager to support this motion.

Motion M-116 will prevent tragedies where sexual predators reoffend. If this motion were adopted, perhaps Melanie Carpenter and Pamela Cameron would still be alive today.

Motion M-116 reflects the view of the over half a million individuals who signed the Melanie Carpenter Society petition and the hundreds of thousands of Canadians supporting the Peace and Justice for Canadians Association. They believe as I do that dangerous sex offenders and pedophiles belong behind bars and not on our streets until such a time as they will no longer pose a risk to Canadian society.

Canadians have had it with our judicial system which fails to protect Canadians against sexual predators. Motion M-116 would be a start in reforming our justice system to recognize the rights of women and children to the protection they deserve by the judicial system.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the motion by the hon. member for Surrey—White Rock—South Langley is a reflection of the Reformers' reactionary mentality since their first day in this House. The motion we are examining today would force the government to amend the Criminal Code so as to declare all individuals convicted of sexual assault dangerous offenders.

Such an amendment would, to all intents and purposes, eliminate all crown discretion. It would oblige the attorney general of the province in which the offender was tried to direct that an application be brought, each time there was a conviction, to have the offender declared a dangerous offender. This obligation would arise each time two psychiatrists concluded that there was a likelihood of re-offending. What the hon. member is proposing amounts to letting psychiatrists usurp the roles of the prosecutor and of the judge. This is tantamount to turning the justice system totally upside down.

● (1115)

It is clear in the hon. member's mind that the way to eradicate the problem of violence in Canada is to overload our courts and crowd our penitentiaries. The third party is never one to propose anything innovative, nor anything with a potential for consensus among the members.

The Reform Party persists in clouding the issue by fiddling with crime statistics in order to justify their ill-advised interventions. Where the law is concerned, these hypocrites claim to be defending victims' rights, but in reality they are making political hay at the expense of the sufferings of victims of crime. Like Don Quixote jousting with windmills, these extreme rightwingers will do anything to get attention. As I said last week, demagogy has no place in criminal law.

I wonder: what is the justification for such a motion? Has there been a sudden sharp upswing in violent crime? No, on the contrary. The latest statistics available indicate the crime rate dropped by 5 per cent during 1994, the third year in a row that it has gone down.

In 1994 as well, the figures for violent crime were down 3 per cent, the greatest annual drop since 1962. In fact, without exception, all categories of violent crime were down in 1994.

There was a 10 per cent drop in sexual assaults, regardless of type. The homicide rate was the lowest recorded in the past 25 years. The combined total of homicides and attempted murders continued to account for less than one per cent of violent crimes.

In the light of these statistics, we cannot help but wonder about the seriousness of the member's motion. The existing procedure for declaring an offender dangerous works very well. I am not alone in saying so; it is the opinion of all the provincial and the federal attorneys general.

But what about the existing procedure? Section 753 of the Criminal Code allows the courts to declare an individual found guilty of a serious personal injury offence or a sexual offence a dangerous offender.

Once the accused is found guilty of one of the offences in section 752, the court hears the evidence by the crown and bases its decision on the following: demonstration of the offender's inability to restrain his behaviour; a substantial indifference on the part of the offender respecting the consequences of his acts and the behaviour of the offender associated with the offence is so brutal that normal standards of behavioral restraint would be insufficient.

The court gives its decision following conviction, but before sentencing. The court declares the offender dangerous and then imposes a sentence of detention for an indeterminate period in lieu of any other sentence. This is one of the harshest sentences a court can impose, as the offender is not automatically entitled to parole. An individual's file is then reviewed three years after conviction and every two years thereafter.

In practice it is merely a pro forma review, since, only in very rare instances do the case management officers of the National Parole Board not recommend continued detention.

My colleague has already proposed a bill whereby the whole legal proceeding would be repeated just prior to the conclusion of an individual's sentence. Clearly, the least we can say is that she is single-minded. The only question this motion raises is that of relevance.

The hon. member acknowledged herself in the House that her earlier bill applied to very few individuals. The problem posed by repeat offenders is much greater and requires solutions much broader than those proposed by my colleague.

● (1120)

The hon. member puts excessive emphasis on isolated cases when she claims that her motion would be the solution to this kind of problem. The fact is that her motion proposes impractical solutions and targets dangerous offenders who represent only 0.5 per cent of Canada's current inmate population in federal penitentiaries.

By the way, in 1994, Quebec only had one dangerous offender. A second one was just added to the list. The vast majority of inmates considered to be dangerous offenders are in Ontario and in western Canada. From 1985 to 1994, only one dangerous offender was paroled every year. That number always remained constant.

The difference between Quebec and the other provinces is easy to explain. For several years now, Quebec has had an effective medicolegal system in place to deal with court referrals, including dangerous offenders. The system works well and people suffering from mental disorders get adequate psychiatric treatment. All in all, the Quebec initiative is a proven solution to the problems experienced in the rest of Canada, and other provinces should have the wisdom to follow our example.

The current situation certainly does not justify an intervention as drastic as the one proposed by the hon. member. Moreover, the proposed reactionary measures are uncalled-for, because the courts already have effective tools to decide whether an offender should be declared dangerous. A judicious application of the Criminal Code would greatly alleviate the problem.

It is not enough to merely react to public opinion fuelled by gutter papers trying to improve their sales. Nor is it enough to target a very small number of individuals. The government must, in co-operation with the provinces, have a comprehensive approach to detect repeat offenders and ensure that society is better protected. The Quebec model should be followed.

One step was taken with the federal, provincial and territorial task force on violent high-risk offenders. The hon. member should carefully read the report released last year. She will find interesting suggestions and, more importantly, a more realistic picture of the current situation.

It goes without saying that, unfortunately, I will not support her motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Motion No. M-116 is identical to motion numbered M-461 debated during the last session. It did not win approval of the House. I note that the hon. member keeps trying on this subject.

At the outset, I do not believe that the hon. member for Surrey—White Rock—South Langley has thought this idea through, either in terms of its legal impact or its practicalities. Let us be clear on exactly what this amendment to the Criminal Code would require if it were approved.

First, every criminal who is convicted of a serious sexual offence, namely sexual assault under sections 271, 272 and 273 of the code would have to be examined by two psychiatrists in order that the risk of reoffending be determined. If they conclude that the risk is high, then a dangerous offender application would, of necessity, have to be launched. There would be no discretion on the part of the judge and certainly not on the part of the crown prosecutor.

Under the present system, the judge considers relevant information about the offender's criminal history and the mental state of the offender at the time of the offence. This usually takes the form of a formal pre-sentence report. Of course the perspective of the victim is considered.

In other words, in a normal case a whole range of information is taken into account in order to determine the appropriate sentence. If this motion were to be adopted, every convicted sex offender would be remanded to a psychiatric facility for a thorough examination by two psychiatrists. These psychiatrists could give a precise prediction of the risk presented by every criminal.

● (1125)

Under current law the crown attorney and the judge are the authorities who decide whether to seek the opinion of psychiatrists on the danger posed by a convicted person. It is not the other way around. The psychiatrists do not tell the officers of the court whether to proceed with a dangerous offender application.

There is good reason for giving the crown and judges the discretion to seek a detailed psychiatric examination of the offender and to initiate a dangerous offender application. It is because the dangerous offender process is essentially and primarily a legal one, it is not just a question of psychiatric prediction.

The crown attorney has to decide whether the dangerous offender application will meet the legal standards set out in part XXIV of the Criminal Code. For example, section 753 of the code requires the crown to show that the offender ''by his conduct in any sexual matter, including that involved in the commission of the offence for which he has been convicted,'' has shown a failure to control his sexual impulses and a likelihood of causing serious injury in the future.

This is a legal test, as the courts have repeatedly pointed out. There is no point in making an application under part XXIV if it has no chance of succeeding.

I do not wish to denigrate the role of psychiatry in this process. Indeed, dangerous offender rules require that psychiatric evidence be presented for both sides at the dangerous offender hearing.

I also note the references which the hon. member made in the last debate on this issue to the work of Dr. Robert Hare in predicting the risk of recidivism by psychopaths, including psychopathic sex offenders.

The ability of psychiatrists and psychologists to assess the nature and degree of risk of offenders has certainly improved in the last decade. I have heard Canada described as a leader in this field. I further note that the Correctional Service of Canada employs a wide range of clinical and actuarial testing in its intake and case management programs for federal inmates.

The proposed amendment to the Criminal Code has the balance wrong. It would compel the crown to bring a dangerous offender application every time a pair of psychiatrists reach a medical conclusion about risk. Perhaps if the motion called for discretion, it might receive more support. However, the motion advocates a sweeping measure that would diminish the role of judges and prosecutors and indiscriminately force every case of sexual offending to proceed through a lengthy and expensive examination by psychiatrists, even when there is little chance of those psychiatrists labelling the offender as high risk.

I am glad that the hon. member has such faith in psychiatrists. Perhaps she is unaware that the Canadian Psychiatric Association has stated that there is already a shortage of qualified forensic psychiatrists in Canada. The Correctional Service of Canada and provincial departments of justice are already hard pressed to find psychiatric advice even for priority cases.

I find it interesting that the Reform Party will spare no expense in this area, even if the chances of winning a dangerous offender case are thin or remote. To put this in context, I refer members to figures which were recently released by Statistics Canada.

In 1994-95 the federal government spent $913 million on adult corrections. The provinces and territories spent another $980 million. The capital cost of building federal penitentiaries increased 70 per cent between 1990-91 and 1994-95. It costs taxpayers $44,000 per year to keep a person in a federal penitentiary. The per capita cost to operate the adult correction system represents $65 for each Canadian.

Could we not be a bit more selective in where we focus our resources? Did the hon. member do a cost analysis?

I would like to suggest there is a way to be selective and strategic in the way in which our limited resources are employed. The speech from the throne of February 27 of this year contains the following statement:

> The government will focus corrections resources on high-risk offenders while increasing efforts to lower the number of young people who come into conflict with the justice system. The government will develop innovative alternatives to incarceration for low-risk offenders.

● (1130)

This motion is typical of measures that unselectively demand indeterminate detention for crimes that should be targeted much more carefully. I believe the important word here is carefully.

I trust prosecutors, courts and juries to pass the appropriate judgments on sex offenders. We all expect that. The question that must be asked is whether sex offenders are slipping through the system. Are opportunities for dangerous offenders being missed?

Federal and provincial ministers of justice certainly agree the dangerous offenders provisions are an extremely valuable tool if used properly.

I note that during the last debate on this identical motion the Minister of Justice made reference to the dangerous offender flagging system. This system has been set up by the RCMP working closely with the provinces. It allows police and prosecutors to identify criminals who appear to demonstrate a high and continuing risk of future violent conduct.

Police and crowns can then become aware of these individuals through a flag placed on the data banks of the Canadian Police Information Centre, CPIC. I am informed that most provinces and territories have designated co-ordinators to operate the provincial end of the system and that a number of offenders have already been flagged. It is this kind of targeted measure that will make the dangerous offender procedure more effective.

The Supreme Court of Canada has ruled that the dangerous offender sentencing procedure as set out in part XXIV of the Criminal Code is a well tailored scheme that meets the requirements of the charter of rights and freedoms. The criteria are reasonable and focus on a select group of high risk offenders.

If the sweeping, unselective amendments anticipated in this motion were implemented there would be a considerable risk that the entire dangerous offender scheme would be undermined and discredited. I cannot support the motion.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I listened to my hon. colleague who sits on the Justice committee with me. I wonder if he feels that lawyers are the ones who should do the psychiatric examination of people who have demonstrated by their actions that they are dangerous to our children and other people within society.

I rise to support my colleague's motion to amendment the Criminal Code. If Motion No. 116 is adopted, the section of the Criminal Code dealing with dangerous offenders will be altered to allow for the examination of sex offenders by two psychiatrists to determine their propensity to offend again.

If the psychiatrists conclude the offender is likely to commit or attempt to commit another offence in the future, the attorney general of the province may direct that an application be brought to have the offender declared a dangerous offender.

On September 14 last year an article appeared in the *Financial Post* containing figures from Correctional Services Canada. I concur with the author's observations that these figures are worrisome and clearly indicate the system does not protect the public from convicted murders and other dangerous predators. These figures demonstrate the need for my colleague's amendment to the Criminal Code.

According to a chart furnished by the solicitor general to Diane Francis, editor of the *Financial Post*, between 1989 and 1994 no fewer than 78 people committed murder while on conditional release.

If we had in place legislation allowing for the designation of dangerous offenders prior to and following sentencing, if we had eliminated statutory release and if we eliminated the patronage appointment of parole board members, thereby ensuring only qualified people are making the decision regarding the parole of violent offenders, measures Reform has been advocating for well over two years, we would have saved 78 lives in this five year period, or at least the possibility of doing so would have been present. We would have saved 1.3 lives each month during this time.

• (1135)

We must move immediately to amend the Criminal Code to ensure the public is protected from potential repeat offenders who have demonstrated by their actions that they are a danger to our children and members of society.

The same figures reveal that some 4,960 persons convicted of lesser violent offences such as child molestation, manslaughter, rape or attempted murder repeated their crimes while on conditional release. These figures show we have a terrible record in terms of judging whether a person has been rehabilitated after they have demonstrated they pose a violent threat to members of society.

Ms. Francis concluded that those figures are awful, and I agree with her. Five thousand crimes against our children and other innocent victims could have and should have been deterred or prevented. Clearly the Criminal Code amendment my colleague from Surrey—White Rock—South Langley has proposed will assist in the prevention of these types of assaults.

The examination of these offenders and therefore the indefinite incarceration of dangerous offenders will enhance public safety. Sex offenders, especially child molesters, have a high rate of recidivism. The only way to keep our children safe, the only way to prevent sexual predators from taking victims and destroying the life of another innocent child is to keep them locked up, to keep them incarcerated indefinitely until there is absolutely no risk of reoffending.

If we cannot protect society from those who have identified themselves by their actions as dangerous to others, what chance does our justice system really have?

A recent article in *MacLean's* reveals that psychologists and criminologists agree that the best way to reduce recidivism rates is by classifying offenders on the basis on the continuing risk they represent to society, and in those cases in which the risk of reoffending is high, classifying such offenders as dangerous.

Years ago the process of classification was fraught with guess work but today research in Canada has led to vastly improved techniques for classifying offenders. University of British Columbia psychologist Robert Hare has developed a widely used scale known as the psychopathy check list. Employing this list during intense interviews with offenders, psychologists can with 75 per cent to 80 per cent accuracy determine whether an offender is a dangerous psychopath.

This test is not only valuable in determining an offender's risk of reoffending for the purpose of classifying them a dangerous offender and thus providing for indefinite incarceration, it also assists correctional services in determining how they may, if at all, rehabilitate such offenders. Many experts agree the best way to reduce the risk of repeat offenders is through intense counselling.

If Melvin Stanton and Joseph Fredericks had been examined by psychiatrists, as recommended by my colleague, and if Daniel Gingras had been subjected to Mr. Hare's test, the parole board may not have had the opportunity to make such a disastrous decision regarding the temporary absence or parole of this convicted murderer and these two sex offenders.

In January 1988 Melvin Stanton, a violent sex offender, was granted a temporary absence from an Ontario penitentiary and within hours of getting out raped and murdered a young woman in downtown Toronto.

If Mr. Stanton had been classified a dangerous offender or if the risk of his reoffending had been known, the parole board never would have granted him leave and an innocent life never would have been so violently snuffed out.

If parolee Joseph Fredericks had been recognized by the justice system for what he really was, a sadistic pedophile, and incarcerated accordingly, 11-year old Christopher Stephenson of Brampton, Ontario would not have been abducted, raped and fatally stabbed in June 1988.

If convicted murderer Daniel Gingras was not given a temporary absence from an Edmonton institution in the summer of 1987, two lives would have been saved. I urge members of all sides of the House to vote in favour of this motion.

In the absence of such an amendment, Canadians will have to take measures to defend their own lives and those of their children. They will have to do what the mothers of Val-d'Or, Quebec have done to protect themselves. They will have to plaster warning pamphlets throughout their communities. They will have to keep their doors locked and they will have to keep their children within close range at all times; no bike rides through the park, no walking home alone after school because they live in constant fear for their children that they may fall victim to a sex offender.

• (1140)

Convicted sex offender Joe Cannon, who is serving six months for gross indecency and who has been convicted of six sexual offences since 1988, will soon be eligible for temporary leave from a prison in Val-d'Or. With no assurance from the justice system that this offender will not strike again, residents can only minimize, not eliminate, his chance of victimizing one of their children again.

In our judgment the only way the children of Val-d'Or can be completely safe from this sex offender is if he kept in prison until examiners, two psychiatrists, are absolutely certain he will not reoffend. My colleague's amendment could provide that assurance.

The main objective of any proposed justice legislation or amendment to the Criminal Code is to improve public safety. This amendment meets that criterion. It will enhance personal security by providing us with the assurance that sex offenders, those offenders labelled dangerous, will not be released from prison until there is an absolute sign that there is no risk of their harming our children.

I urge members on all sides of the House to support this motion.

Mr. John Bryden (Hamilton—Wentworth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to this motion. I have many reservations about the motion which I will put on record.

The hon. member for Surrey—White Rock—South Langley has introduced a motion that calls for making it mandatory for the crown, in all cases in which a person has been convicted of a sexual offence involving a child or sexual assaults, to apply to the court to have the offender declared a dangerous offender whenever two psychiatrists are of the opinion that there is a danger the offender will strike again.

The hon. member is asking the government to implement this through an amendment to part XXIV of the Criminal Code, the part that deals with dangerous offenders. Obviously the hon. member is of the view that the dangerous offenders provision of the Criminal Code needs improvement. Quite possibly it could be improved but I am not sure the measure proposed by the hon. member would carry the appropriate result.

I am not saying part XXIV should never be changed, but the evolution of the dangerous offender concept and the restrictions the charter of rights imposes on that concept indicate we should proceed cautiously in broadening it or oversimplifying it.

The existing dangerous offender system has three components: a focus on the most serious offences, a focus on the pattern of the offender's conduct, and an assessment of the likelihood of the offender's continuing his serious offending. These criteria must be met if we are to justify locking up individuals indefinitely.

I will address one proposed change with which I disagree, a proposal central to this motion, the mandatory aspect. The motion provides that every time two psychiatrists determine that in effect an offender poses a high risk of reoffending, the attorney general of the province in which the offender was convicted shall direct that a dangerous offender application be brought.

I do not support the elimination of the discretion of prosecutors in the bringing of dangerous offender applications. It would be unwise to do so. The criteria for a dangerous offender finding are contained within the Criminal Code. This is a concept created by criminal law and supported by criminal procedure.

It is true these criteria rely heavily on psychiatric prediction of risk, but medical standards are not the only ones that have to be met. Section 753 of the Criminal Code requires that the likelihood of the offender's committing further harm must be established to the satisfaction of the court. This is not entirely or even primarily a matter of medical or statistical prediction but a legal decision made according to criteria legislated by Parliament.

The crown should possess the discretion, considering all evidence available to it, to estimate whether an application will be strong enough to meet this legal standard. If an application is brought without meeting this legal standard, it is a waste of time and resources and will not succeed.

● (1145)

I also want to address the issue of broadening the scope of the legislation. The motion would broaden part XXIV to capture any sex offence against a child. This would include cases of sexual interference under section 151 and an invitation to sexual touching under section 152 of the Criminal Code. While these crimes carry a maximum penalty of 10-year's imprisonment, individual offences usually do not receive such lengthy sentences nor do they typically involve the degree of violence envisioned in part XXIV. In broadening the target group so much, the motion before us runs a serious risk of conflicting with the charter and a 1987 Supreme Court decision.

The current dangerous offender provisions came into the Criminal Code in 1977 and replaced the habitual offenders provisions that had been found to be too broad. These amendments were designed to be more precise, to target the most serious offenders and, similarly, to avoid widening the net too much. In essence, Parliament was saying, let us target the worst offenders without sweeping in the low risk and the nuisance cases.

The dangerous offender legislation passed a major hurdle with the Supreme Court of Canada decision in R. *v.* Lyons in 1987. The court ruled that the dangerous offender provisions did not violate the charter of rights and freedoms. This case constitutes a firm indication by the Supreme Court that any law that seeks to sentence a citizen to an indefinite term in a penitentiary must be well tailored and confined to the most serious circumstances.

In broadening the target groups so much, the motion before us runs a serious risk of conflicting with this decision. I doubt that the Supreme Court would find this much net widening consistent with the charter, particularly when given the new rules prescribed elsewhere in this motion. Crown attorneys would be forced to launch many more applications. The court, as in the Lyons case, would be vigilant to the potential for abuse in the overall structure of the procedure.

In the same Lyons case, the Supreme Court also stated that it was important for the crown to have some discretion in bringing dangerous offender applications and that the absence of any such discretion could lead to a conclusion that the law is arbitrary. That could very well be the case if Parliament was to legislate according to this motion before us today.

I would like to point out how successful part XXIV of the Criminal Code has proven to be. Between 1977 and 1995 approximately 143 offenders were found to be dangerous offenders and sentenced indeterminately to a Canadian penitentiary. Of that number, 134 remain there still.

There are signs that the provinces are using the procedure more often. Successful applications usually average eight or nine a year. In 1993 there were 15 successful cases. In 1994 there were 13 cases. We all remember the recent designation of Paul Bernardo as a dangerous offender.

I suggest that the current motion is not an appropriate way to improve the dangerous offender legislation. I regret that I cannot support this motion.

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am not pleased to speak on this bill today. As a matter of fact, I am very upset that this Liberal government, which has a majority in the House and has the power to enact laws to protect our society, our families and our children and to follow through on a promise of recognizing the need for safety in our society, refuses to enact legislation that will do exactly that. It leaves it up to the Reform Party, the opposition, to bring this type of motion to the House of Commons.

While I am certainly anxious to support M-116, the motion of the hon. member for Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, at the same time I am really upset that it has been left up to an opposition party to do this. Reformers have recognized the need to protect society and are proud to do it.

● (1150)

After listening to the hon. members from the Bloc and the Liberal Party speak, it must be said that we have just heard members from these parties prefer to argue for the rights of sexual offenders and sexual predators. They prefer to argue for those kinds of rights as opposed to arguing for the rights of society as a whole and the victims of these very sick people.

The motion the hon. member from Surrey-White Rock puts forward seeks to amend the dangerous offender section of the Criminal Code to ensure that sexual offenders, these predators, will not be free to walk in society and offend again. They would be declared dangerous offenders. This would happen if two psychiatrists who are trained in assessing the character and the mental makeup of the people who have committed these horrible crimes stated that these people would reoffend again. The courts would be bound to keep them in jail which is where they should be.

Being labelled a dangerous offender involves an indeterminate prison sentence. There is a need for this amendment to the legislation. One need only look back a few years to get a sense of how poorly the justice system deals with people who sexually offend.

It has been mentioned before but the House will remember the case of Melanie Carpenter and her killer Fernand Auger, an individual with a tremendously long history of sexual offences. Before being released from prison a psychologist stated that beyond a shadow of a doubt Mr. Auger would reoffend. The system

knew he was going to reoffend but it let him go free. Now Melanie Carpenter is dead because of it.

I am just amazed at these Liberal and Bloc members who, when speaking against this motion, constantly refer back to the criminal justice system as their rationale. The Canadian people know that the criminal justice system stinks. It needs a complete overhaul. Yet the Liberal and the Bloc members use it as their rationale to speak against motions which will protect society. They say it cannot be done because the criminal justice system states so and so and they go on to relate what the justice system says.

The thinking that goes on in the minds of some members is astounding. They try to defend the criminal justice system which no Canadian would ever defend.

The present system is such that psychologists could have done nothing to stop Mr. Auger's release. The system allowed this Auger fellow to refuse treatment while he was in prison. This guy was a sexual predator, a sexual offender. He was convicted. He went to prison and he stated: ''I'm just going to stay for a while but I don't need any treatment and I am not going to take it''. What happened? The system let him out and he brutally killed someone.

Joseph Fredericks, a man with a long history of sexual offences against children was released from a Toronto jail in 1988. Despite the fact that there was a 99 per cent chance that he would reoffend, the system let him go. The system put him back into society. The system did not have the power to keep him incarcerated even though the system knew he would reoffend. He abducted, raped and killed Christopher Stephenson. The system let him go. Once again the system failed. As a result the Stephenson's lost their son.

● (1155)

More recently, in my home town of Prince George, we learned that Bobby Gordon Oatway, a twice convicted sexual offender, a pedophile, a predator of little children, was being released from prison on parole even though he had refused treatment in prison, even though the corrections people, the parole people, knew beyond a shadow of a doubt that he was most likely to offend again. Out the door he walks. He was coming to Prince George.

Had it not been for a phone call from one of his victims in the lower mainland of B.C. to Prince George letting people know he was coming, he would have come back into our community probably totally undetected. Chances are that he would have committed an offence there.

After the citizens were warned that he was coming, on their own and without the help from the justice system because the system let this Mr. Oatway out in the first place, mounted a campaign and distributed posters. This changed Mr. Oatway's mind and he did not come to Prince George. Unfortunately he is in Toronto now and they are faced with the same problem. They have a predator in their community who is likely to offend again. The system failed. He will offend against innocent children who are just enjoying being kids only to be victimized by some sexual predator, some sick person.

Canadians believe that the justice system is severely deficient when it comes to protecting society from these sick, sexual predators. M-116 goes a long way to addressing the situation. It ensures that dangerous sexual offenders will be kept in prison so that our streets, our playgrounds, our schoolyards and our communities can be safe again.

Why should parents have to worry about where their kids play, how they go to school? Why should parents have to worry about their kids going to a playground and having a good time, like kids are supposed to do? They have to worry because the justice system lets people who are sexual predators out on the streets. That is unfair.

The government has had lots of chances to improve the law as it applies to this type of offender. When the Liberals passed Bill C-45 last year, my colleagues in the Reform Party put forward a number of amendments to address sexual offenders and ways to fix the system so that society would not have to fear these people. Specifically, they argue in favour of a child sex offender registry which would identify them so that citizens could take precautions on their own where the justice system fails them.

As well, they argued in favour of sex offenders having to serve their full sentence and undergo—this will come as a real shock to Liberals—mandatory treatment while in prison. Needless to say the Liberals did not adopt any of these proposals and society remains vulnerable to these sick people who prey on little children and commit other sexual offences.

The problem with the government, as mentioned in the opening part of my speech, is that it is concerned more for the rights of criminals. Victims' rights come second as far as the Liberals are concerned. While a lot of bureaucrats sit around and muse over how to protect criminals' rights, these offenders are wandering around anonymously in our neighbourhoods.

● (1200)

The Canadian Police Association got into the heart of the issue in a submission given to MPs in 1993. It stated: ''We think we should rethink the basic assumption that dangerous risk high offenders must be released no matter what danger they pose''. Policemen in our streets are dealing with these people on a daily basis. They know these people. They know the chances of them reoffending.

They want to keep them off the streets. That is exactly what Motion M-116 addresses.

We must question the logic in simply allowing the justice system to keep releasing these offenders. I might add that we have to question releasing them when their chance of reoffending is very high. Seventy per cent of all inmates who are dangerous offenders have at least one prior federal sentence. These individuals are hard core criminals and it is not overly difficult to identify them.

Similar to the Canadian Police Association position, the group CAVEAT released a report called ''Safety Net''. It called for dangerous offender applications to be brought against high risk offenders in order to protect the public. This should be the ultimate role of our justice system: the protection of society, our families and our communities. Unfortunately, it seems as though it has been turned on its head according to the Liberal and Bloc members, and criminals' rights come first. That is a shame.

In November 1994 the supreme court ruled that sex offenders could no longer be automatically banned for life from hanging around parks, school yards and playgrounds. The justice system says that people who prey on and victimize little kids cannot be kept from areas where little kids play. That is a sign of a very sick system. What is even more distressing is that the government supports that decision.

I cannot support the government's position on this. I will support Motion M-116. I urge all members who are concerned about the public, the families and the children of the country to support it as well.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: My colleagues, the hour for consideration of private members' business has now expired. Therefore, the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

CANADA TRANSPORTATION ACT

The House resumed from Friday, March 22, consideration of Bill C-14, an act to continue the National Transportation Agency as the Canadian Transportation Agency, to consolidate and revise the National Transportation Act, 1987 and the Railway Act and to amend or repeal others acts as a consequence, as reported with amendments from the committee, and of motions in Group No.8.

Mr. Paul Mercier (Blainville—Deux-Montagnes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Motion No. 18 relates to clause 98, which reads:

> 98.(1) A railway company shall not construct a railway line without the approval of the Agency.
>
> (2) The Agency may, on application by the railway company, grant the approval if it considers that the location of the railway line is reasonable, taking into consideration requirements for railway operations and services and the interests of the localities that will be affected by the line.

These are excellent provisions, and an effort is made to take into consideration the needs of the users, the company and the region. All that is fine but incomplete. There are two other equally important elements, which our motion is designed to include.

The first of these two elements is the environment. We are surprised to note that the legislation does not state that, before granting approval, the environmental impact must be considered, given that constructing a railway line will obviously change the urban or rural landscape and that an environmental impact assessment is therefore required.

● (1205)

The second element that was overlooked—and this clearly reflects the general attitude of this government, which constantly overlooks the interests, priorities and jurisdictions of the provinces—as part of the process for granting the approval to construct a railway line is consultation, the mere fact of consulting the province or provinces affected before granting this approval.

Yet, land use planning is specifically a provincial field of activity, a provincial area of jurisdiction, either directly or by delegation, because the development plans are prepared by the provinces and approved by the provincial government under which the municipalities come. In particular, corridors may or may not have been provided or approved by the province in these plans for a line to eventually go through the area.

If the allowance, the right of way was not provided for in the development plan for a railway line to go through, it is obvious that changes will have to be made. It is really unthinkable that the federal government go ahead without even consulting the province concerned. This is typical of the way the federal government deals with the provinces, and that is why our motion adds that the granting of the approval to construct a new railway line shall also be subject to ''the obtaining of an environmental assessment and compliance with zoning by-laws in the municipalities in any province affected by the railway line''.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Bloc motion, there is some merit in it in terms of environmental considerations however, on reviewing this, had it been worded a little differently it would have been easier to support. The way the motion reads it is a cumbersome process which would grind work to a halt. It is not workable.

Motion No. 19 is also connected in some way to what the Bloc raised, which were the concerns of municipalities within the various provinces affected by rail activity. Railways have property which must be crossed from time to time either by the municipalities for infrastructure work or by utility companies in order to supply service to the general public. Often permission is required to make these crossings, either with an overhead crossing or more often an underhead crossing.

The concerns raised by both the municipalities and utility companies are that in the event of rail line abandonment or selling off of the rail lines, they have no tenure on these crossings. They would like something put into the bill which would ensure the infrastructure would continue in the interests of the general public. Obviously, it would be a great hardship for a municipality if suddenly a water or sewer line which crossed rail property was ruled improper and had to be rerouted.

I suspect it will be suggested by the other side that it could be taken care of by getting an expropriation and that is right. The land could be expropriated which would of course mean going to court with lawyers and delays and uncertainty. This is not a company benefit or profit for an individual or an individual company. This is just something to address the needs of the taxpayers in the affected area. It is worthwhile. It is not something which will be a hardship to the rail lines. I ask that all members of the House give it serious consideration.

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened quite carefully to the amendment proposed by the member. I should say that the government does not support the motion because it is not consistent with the current environmental legislation regarding circumstances and responsibilities for conducting environmental assessments. While I understand where the hon. member is coming from, he should realize there is an inconsistency in the motion.

• (1210)

With regard to the subject of local conditions, the hon. member should read section 98(2) again. We believe that the consideration of local conditions is already adequately covered in 98(2) and for that reason we do not believe that this motion should be supported.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 18 in Group No. 8. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 19. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

The Deputy Speaker: I think colleagues there were not sufficient members in the House at the time of the calling of the matter.

Mr. Gouk: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I do believe there may be more than five who have come in now, but at the actual time the fifth member was standing at the back by his desk.

The Deputy Speaker: There is no doubt at all. The member is right. There are more than five now, but unfortunately when there was the standing vote, there were not five and accordingly the matter would fail then on division.

Motion No. 19 negatived.

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 22

That Bill C-14, in Clause 106, be amended in the English version

(*a*) by replacing line 24, on page 46, with the following:

''ment, bailment, mortgage or hypothec or as a lessor or'';

(*b*) by replacing line 31, on page 46, with the following:

''tions under the security agreement, bailment, mort-''; and

(*c*) by replacing lines 33 to 35, on page 46, with the following:

''(*b*) any event that occurred before or after the scheme was filed and that constitutes a default under the security agreement, bailment, mort-''.

Motion No. 26

That Bill C-14, in Clause 133, be amended in the French version, by replacing line 14, on page 61, with the following:

''sur ses lignes—et, le cas échéant, sur des dis-''.

● (1215)

Motion No. 71

That Bill C-14, be amended by adding after line 11, on page 94, the following:

''CN Commercialization Act

210.1 Subsections 3(2) and (3) of the CN Commercialization Act are replaced by the following:

(2) Nothing in, or done under the authority of, this Act affects the operation of the Competition Act in respect of the acquisition of any interest in CN.''

Motion No. 74

That Bill C-14 be amended by deleting Clause 275.

Motion No. 75

That Bill C-14 be amended by deleting Clause 276.

Motion No. 76

That Bill C-14, in Clause 278, be amended by replacing lines 26 to 37, on page 120, with the following:

''278. If this section comes into force before the day fixed by order under section 24 of the Budget Implementation Act, 1995, then the definition ''Agency'' in section 2 of the Atlantic Region Freight Assistance Act is replaced by the following:''.

Motion No. 77

That Bill C-14, in Clause 279, be amended by replacing lines 40 to 42, on page 120, and lines 1 to 6, on page 121, with the following:

''279. If this section comes into force before the day fixed by order under section 25 of the Budget Implementation Act, 1995, then''.

Motion No. 78

That Bill C-14 be amended by deleting Clause 280.

Motion No. 79

That Bill C-14 be amended by deleting Clause 281.

Motion No. 80

That Bill C-14 be amended by deleting Clause 282.

Motion No. 81

That Bill C-14, in Part I of Schedule IV, be amended by replacing, on page 135, the following:

''Central Butte M 44.0 Riverhurst (M 110.5) 66.5''.

with the following:

''Central Butte M 44.2 Riverhurst (M 110.5) 66.3''.

Motion No. 82

That Bill C-14, in Part II of Schedule IV, be amended by replacing, on page 135, the following:

''Gretna-La Rivière Gretna (M 14.1) Altona (M 21.4) 7.3''.

with the following:

''Gretna-La Rivière Gretna (M 14.1) Altona (M 6.8) 7.3''.

He said: Mr. Speaker, all these amendments are essentially technical. They are to bring the French text in conformity with the English and vice versa on a number of motions, that is Motions Nos. 22 and 26.

Furthermore, these amendments reflect the fact that other pieces of legislation in draft at the time this bill was first tabled before the House have now been proclaimed, for example the Budget Implementation Act, 1995 or the CN Commercialization Act.

Therefore there is a need to bring it into conformity with what has been passed, Motions Nos. 71, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79 and 80. The final group, Motions Nos. 81 and 82, is to correct geographic references to branch lines identified in schedule IV of the bill.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 22. All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Agreed to by unanimous consent. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 26, 81 and 82 carried.

(Motions Nos. 22, 26, 81 and 82 agreed to.)

[*English*]

Mr. Zed: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there would be unanimous consent to have that vote applied to Motions Nos. 71, 74, 76 and 78.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Does the whip for the Bloc Quebecois agree?

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: Agreed.

[*English*]

Mr. Gouk: Agreed.

Mr. Althouse: Agreed.

● (1220)

Motions Nos. 71, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80 agreed to.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 23

That Bill C-14 be amended by deleting Clause 112.

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 24

That Bill C-14, in Clause 112, be amended by replacing line 20, on page 49, with the following:

''must be commercially fair and reasonable to all parties.''

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this clause has been quite contentious among the users in the grain industry. They have some difficulty with the phrase ''commercially fair and reasonable'' which clause 112 contains.

This is not something that I alone was concerned about in the House. The hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster had also attempted to move a similar motion, hence the support by my hon. friend from Lisgar—Marquette.

The problem is that the provisions of this clause are to provide an interpretive direction to the Canadian transport agency when it is setting rates or conditions of service as they apply to carriers.

Since the clause now reads ''a rate or condition of service established by the agency under this division must be commercially fair and reasonable'', a lot of the witnesses who were before the transport committee, including the prairie pools, the National Farmer's Union, the three prairie provincial governments, indicated they could not support such a provision because there was no clear definition as to what constitutes fair and reasonable.

It was also indicated that clause 113 was to serve as a general guideline for the NTA. If that were the case, this kind of guideline should be conveyed to the agency through means other than legislation.

In their submission to the transport committee the three prairie governments stated clause 113 provides yet another potential avenue for railways to delay the process and to appeal rates established by formulas for interswitching and competitive line rates.

Since a large number of the people who will be affected by this clause think it should be dropped, I am in agreement and propose this amendment to strike this clause from the legislation.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we support this amendment because of the overwhelming request for that by all the people who intervened at the committee level.

As I said earlier in debate, I do not see why the Liberals would hold committee meetings, paying for interpreters, paying for all the technicians, paying for the research people, the clerk and all the others who come before the committee if they are not prepared to listen to those who come.

One of the people who came before the committee was Mr. Ashley from the National Transportation Agency. I specifically asked him the meaning of ''commercially fair and reasonable''. His response was there is no specifically defined position since it may mean rather than it would.

This was to cause a lot of uncertainty for shippers who wish to bring their cases before the agency. It also means a great boost for the law profession, as it argues the two opposite extremes of this definition.

● (1225)

It was not there before. The vast majority of people who came before the committee do not want to see it there now. We have not seen any evidence to suggest it serves a useful purpose. We would like to see that taken out and we are very happy to add our support to the hon. member for Mackenzie in his attempts to have this removed.

Motion No. 24 ties into the same thing. It is an amendment to what is now clause 112. It is not necessarily a good amendment. It would be ideal to have the clause removed completely, in which case Motion No. 24 would simply disappear.

If the government intends to use its majority to push through a decision that was unpopular among shippers, among the majority of people who came before the board, and that was not even supported by the National Transportation Agency, with great reluctance we will probably support Motion No. 24 because it is the equivalent of losing only a finger or two when you had been threatened with losing your entire arm. I do not think it is that good. It is probably more like losing it above or below the elbow. That would be a more appropriate analogy.

Motion No. 24 does not make much improvement. If the Liberals are condescending enough to allow us to have that little crumb and will not do what is right, we will have to take whatever is left over.

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of my friends opposite, although I believe we should put this in the context of the examination that has taken place in committee.

It is true that our committee members, including opposition members, are bound to listen to and consider any position brought forward. However, this is the difference between this side of the House and the other. It is not simply the weight of people who arrive as witnesses that determine the outcome.

We do not believe we can have our role as government, as representatives of the people of Canada somehow suspended because a group of people, a large number of people, come on one side or the other. We have to analyse the merits of what is said and not simply count up the number of people who oppose or support a particular measure.

With respect to Motion No. 23, the committee did that. It considered the representations made and it came to the unanimous conclusion that this section of the bill did not require immense substantive amendment. In its view a regulatory decision must be accepted as being in good faith and must be considered fair and

reasonable. We cannot accept the intent of this motion which implies the opposite if we have any confidence whatsoever in the regulatory bodies the House sets up.

We do not support this motion, although I can assure hon. members it was carefully considered. The intent put forward is taken care of by the wording of the current bill.

With respect to Motion No. 24, the words listed are ''must be commercially fair and reasonable to all parties''. Obviously this is a government motion which we support for the following reasons. The provision gives guidance to the agency when it takes over from commercial negotiations between the parties so as to impose a rate or a level of service on the railway.

It is assumed that at the point when it takes over the commercial deliberations between the two parties have broken down. At that point the agency must have the guidance of this section, and it will. It must look at balance to ensure that when it examines the rate it will be fair and reasonable to all the parties.

Some stakeholders have said this phrase is unclear and will create excessive litigation. I do not believe so at all. In my view the average person in the public, the average person watching the televised proceedings of the House today will have pretty good idea in their own mind of what is fair and reasonable.

I think excessive use of the courts to get the lawyers to argue something which is not fair and reasonable, not the common sense meaning, would not succeed when we have a good regulatory agency such as the NTA.

● (1230)

Some litigation is inevitable with any new piece of legislation. It happened with the major transportation bills in 1967 and again 20 years later in 1987 and it will happen with this one. There will be challenges, of course. It happens every time there is a legislative change.

As to the claim that there are going to be hundreds of cases, let me just observe that the costs of litigation make that prohibitive, costs not only in terms of dollars but also in terms of time. These costs fall on all parties. Railways and shippers know that after one, two or three key cases they will have all the clarity they need from the NTA and the courts. What we will get as a result of the change are more successful commercial agreements for the rail service, which is the objective, where both parties and the entire Canadian economy wind up as the winners.

Clause 112 in the Canada Transportation Act, that the rate imposed by the agency be commercially fair and reasonable to all parties, is important and indeed vital for rail renewal in Canada which is obviously in the interests of producers and shippers as well. This will help put the required new balance into the formula for the benefit of all Canadians. Therefore, we definitely support Motion No. 24, just as we must oppose Motion No. 23.

Mr. Robert D. Nault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the amendment by my colleague from the NDP and to the support he has received from the Reform Party.

This is an important discussion. I sat on the committee and from my railway experience I can say that this is obviously something that has stacked up against the railways for a number of years. If we are going to have a successful railway industry and a transportation sector which will deliver the services required, there must be a significant balance.

In 1987 when the Tory government brought in the NTA, it brought in some regulatory changes but stacked them on top of each other. Because of that stacking there were some problems with the act which these amendments are trying to change. The rationale is that if we are going to go to a more commercially driven transportation sector, the process must be in place for it to be successful.

Most intriguing is that on the one hand the Reform Party has continually said that governments should not get in the way of free market enterprise and allow companies to make decisions on their own. We all know that commercially fair and reasonable means that agencies are given the objective of making decisions on behalf of two complainants. For instance when a shipper disputes what the railway would like to charge there must be some form of criteria laid out in order for them to make decisions and arrive at a result. The process in the amendment the minister has added which affects all parties is intended to make sure that the parties are relatively successful in Canada.

One thing the opposition has failed to bring forward so far in the discussion but which came forward in committee is that since 1987 the line rates and the cost to the railways have increased 30 per cent. In fact railway companies in this country have had significant problems in making a profit. I know the NDP are suggesting this but I am quite surprised that the Reform Party is in agreement. If they are suggesting that the government bail out the railways every time they do not make a profit, we can then go back to the regulatory system which is in place now.

● (1235)

People would go to the agency only for one reason. The agency would make a decision on whether it is fair and commercially viable for the railway to up its cost per commodity. Under the present system, that has not taken place and therefore, there have been problems with it all along. The intent of these new regulations and changes is to put the balance back where it belongs. It is the same argument with labour-management relations. If there is not a good balance then it does not work. The same thing occurred with the 1987 amendments. Of course, the grain farmers and shippers in

western Canada are opposed to this. There will be stronger, businesslike discussions and debate which will go on before they go to the agency.

I reiterate that when I was in committee not everybody agreed that this was a bad thing as the member who spoke previous to me suggested. There were different groups of thought. If we go to a commercially based industry and system and if the government stops subsidizing the railway industry, it would have to have the means and the capability to be successful. That is what this rebalancing does.

The amendment the government has proposed will prove over the years that this is good for Canada in the long run. It is not going to be successful if we use the short term arguments of the opposition. We will be revisiting this as we did in the 1920s, in the 1940s and in the 1970s and bailing out railway industries because we have not allowed them the tools to be successful. That is why this amendment is so important to the overall viability of the industry itself and of course to all of us who need to get our products to market.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question on Group No. 10?

Some hon. members: Question.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 23. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 56

That Bill C-14 be amended by adding after line 39, on page 68, the following new clause:

''146.18 On the coming into force of this Division, sections 268 to 270 of the Railway Act shall apply to the provision of passenger-train services only in the following circumstances:

(*a*) the passenger train service have been determined by the Agency to be in the public interest; or

(*b*) the Governor in Council has declared a route or segment of a route of Via Rail Canada Inc. to be a protected route.''

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead, BQ): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Are you talking about Group No. 12 or Group No. 11?

The Deputy Speaker: Group No. 12.

We considered Group No. 11 last Friday, at which time we also deferred the division on these motions.

[*English*]

Perhaps I should read the motion. It is in the same group.

Mr. Zed: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, could you advise whether we dispensed with Motion No. 24 in Group No. 10?

The Deputy Speaker: The matter of Motion No. 24 will be disposed of after the deferred vote.

Mr. Zed: Motion No. 24 as well?

The Deputy Speaker: Motion No. 23 was deferred and its rise or fall depends on what happens with Motion No. 23.

● (1240)

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 70

That Bill C-14, in Clause 185, be amended by replacing line 16, on page 86, with the following:

''(2) Sections 264 to 267, 344, 345 and 358.''

He said: Mr. Speaker, cut to its most simplistic form, this motion would require the agency to determine whether or not a passenger train service was in the public interest. It would say that the governor in council has declared a route or segment of a route of VIA Rail to be a protected route. Essentially it would require the agency to determine whether a line that carries passengers should be protected, particularly in areas such as northern Ontario where 80 per cent to 90 per cent of the customers along the route have no other access to their destinations except by rail. The basic difference is that this would be required, instead of a clause where the agency may use these as considerations.

While Motion No. 70 lists a bunch of numbers, essentially it would make the proper corrections. Since this amendment would deal with sections 268 to 270 of the Railway Act, Motion No. 70 would simply drop those numbers from the succeeding clause in the bill because that would no longer be necessary. Motion No. 70 is simply housekeeping contingent upon Motion No. 56 passing.

The question here is whether a fully deregulated system can in fact perform a function for isolated areas. I note that some witnesses from the coalition for service to northern Ontario began their commentaries by saying that they began their work over a year ago believing strongly that they would seek market driven solutions to the ills that plague transport rather than once again looking to governments to save the railroads.

This spring however the coalition reluctantly came to the conclusion that when it came to rail passenger service, services in northern Ontario were no different from rail passenger services elsewhere in the world and that specifically, northern Ontario services understood that the passengers by themselves were not in a position, nor were they willing to pay for the full cost of such rail based service. Someone other than the fee payer would be needed to pay the difference in cost. They went on to point out the amount of subsidy which has been paid to maintain some of the lines in northern Ontario. I suspect we would find subsidies being paid to maintain service in other parts of the country as well when it comes to rail passenger service.

The intent of this amendment is to recognize that there are some places which will not be able to pay for the service on a user pay basis, that those parts of the country are important and that therefore we all should pay a little bit in order to maintain access to those regions for the people who live there. That is after all what a country is supposed to be about. It was the original rail service requirement in the Constitution to link the various colonies and regions of the country together.

Even though we are going to a deregulated system, there will always be some parts of the country in which full deregulation will make absolutely no sense, such as the many communities in northern Ontario. This particular amendment would require the agency to take that into consideration before it decided whether to provide a service.

● (1245)

Mr. Robert D. Nault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak against this motion for some very obvious reasons. The NDP are still stuck about the 1920s. Its members do not seem to have been able to take a good look at what this bill intends to do.

The bill is intended to take the public interest out of a mode of transportation. It treats railroads just like truckers or shippers or anybody else. That is not to suggest that the agency is the final arbitrator of the public interest.

The legislation states that if there is something in the public interest it can be taken to members of Parliament. They are there to fight for a particular rail line if it is being subsidized. It will be a transparent subsidization that will be dealt with based on the merits of a certain region.

To send it to a non-elected body which on the one hand looks at the commercial side of issues but on the other hand what Canada's public interest is and what the beliefs are of the government of day, suggests to me that it is skewing the whole process of having successful transportation systems.

Section 48 permits the minister to enter into support agreements for the continuation of rail passenger service. From my experience and knowledge, that is what has been done in northern Ontario. I take offence at the member's suggestion that all of a sudden the government is going to leave northern Ontario in the lurch.

The other issue is one I have mentioned before. I believe the people who should deal with the public interest are those of us in the House. The agencies are there to make sure that the transportation system functions and runs properly. That is why the public interest scenario has been taken out of the bill.

I suggest to members that we get into the modern age and understand what is the intent of a rail transportation system. It is to get product to market as quickly and as cheaply as possible. Rail transportation, as far as passenger service is concerned, is a different issue and should be dealt with in a different arena which happens to be this one here.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Group No. 12, Motions Nos. 56 and 70. All those in favour of the Motion No. 70 will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare Motion No. 70 defeated on division. Therefore Motion No. 56 is defeated.

(Motions Nos. 56 and 70 negatived.)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: We now go on to Group No. 13.

Mr. Paul Mercier (for Mr. Guimond) moved:

Motion No. 57

That Bill C-14 be amended by deleting Clause 147.

Motion No. 58

That Bill C-14 be amended by deleting Clause 148.

Motion No. 59

That Bill C-14 be amended by deleting Clause 149.

Motion No. 60

That Bill C-14 be amended by deleting Clause 150.

Motion No. 61

That Bill C-14 be amended by deleting Clause 151.

Motion No. 62

That Bill C-14 be amended by deleting Clause 152.

Motion No. 63

That Bill C-14 be amended by deleting Clause 153.

Motion No. 64

That Bill C-14 be amended by deleting Clause 154.

Motion No. 65

That Bill C-14 be amended by deleting Clause 155.

● (1250)

[*English*]

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 66

That Bill C-14, in Clause 155, be amended by replacing lines 17 to 21, on page 72, with the following:

''(2) The Minister shall lay before the House of Commons a report concerning the review made under subsection (1) within thirty sitting days after the review is completed.''

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Mercier (Blainville—Deux-Montagnes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will defend Motions Nos. 57 to 65 together. They have the same purpose, are related to clauses 147 to 155 and are not intended to amend them. The sole purpose of the motions is to delete these clauses from the bill.

These provisions are back, with special benefits for Western grain transportation. We are opposed to such benefits. Let us remember that just a few days ago, in this House, the hon. member for Frontenac expressed his disagreement with the fact that dairy subsidies had been eliminated, with no compensation for dairy producers, while the same had not been the case for Western grain transportation and production.

These clauses deal with the introduction of a maximum rate and special conditions for the transportation of Western grain. These provisions were introduced in the 1987 legislation, when the Western Grain Transportation Act, the so-called WGTA, was repealed and the subsidy eliminated. But Western farmers were generously compensated, to the tune of close to $3 billion, for the elimination of the subsidy and the WGTA. In this bill, the government is reintroducing the provisions introduced in the 1987 legislation.

Western farmers have been very well compensated, unlike their counterparts in Quebec, as I have just mentioned. They should therefore be able to cope with the new conditions for transportation in the West, and to adapt to a rail system operating on a strictly commercial basis, as is the case here.

Treating Eastern and Western shippers on an unequal footing can only result in an inequitable development of the rail system by adversely affecting the resources that shippers in the Eastern network can invest. It is for these reasons that we are asking that these clauses be deleted from the bill.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a couple of short observations.

If this motion is passed, it will negatively impact on western grain transportation. If Bloc Quebecois members were to rise in the House and say that they are a regional party, interested in specific partisan points within the province of Quebec, then their motion would be perfectly understandable.

However, for them to say that they are a national opposition party, the official opposition, and vote on such partisan views is totally unacceptable. We will not be supporting this motion.

● (1255)

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the grouping of the motions includes one from me. It states that Bill C-14 on page 72, section 155, requires a review where:

> —the minister shall, in consultation with shippers, railway companies and any other persons that the Minister considers appropriate, conduct and complete a review of the effect of this Act, and in particular this Division, on the efficiency of the grain transportation and handling system and on the sharing of efficiency gains as between shippers and railway companies.

As we go further through section 155 which creates this study in the future, nothing requires the study to be made public. This motion has the effect of requiring that the results of such a study be laid before the House of Commons within 30 days of the completion of the review.

This is quite common and normal for reviews structured under acts of Parliament. I presume it was an error on the part of the government and it was simply missed. I expect that the government will be supportive of this since it has a similar kind of clause in 48 which deals with extraordinary disruptions to the system and those extraordinary disruptions are reported to the House of Commons. As well in clause 43, the minister tables the annual reports of the Canadian Transport Agency.

On such an important issue as this review of whether the whole system of deregulation has or has not worked, it is obvious that the House of Commons would and should be interested. I am sure it was simply an oversight on the part of the government and I expect the motion will be supported at the time of the vote.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 57. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The deferred division will also apply to Motions Nos. 58 to 65.

[*English*]

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I understood that you had included Motion No. 66 in the last group. It was not decided how to deal with it.

The Deputy Speaker: The question on the member's motion will only be put depending on how the vote comes out on motion No. 57.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 67

That Bill C-14 be amended by adding after line 25, on page 72, the following new Clause:

''155.1(1) After consultation with such participants as the Agency deems appropriate, the Agency shall, on or before March 31, 1997, on the basis of the most recent calendar or crop year for which appropriate costing information is available, complete a review of and determine, for that year, the volume-related variable costs of the railway companies for the movement of grain and the line-related variable costs of the railway companies for grain-dependent branch lines as designated by the Agency pursuant to section 41 of the Western Grain Transportation Act.

(2) In carrying out the review and making the determination referred to in subsection (1), the Agency shall

(*a*) take into account all costs actually incurred that are directly related to the provision of an adequate, reliable and efficient railway transportation system that will meet future requirements for the movement of grain;

(*b*) compute the costs of capital and adjust that cost by any amount it deems justified in light of the risks associated with the movement of grain;

(*c*) exclude the costs of capital and depreciation in respect of branch line assets provided under the Prairie Branch Line Rehabilitation Program and in respect of railway cars that have not been funded by the railway companies;

(*d*) exclude the costs incurred by the railway companies in providing for and holding public meetings referred to in section 56.1 of the Western Grain Transportation Act;

(*e*) reduce the additional costs directly attributable to the joint line movement referred to in sections 49 and 50 of that Act by an amount equal to the additional revenues derived by the railway companies pursuant to those sections; and

(*f*) reduce the additional costs directly attributable to the acquisition by the railway companies of railway cars for the movement of grain other than box cars or hopper cars by an amount equal to the additional revenues derived by the railway companies pursuant to sections 51 and 52 of that Act.

(3) The Agency shall, on or before March 31, 1997 and on or before March 31 of every fourth year thereafter, complete a further review and determination of costs in accordance with subsections (1) and (2) on the basis of the most recent calendar or crop year for which appropriate costing information is available.

(4) In carrying out the review referred to in subsection (1) and further review made pursuant to subsection (3), the Agency shall assess the appropriateness of the level of the contribution to the constant costs of the railway companies referred to in paragraph (*b*) of the definition ''estimated eligible costs'' in subsection 34(1) of the Western Grain Transportation Act and make recommendations to the Minister thereon.

(5) In assessing the appropriateness of the level of the contribution referred to in subsection (4), the Agency shall be guided by the following objectives:

(*a*) to ensure that the overall revenues of the railway system are adequate to meet its long-term needs; and

(*b*) to ensure that the contribution to constant cost provided by the movement of grain is fair in relation to the contribution provided by other commodities.''

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion falls neatly behind the one I spoke to just a few moments ago. It fleshes out a little more the kinds of consultations the agency should engage in when doing a review. It is for an earlier review than the one required under the previous motion. In the previous motion the review was to be completed by 1999. This sets out similar guidelines for a review, which I suppose if one was a social scientist, an economist or an an accountant, would say that this establishes the base line for the future review. It establishes the same parameters and the same requirements. It looks at the same things the review in 1999 will look at but does it on the first year of the agency's activities. We will see in 1999 whether progress is made.

• (1300)

It will be very difficult to do a proper job of the review in 1999 if there is no base study done now. This sets up the opportunity for the agency to conduct such a base study. It will clearly establish the real costs of the system as of this coming year. When we have the review in 1999 we will know whether progress has been made and whether the act is a success or a failure.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 67. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare Motion No. 67 defeated.

The House will now proceed to the taking of the divisions at the end of report stage.

Call in the members.

The deputy whip for the government party has requested a deferral until 6 p.m. tonight. Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

CIVIL AIR NAVIGATION SERVICES COMMERCIALIZATION ACT

On the Order: Government Orders:

March 14, 1996—The Minister of Transport—Second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Transport of Bill C-20, an act respecting the commercialization of civil air navigation services.

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.) moved:

That Bill C-20, an act respecting the commercialization of civil air navigation services, be referred forthwith to the Standing Committee on Transport.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to refer the civil air navigation services commercialization act to the Standing Committee on Transport. As members know, the navigation system is the network of air traffic control services, flight information services, aviation weather services and navigational aids necessary for the safe and expeditious movement of aircraft across the country.

It is customary for the underlying principle of a bill to be debated before it is referred to the committee. That debate usually occurs at second reading. However, in the case of this legislation the debate has taken place over the course of the past two years, and a very extensive debate it has been.

The government first announced it would study commercialization of the air navigation system in the 1994 budget. Hon. members debated the merits of commercialization at that time.

The not for profit model set out in the legislation was chosen by an advisory committee composed of users, unions and other stakeholders. The committee studied seven different options for commercialization. It consulted with interested parties across Canada. Many Canadians from coast to coast debated the merits of commercialization during the consultative process. I pay tribute to the energy and dedication displayed by members of the committee from all sides of the House in that exercise.

The government announced its decision to proceed with commercialization of air navigation in the 1995 budget. Hon. members were again afforded the opportunity to debate this decision. There has been already considerable debate on the underlying principle of this bill. Because so many have been given the chance to contribute there is today broad support for this piece of legislation.

• (1305)

As the House knows, Nav Canada was incorporated in May 1995 under the part II of the Canada Corporations Act for the purpose of developing, operating and maintaining the air navigation system. Highly successful negotiations have resulted in an agreement in principle between the government, Nav Canada and the involved unions. Under this agreement Transport Canada will transfer the navigation system to Nav Canada for $1.5 billion. This will make a significant contribution to the government's deficit reduction efforts, efforts to which the governor general in the speech from the throne paid tribute a few weeks ago.

Subject to the review and the approval of Parliament and the receipt of royal assent, this transfer is set for July 1 this year, a very significant date in Canadian history.

Nav Canada will receive all the assets used by Transport Canada in the provision of air navigation services. This includes land, equipment and other items required to ensure the system's continued safe and effective operation.

After the transfer Nav Canada will be responsible for providing all of the air navigation services currently provided by Transport Canada including air traffic services, community aerodrome radio services, aeronautical telecommunications, aeronautical information services and aviation weather services.

Transport Canada will be responsible for ensuring the continued safe provision of these services. The new safety regulations developed specifically to address the commercialization of the air

navigation system will be in place before the transfer happens. Transport Canada will monitor and enforce these regulations in much the same way it now does with the air carrier industry.

Nav Canada will be required to have an internal safety management program. In addition, the corporation will not be permitted to reduce the service it provides where it would jeopardize safety. Furthermore, the Aeronautics Act which establishes the regulatory framework to maintain safety in the aviation industry will always take precedence over the commercialization legislation.

I mentioned a moment ago that we have reached agreement in principle with all parties in this project. I underline this includes unprecedented support from the very people who will be most affected by commercialization, the employees working in the system itself. Their support is outlined in a memorandum of understanding between Transport Canada and the employee bargaining agents. Under this memorandum, which was signed last September, current collective agreements will continue to apply. Bargaining agents will have successor rights until Nav Canada and its employees reach their own agreements between each other.

Those who use the air navigational system have likewise endorsed this legislation, and no wonder. The government projects that costs will come down, possibly within two to three years, as private sector management principles take hold of the system, as subsidies are phased out and as the regulations governing the air navigation system are streamlined.

There are concerns of isolated communities and they are reflected in this legislation as well. The act ensures continued provision of air navigational services to northern and remote communities. It also includes a process to involve provincial and territorial governments should any service reductions be proposed by Nav Canada in the future.

Following established practice and in keeping with Nav Canada's national role, the provisions of the Official Languages Act will also apply throughout Nav Canada as if it were a federal institution.

• (1310)

Nav Canada must maintain services to humanitarian or emergency flights in the event of any work stoppage that might occur.

The commercialization of the air navigation system is a key part in the government's efforts to modernize the Canadian transportation system. It complements our other transportation initiatives including the commercialization of federal airports, seaports and harbours, the privatization of Canadian National Railways, the commercialization of ferry services and the conversion of Transport Canada's motor vehicle test centre to a government owned but contractor operated facility.

Commercialization of the air navigation system is consistent also with international trends such as those in Australia, New Zealand, Germany, South Africa and Ireland. All those countries have opted for some form of commercial air navigation during the past decade.

This transaction is one of the largest commercialization initiatives undertaken by the federal government. It is a model of the co-operation required between public and private sectors. It is also a very visible demonstration of the government's commitment to streamlining its operations and reducing its expenditures as well as its determination to stop providing services that can be better provided by the private sector.

That is a good deal for all Canadians, for taxpayers, by making a $1.5 billion contribution to reducing the federal deficit. It is good for the industry by maintaining safety while increasing the system's ability to respond to changed demands and new technologies.

It is good for users by providing more efficient and cost effective operations. It is good for the system's employees by offering them the opportunity to continue to work and contribute in a new and challenging work environment. It is also good for Nav Canada by setting the stage for it to operate one of the world's best run and safest air navigation systems.

I urge all hon. members to approve the motion to refer the civil air navigation services commercialization act directly to committee. Let us speed up the process of ensuring continued safe, efficient and flexible air navigation services for Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on Bill C-20, which is before us today. Our position is clear: we are not, opposed to the principle set out therein, that is to say providing the public with better and more affordable service. In today's difficult times, I believe this principle must be everyone's objective.

We are, therefore, in agreement with the principle of Bill C-20, but we have many questions on the way the government has drafted it, has worded the underlying principles.

For instance, it is all very well to say that Nav Canada is to be a not for profit corporation. Fine, no problem with that. Now, if we look at who will be on the board to preserve the rights of users, we find there will be 15 representatives of the aviation sector, both commercial and non commercial, the unions, the federal government, plus independent members. Here again, I find this praiseworthy.

When we thoroughly examine who those members will be, however, we find they will be only the major carriers. The small ones will not be represented, although a number of those consulted by the members of the task forces on this intended government

measure expressed a wish to see small carriers hold at least one seat on the board.

They did not get it in the legislation, for all practical purposes. Is that a sign of how things will be later on? I hope not. Surely they will have the chance to remedy this, and we will stress that point when the bill goes to committee.

• (1315)

Therefore, we support the principle, but we have some questions about the wording. We have some concerns about safety as well.

I heard the minister introduce this bill at this particular stage, and he said we would have to leave it up to the agency to check the homework the government had done to find ways to save money, and all with the aim of user safety. I do not think the bill stress safety enough. I agree that savings have to be made, but, as far as safety is concerned, I do not think anyone, especially in the field of aviation, is going to ask the government to make savings at the risk of safety.

The preamble to this bill should make the message very clear to the agency that will be managing these things in the future. Safety is vital, and, at this point in time, I think the bill is lacking in this regard. We will also make sure the matter comes up for discussion in committee.

There is the matter of employment as well. The agency, which currently manages all navigational services, has some 6,400 employees. It is therefore very important in terms of the jobs in this agency that legislation be passed by Parliament to promote or attempt to keep as many jobs as possible, while lowering costs.

I heard the minister earlier assuring the House that union members had been consulted, that there was no problem continuing labour contracts and that everything would go smoothly. Yes, for the time being. However, there is a series of collective agreements to be renegotiated between March 1997 and October 1998, I believe. If the objective is to save money, some jobs will certainly be lost in the process, whether we like it or not.

This bill should perhaps include a detailed list of what the government would like the corporation to keep. Now is the time to do it while we are reviewing this bill and setting up this organization. We as legislators and members of the House of Commons will set the guidelines, and I think it is important to do so right away.

I look forward to hearing union representatives testify about these collective agreements before the committee and explain to us how they see the future in terms of privatizing, so to speak, all civilian air navigation services. This is a very important point.

I have another point to make that is extremely important, especially for some regions. I represent the riding of Berthier—Montcalm, which unfortunately does not have a major airport although there are some on the outskirts. My colleague from Trois-Rivières, for his part, is lucky enough to have a major airport in his riding. I think it would be important, in this bill, to make the regions feel secure, to help small airports get equal, if not special, treatment because local economies are often directly or indirectly linked to transport facilities, including airports.

However, in its drive to save money, the non-profit corporation may not see things the way I do today. It will not necessarily think about the regions in deciding to eliminate or modify jobs or even to close air transport services. Now is time for us, as the legislators now considering this bill, to include in it some very specific provisions outlining what we as parliamentarians want from this non-profit corporation.

The corporation will buy this for $1.5 billion. This is all well and good, but then if there are problems or if the regions encounter some difficulties, we will not come out ahead in return for $2 billion.

• (1320)

It is time that to stand up for the regions, because they are important. They are important to Quebec and to Canada as well. Nowhere in this bill do I see any assurance that these services will be maintained.

Another important element is small air carriers. There is a direct link between small carriers and small airports. Small carriers and major carriers view things quite differently; take for example, in Part III, the air navigation charges set by NAV CANADA.

Major air carriers would like fly over fees to be lower than landing fees, which is quite normal. On the other hand, small carriers are calling for just the opposite. Why? Because they are not on as strong an economic or financial footing as major carriers.

If we want small air carriers to be able to survive in their regions, this point must be stressed in the legislation. Nowhere in Bill C-20 is this philosophy, this attitude of the government regarding small carriers reflected.

We get the distinct impression that the bill was dictated by major carriers and that it is intended to serve their interests. Granted, It is for reasons of economy and to have better service in the future. But we know that the signal was sent by the major carriers.

It is important for small airports and carriers, as well as for the regions, to send the message today, through Bill C-20.

Bill C-20 is complex because it deals with a number of issues. However, many terms used are vague. A principle of law provides that, when drafting a piece of legislation, the legislator must be clear. It uses terms that are as clear as possible, to facilitate their interpretation by the courts.

However, some expressions in this bill are quite vague, including three in clause 2(4), which will have to be improved on, hopefully in committee. There are expressions such as interested party, persons designated by the minister, demonstrable consensus and transparency. These expressions are not very clear in the bill. In the end, we do not really know the purpose of this legislation.

These things will have to be clarified in committee so that we can support this bill. In principle, we agree, but we must also end up with an act which will mean something and with which we can agree.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I will start by telling the government I am recommending to my party that we support this bill going to committee after first reading, which is contrary to our normal policy.

When the House first started the concept of sending legislation to committee after first reading, it sounded like a great idea. It was supposed to be easier. Nobody would get their back up in the House before the bill went to committee. However, we were blind sided by that because once a bill got to committee, we found that it was treated in a very autocratic manner.

I opposed Bill C-101, which later became Bill C-14, going to committee after first reading. Of course the Liberals used their voting might to ram it through. In all fairness at committee level, notwithstanding the fact there were still things in the bill which I did not like, it was dealt with in a much more open handed manner than had previously been the case.

I see no advantage in debating the bill at this point. Debate does not answer questions. It postulates each of the various positions, but it does not answer questions. I have some questions which need to be answered and this can best be done at the committee level. I would like to see the bill go to committee so we can start dealing with the real questions that have been brought up. Before I proceed, I would like to put the government on notice on some things I am concerned about and will be looking for answers to in committee.

• (1325)

I would like to comment on one of the remarks made by the member from the Bloc Quebecois. He talked about his concern that the anticipated formula will charge more for aircraft landing than it will for aircraft overflying. I should tell the hon. member that unfortunately for him, he does not seem to know very much about the air traffic control system.

An aircraft that overflies, probably in the high level air space, stays under the control of a series of sectors but in one spectrum of the air traffic control system, high level control. Where an aircraft landing may have started in high level control when it came into the air space but had to descend through low level control, then into terminal control and then ultimately airport control, there is a much greater workload, more people involved and more equipment requirements. Therefore, there is a rationale for this.

If the member has small airlines or operators who are concerned about this, if he cares to share those with me, I would be happy to talk to them. I have talked to a lot of large and small operators as well as all the other players in this and I have not found this particular opposition. It does not mean I am not open to hearing it if he has something to bring forward.

The minister in his opening remarks talked about this great windfall of $1.5 billion that is going to come in. He suggested that it will be used to reduce the deficit. If he does I just hope he keeps in mind that it is not going to come in every year. It is not going to do much for deficit control. It is just a little short term thing. The reality is that it is probably not going to be used for the deficit at all. It is probably going to be used to try to buy off some provinces where they are signing on to the new GST scheme.

I am in favour of a lot of things about the program as it stands now, for example the not for profit corporation as opposed to the crown corporation which I had the impression the government was pushing and pushing rather hard at the beginning. In fact, I could see a lot of senior bureaucrats jockeying for a high level position in the new crown corporation.

I am very pleased to see that the various users involved in this did get their act together and sat down and presented a united front to transport and did manage to bring in the not for profit concept. I am sure it will work much better than a crown corporation ever would. It is good to get it out of government hands, not only out of transport but out of the crown corporation concept as well.

Under the previous government control we have seen something known as RAMP, the radar modernization project. That has been on the go for a decade and it is now way behind schedule. It is over budget. After over 600 software applications, it is still not fully operational. That is a good example of government efficiency. I hope to see much better being done by the private sector.

A number of questions need to be answered and I will just touch on a few. One of the things the new corporation is banned from compensation for is anything the government does by way of an international agreement. I do have some concerns there. We can certainly expand on this in committee. I raised my concerns at the briefing we had on this and I will be taking this further.

I have a concern that the corporation had a very vested interest in taking this over. It is their own organization that impacts on it more than anyone else and consequently they want to have a say in this new operation. Therefore, it was incumbent upon them, one way or another, to ensure that they were successful in taking over this privatized or commercialized air traffic control entity. I have some concerns that they may have been in a situation of negotiating with a gun at their heads as several of the airport authorities did and

now find after the fact that they do not have enough capital to operate properly.

In talking about capital, the Nav Canada corporation has advertised that it is now going to go for a bond issue, seeking possibly as much as $2.5 billion to $3 billion. One question I have not heard answered is about the pension fund the government has turned over to Nav Canada for the pension earnings and positions of all those people who have current pension time earned. That pension fund has to be invested if it is going to grow and continue to have enough revenues in it to pay the pension obligations that the various employees have earned. Can that pension money be invested by Nav Canada in the Nav Canada bond issue? A lot of employees in the organization would like to know the answer to that as well.

• (1330)

I have concerns about a couple of other areas. One is northern operations. When and under what conditions can Nav Canada be required to continue to operate in the north when it seems to be no longer practical to do so? If it is ordered to continue when there is no commercial sense in being there, will there will be any compensation, and if so, in what form?

I come to the AWOS, the automated weather observation system. I assume this will come, at least partly, under the parameters of the new Nav Canada corporation. I am very concerned about how this will be handled. AWOS is a dangerous piece of equipment. It has been installed in 60 locations. The former Minister of Transport acknowledged that it has problems and decommissioned it at two airports, but still left it in 58 others.

Why are the lives of the people at two airports where it was taken out more important than the lives of the people at the other 58 airports where it is still in service? How does Nav Canada fit into the AWOS system and what are its plans for it?

There is also the matter of the Hughes contract. This new computerized concept of radar is way behind schedule, away over budget, but the government rewrote the contract so that it is now in theory back on schedule and back on budget. It did that by giving a considerable time extension to Hughes, along with an increase in what it is going to pay for a system that is going to have most of its major features removed.

The government cannot stand up and say the Nav Canada corporation loves this because it is paying $1.5 billion. These were gun at the head negotiations and someone has to speak on its behalf. I will be raising that issue in committee.

I will give the government the opportunity to prove that it is being more open minded, that it is going to follow with the intent that it stated when it brought up the original concept of going to committee after first reading. I trust that it will be as open in committee this time as it was to some degree under Bill C-101. If it is, then perhaps we will support going to committee after first reading several times in the future.

On the other hand, if the government does what it did on Bill C-89, which was to ignore all the input, all the amendments and ram the bill through the way it was, then I can assure the House that this will be the last time that we support this concept.

Mr. Glen McKinnon (Brandon—Souris, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and an honour to speak in support of this motion being referred to the Standing Committee on Transport.

As my colleague opposite mentioned, not necessarily today but also in committee, air navigation technology is changing rapidly. I have just returned from New Zealand and I met some members of Canadian companies on that tour that are involved in the transition of the New Zealand navigation system. It is attempting to privatize but also to upgrade navigation technology.

My report to the hon. member and to this House would be that things are going very well. We have agreed to stay in touch and hopefully we will get some reports on this side of the Pacific on what and how that is all unfolding.

This is a very important bill, putting into place a crucial element of the government's overall strategy to modernize Canada's navigation and transportation system. It comes at a time when governments around the world are getting out of the business of providing services and concentrating instead on setting policy and enforcing safety. That has to be of paramount concern to all of us in this House.

• (1335)

It also comes at a time when governments are recognizing that they can no longer meet all of the needs of modern air navigation. Many user groups, such as the Air Transport Association of Canada, the Canadian Air Line Pilots Association and the Canadian Air Traffic Control Association, have all said that the current government operated air navigation system does not meet the needs of the aviation community and its expanding role.

There is no doubt that the time for a government operated civil air navigation system has passed. Once there was a need for governments to be involved in every aspect of air transportation. The present system had its beginnings in wartime when in 1944 member countries of the International Civil Aviation Organization, ICAO, signed the Chicago convention. Article 28 of that convention called on all members to provide airports, radio services,

meteorological services and other air navigation facilities to facilitate international air navigation.

In Canada, the Department of Transport, known today as Transport Canada, assumed responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the principal airports and the non-military air navigation system. For over 50 years the department met the responsibility of developing aviation facilities and, in particular, providing air navigation services to civil aviation.

Starting in the seventies and continuing today, governments in the developed world began to reconsider their involvement in providing services that could be better provided by the private sector. As a consequence, many government began to reduce their involvement in various sectors both as regulators and as owners.

With government downsizing and public sector restraint in full swing both here and in other countries, there is no longer any justification for a government operated air navigation system, just as there is little justification for governments to own railroads or airports. The aviation sector is mature. It no longer needs extensive government involvement to grow and prosper.

Canada has undertaken its review of the role of government in the aviation industry. As a result the federal government has eliminated much of the economic regulation of commercial aviation. It has divested itself of ownership in the airline industry and in the aircraft manufacturing industry and is moving away from operating airports.

The government's review of the air navigation system showed a number of reasons to change: the present system is not flexible enough to respond to changes in demand, and greater efficiency, lower costs and increased accountability are needed.

Safety, once seen as the justification for state control and management of air navigation systems, is now viewed as an integral part of managing the system. This, combined with the increasing fiscal pressures on governments, has led to the conclusion in Canada and around the globe that the system can be run along commercial lines, subject to appropriate government regulation.

Consequently, the government has acted decisively to alter its role in providing air navigation services. The current bill provides the legal means to transfer Canada's civil air navigation system from Transport Canada to Nav Canada, a private non-profit corporation, for $1.5 billion.

Canada, in its leadership role in the aviation industry, is at the forefront of many changes. Many countries, such as New Zealand, Australia, Ireland, Austria, Portugal, Germany and Great Britain have already commercialized their air navigation systems. This bold move has been carefully planned and developed to meet Canada's unique needs in aviation requirements. The separation of government will provide the commercial freedom necessary to meet customer needs and increase system efficiency.

The challenge however is to be able to maintain a functional system in the remote parts of Canada that are lacking in some of the resources required to keep a safety component very reliable.

Nav Canada, as a user oriented corporation, will be able to respond efficiently to the needs of the system with effective government regulation and maintain the high, established level of safety. Transport Canada is sharing the experience gained in this project with other countries, departments and agencies. Its experience will serve as a model both nationally and internationally. The commercialization of the air navigation system is a key element of the government's comprehensive strategy to modernize and prepare for the next century.

The commercialization of the air navigation system will provide many important benefits: first, for taxpayers, by making a $1.5 billion contribution to reducing the federal deficit. This was the amount that the previous speaker mentioned. Second, for the industry, by maintaining safety while increasing the system's ability to respond to changing demands and new technologies; third, for users, by providing more efficient and cost effective operations; fourth, for the system's employees, by offering them the opportunity to continue to contribute to a new and challenging work environment; and fifth, for Nav Canada, by setting the stage for it to operate one of the world's best run and safest air navigation systems.

• (1340)

I ask that all members support the motion to refer the bill to the Standing Committee on Transport before second reading. This initiative has already been the subject of extensive consultation across the country, as well as internationally. It is in the interests of all Canadians that we move forward with due speed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Mercier (Blainville—Deux-Montagnes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, with respect to Bill C-20, I would like to begin by pointing out the scope of its proposed reforms.

Air navigation services are delivered via seven regional control centres. There are 44 control towers and 86 flight information stations. It is important to point out the human element: 6,400 people are currently involved in supporting the air navigation system.

There is a very general agreement in favour of commercialization, and we too are in favour. It was recommended by independent studies, a departmental task force and the October 1992 Royal Commission on National Passenger Transportation, and supported by those working in the field, air carriers, private operators, the air controllers' union and so on.

I shall begin with a word about the corporation created by the bill. The bill provides the framework for handing over Transport Canada's civil air navigation services to NAV CANADA, a not for profit corporation incorporated under Part II of the Canada Corporations Act. This is a follow up to the agreement in principle signed December 8, 1995 by Transport Canada and NAV CANADA, selling the air navigation system for $1.5 billion.

The fact that this corporation will be one of a kind places it in a monopoly situation of concern to us. The federal government will need to monitor its performance, but abuse of monopolistic power must be avoided.

The new corporation must ensure that those with little if any representation on the board, such as the small carriers or the general aviation sector, are not discriminated against. New companies must not be at a disadvantage either. It would appear at first glance that NAV CANADA has not respected the wishes of the small carriers, for only the big ones are represented on the board. There is, for instance, no representation of the Association québécoise des transporteurs aériens.

In committee we will be proposing amendments relating to better safeguards against arbitrary power and to maintaining services to outlying areas.

Where safety is concerned, Transport Canada has established security regulations and standards that will apply to the new corporation, and operations will be monitored to ensure compliance. It would be important, however, on a more general level, to ensure that public safety takes priority over profits. The bill does not include any safety standards. It would be important to include in the preamble the point that safety must take precedence over profits, and that passenger safety will always come first, ahead of any commercial considerations, whenever the two are in conflict.

• (1345)

We must also ensure that those who will be designated to implement the legislation will not be chosen arbitrarily. We are told it will be established by the minister, but on whose recommendation? Nobody is saying. Who should be consulted? Whose advice should be taken into account? Nobody is saying. For our part, we want to be sure there will be no political patronage in the selection of employees and that the more active union leaders will not be left on the shelf because of their activity, and we will make amendments in this regard.

In addition, some changes will have to be made to the legislation in favour of remote areas, whose economic performance, naturally, could be considered less significant.

The minister can designate northern or remote services which will be given special treatment under the legislation. That is excellent, but we feel there must be a list first approved by the standing committee of the House, which will hold public hearings on this. Accordingly, small airports such as Sept-Îles or Rouyn-Noranda will be able to make representations if they need to to protect their interests. It would be just too easy for the new corporation to cut services for reasons of profitability in remote areas.

Still on the subject of remote areas, the legislation provides that the corporation may, despite rejection of the proposal by a provincial government, change or close northern or remote services. This is not acceptable. It must take the opinions of the provinces into account.

Big and small carriers do not share the same opinions on charges for air navigation services, as my colleague for Berthier—Montcalm pointed out a few minutes ago. Major carriers want the cost of overflights to be less than the cost of landing, and the small carriers want exactly the opposite. In view of the importance of regional transport in the regions and in Quebec, we cannot agree with the way the legislation deals with this.

On the other hand we agree with the principle in Part IV on employees. At first glance, there is no employer-employee problems. The working conditions will be the same as those in the public service for the life of the collective agreement, which terminates on a date set by regulation, as approved by cabinet.

However, with the closures anticipated and the cuts in service, there will probably be lay-offs in a few years. It would therefore be appropriate to have the union leaders appear before the committee, in order to get their opinion on the matter.

In conclusion, we agree with the legislation in principle and will support it if the amendments we will propose in the spirit I have just described are considered. Furthermore, we do not oppose its being sent to committee.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of this motion to refer Bill C-20 to the Standing Committee on Transport before second reading. Before I proceed, I want to speak to the comments made by the hon. member for Kootenay West—Revelstoke in which he made reference to ramming something through. I understand his frustration but it is with democracy and not with this place.

In any event, the bill carries out the decision taken by the government as announced in the February 25 federal budget to commercialize the air navigation system. It provides for the legal means to transfer Canada's civil air navigation system from

Transport Canada to a private, not for profit corporation called Nav Canada. I would like to take the opportunity to reiterate to the House that safety will not be compromised with that transfer.

Canada's civil air navigation system is a network of air traffic control services, flight information services, aviation weather services and air navigation aids that allow for the safe and efficient movement of aircraft. This system handles more than six million aircraft movements a year. Its annual budget is about $550 million for operations and maintenance and $250 million for capital improvements for a total budget of some $800 million.

• (1350)

Transport Canada has managed this system well for more than 50 years during which time air travel and air navigation have modernized becoming evermore complex and evermore necessary. Times have changed and governments everywhere are finding it increasingly difficult and less necessary to operate transportation systems.

Transport Canada's mission is to provide for a safe, environmentally sound national transportation system that is consistent with a competitive economy and the achievement of Canada's goals. However, the new Transport Canada is moving away from operating the system to focus on setting the standards and regulating for safety and security. The department has been receiving strong messages from many quarters that the air navigation system needs improvement. It is unlikely these improvements can ever be made if the system stays under the government's wing.

The potential of commercialization to improve efficiency and maintain the safety of the air navigation system has long been recognized. In 1992 the Royal Commission on National Passenger Transportation recommended commercialization of the system.

Nevertheless, change is always unsettling. Some may feel that as government withdraws from operating the system, safety may be compromised. Nothing could be less true. None of the changes that are being made to Transport Canada and the Canadian transportation system will ever compromise the department's commitment to safety. Safety and security will always come first and Transport Canada will continue to ensure that the high standards of safety and security that Canadians have come to expect will in fact be maintained.

Safety was identified as the highest priority when commercialization was first considered in early 1994. Transport Canada's position was then, and continues to be now, that operations under Nav Canada must be as safe as the current system. This is not just a case of good intentions. When it comes to the air navigation system, safety is an integral part of its management.

Nav Canada will be responsible for providing all the air navigation services currently provided by Transport Canada. Aviation safety and the safety of the public will remain the responsibility of the Minister of Transport. This responsibility will be exercised through the Aeronautics Act and regulations made under that act. To do so the department is establishing safety regulations and standards that will be monitored, audited and enforced in much the same way as the department regulates air carriers, airports, aircraft manufacturers and other commercial aviation enterprises.

The new regulations developed specifically to address the commercialization of the air navigation system will form part VIII of the Canadian aviation regulations. Under these regulations Nav Canada will be required to have an internal safety management program. In addition, the corporation will not be permitted to reduce the services it provides if doing so would jeopardize safety. The Minister of Transport has the authority to direct Nav Canada to provide services in the interests of safety.

Consultation on the new regulations has begun through the Canadian Aviation Regulations Advisory Committee. They have been published in part I of the *Canada Gazette* and should be enacted into law early this year.

The Aeronautics Act which establishes the regulatory framework to maintain safety in the aviation industry will always take precedence over the Civil Air Navigation Services Commercialization Act. Far from compromising safety, the new arrangement is our guarantee that Canada will continue to have the safe, effective, modern air navigation system it needs.

One of the reasons for commercializing the air navigation system is to ensure that the system has the resources it needs to continue to provide the highest level of safety possible. There is no doubt we must have a modern air navigation system to ensure the safe and efficient movement of aircraft, whether domestic or international, in Canadian managed air space.

• (1355)

Governments cannot respond effectively to the modern needs of air navigation. The downsizing of government services and public sector restraint is incompatible with the dynamic needs of the air industry. Outside of government the system will be able to operate more efficiently. By increasing the system's ability to respond to changing demands and new technologies, we will help to ensure its continued safe operation. That means the system will have the resources it needs to provide the best system possible and, with the federal government overseeing safety and security, that means the safest system possible.

In closing, I ask that all members support the motion to refer Bill C-20 to the Standing Committee on Transport before second reading.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Motion agreed to and bill referred to a committee.)

The Speaker: It being almost 2 p.m., we will now proceed to Statements by Members.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS CONNECTIONS '96

Mr. Larry McCormick (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to invite my colleagues in the House to attend Business Connections '96.

Built around a change and technology theme, Business Connections '96 promises to be a very exciting all day event. This initiative promotes rural economic development, helping to secure our future and guarantee the quality of life we value into the next century. From agricultural research on the ground to the information highway in cyberspace, my constituents are involved.

Over 50 exhibitors will display their products and services, representing micro businesses, high tech, retail, service based and large industries. Keynote speakers and panellists will share their knowledge and experience.

Sponsors include Gibbard Furniture Shops, in its 160th year, Celanese Canada, Goodyear Canada, Lafarge Canada, Municipal Trust, Scotiabank and Strathcona Paper. We have also gained the endorsement of four area chambers of commerce.

I am especially pleased that the Secretary of State for Science, Research and Development will join us to discuss science and technology opportunities.

We hope that everyone will come to Napanee on April 13. I guarantee them an informative and exciting event.

* * *

EQUALITY

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Okanagan Centre, Ref.): One Canada. All of its citizens equal before the constitution. Mr. Speaker, it is almost too late to assure that equality is given to all Canadians.

The Nisga'a deal signed on Friday will create two classes of Canadians: one class has its right to own land protected by the Constitution, the other does not. One has its right to commercial fishing guaranteed by the constitution, the other does not. It is not a constitutional right for non-aboriginals to own land. If it is a constitutional right for aboriginals to own land, so it should be for all Canadians.

I appeal to the Prime Minister not to sign any binding agreement now or in the future which would confer rights upon groups of Canadians based on race. It is urgent because creating two classes of Canadians carries with it the seed of the destruction of Canada's peace and order. We implore the Prime Minister, on behalf of our children, grandchildren and ourselves, not to finalize as it currently stands the Nisga'a deal.

* * *

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have more comments from a grassroots group in Peterborough riding which is working to strengthen Canada. The group writes:

> One of the problems—is that people not knowing each other, find it easy to accept the stereotypes provided for them by manipulators whose steadfast goals are destructive for us all. Yet in Montreal, English, French and other ethnic groups work together with a good degree of harmony because they are face to face. Social intimacy flies in the face of stereotypic attitudes.
>
> We, and others like us, must extend some kind of invitation to our fellow Canadians in Quebec that will bring us closer to that face to face ideal. Whether that can be accomplished on the small scale by inviting francophone acquaintances from various rural and urban areas to our homes—or—to initiate chain letters which will attempt to establish an accord with those in Quebec who feel alienated from the rest of the country, we do not know. We do know, however, we must act to dispel such destructive stereotyping on the part of so many English and French Canadians.

* * *

● (1400)

WORLD FIGURE SKATING CHAMPIONSHIPS

Mr. Rex Crawford (Kent, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, congratulations to the ice dancing team of Victor Kraatz and Shae-Lynn Bourne for winning the bronze medal Friday night at the World Figure Skating Championships in Edmonton.

My riding is very proud of Shae-Lynn, whose home is Chatham, Ontario. The skating pair won Canada's first medal in ice dance since 1988. Years of dedication and commitment to training hard in their sport resulted in a medal.

Shae-Lynn stated: ''It is such an amazing feeling inside that grabs you at that moment when you know you are going to be standing on the podium watching your flag go up. We are both thrilled we did it in Canada''.

The entire nation is justifiably proud of the Kraatz-Bourne team, and special praise to Shae-Lynn from all her friends and family in Chatham and Kent county.

* * *

TAIWAN

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the House should recognize and congratulate Taiwanese President Lee Teng-hui for his victory in Saturday's first democratic presidential election in Taiwan.

This event is the culmination of a series of democratization initiatives in Taiwan going back several years. All the political parties, the candidates and the electorate deserve praise for this democratic success.

Four weeks ago China began conducting military exercises near the island of Taiwan in an attempt to influence the outcome of this election. Defiant voters were not intimidated by Beijing's threats to destabilize their democratic initiative.

I congratulate the people in Taiwan and their political parties which now collectively take responsibility for their future and for Taiwan's relationship with Beijing and other countries in the region and around the world.

* * *

BYELECTIONS

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today byelections are being held in six ridings across the country. In two of those ridings I am surprised the Liberals have the nerve to run candidates.

Excess power from Churchill Falls sells in the U.S. for $800 million a year, but Labrador and Newfoundland gets only $20 million of it. The trans-Labrador highway is in a deplorable state and needs $75 million to rebuild it. That is less than 10 per cent of the money lost every year due to Liberal inaction.

In Etobicoke North the Liberals cancelled the Pearson development contract which cost metro Toronto ridings like Etobicoke North 1,140 airport jobs, 560 direct off airport jobs and 3,000 indirect jobs as well as 14,000 person years of construction work.

The voters have a chance to set things right. The Liberals should hang their heads in shame and the voters in Labrador and Etobicoke North should hang the Liberals out to dry.

CANADA POST

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today there is a byelection in the constituency of the former minister of external affairs. This reminds us that he is now head of Canada Post Corporation.

Mr. Ouellet inherits a Canada Post plagued with service problems. Cheques mailed from Saskatchewan to Edmonton take more than two weeks, resulting in late payment and interest penalties. I get reports of Christmas parcels still not delivered after six weeks. Photos sent two years ago are still not received.

A weekly newspaper goes from Tisdale, Saskatchewan to Swan River, Manitoba each week. The trip takes three hours by car, 20 hours by dog team, 25 hours on skis, 60 hours on foot and 288 hours by Canada Post.

May Mr. Ouellet find a technique to decrease the delivery time faster than he increases postal rates.

* * *

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Quebecois was amazed to learn that there is no budget for the one million flag operation launched by the heritage minister, and that it does not come under any existing official program of the department. Nonetheless, 10 telephone operators are working on this project and are taking orders from Canadians.

While the CBC's budgets are blithely being slashed, with 1,000 additional layoffs planned, while cuts to the National Film Board will result in the dismissal of some 150 creators, it is disgusting that the department has introduced a propaganda initiative without any advance idea of the cost.

Are the people of Canada and Quebec entitled to know the costs associated with the Deputy Prime Minister's propaganda? A rhetorical question, obviously.

* * *

● (1405)

[*English*]

FORD WORLD CURLING CHAMPIONSHIPS

Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Ford World Curling Championships are taking place in Hamilton this week. All of Hamilton is pleased to be hosting this event. We all extend our welcome to the athletes and the visiting spectators.

Thirteen countries are represented at the championships. Along with Canada, there are also teams from Japan, Australia, the United States, Scandinavia, England, Scotland and Europe.

Canada is represented by two teams, one led by Marlin Bodogh of St. Catharines, Ontario, and the other led by Jeffrey Stoughton of Winnipeg.

In the previous world championships the Canadian men came first and the Canadian women came second.

The competition has been very exciting so far. Both Canadian teams have won their first three games and are in first place.

Curling is now an Olympic medal sport and the order of finish in these championships will help determine which teams attend the 1998 winter Olympic games in Nagano, Japan.

I wish the members of the Canadian rinks the best of luck and continued success in the competition.

* * *

[*Translation*]

LOTBINIÈRE-OUEST CIEL

Mr. Jean Landry (Lotbinière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I pay tribute to the CIEL de Lotbinière-Ouest, a job initiative centre in Lobtinière-Ouest. This non profit organization, run by volunteers, is concerned with job creation for those aged 18-40. The centre has 376 members, and is composed of individuals and companies. Its activities take in 12 municipalities in my riding.

The 29 venture capital loans made in 1995 totalled $62,500. At December 31, 1995, there were 33 active loans.

Since its inception 10 years ago, this organization has brought about the creation or consolidation of 221 jobs in my riding of Lotbinière. I am proud of this initiative and congratulate the centre on a job well done.

* * *

[*English*]

THE LATE CHARLES JOSEPH CLARK

Ms. Shaughnessy Cohen (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, earlier this month Windsor lost one of its greatest citizens, Charles Joseph Clark.

Recently inducted into the Order of Canada, Charlie Clark was a fine lawyer, a community activist, a philanthropist and a businessman. He was indeed a great community leader, one to whom Windsor turned for counsel on many occasions such as when the local CBC station was threatened, when the casino became a reality and when we wanted to preserve our unique cultural and natural heritage.

Charlie Clark was also a mentor to many young lawyers, including the three current members of Parliament from Windsor.

I know all members will join me in remembering a great Windsorite, Charles J. Clark, and in offering our most sincere condolences to his family.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FAMILY VIOLENCE

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Gatineau a woman died of injuries inflicted by her attacker. Family violence is a crime just like any form of aggression against a stranger. Gone are the days when society as a whole preferred not to get involved in or pass judgment on cases of violence to women or children, under the pretext that it was none of the neighbours' business.

The major stakeholders in our judicial system are now more aware and better trained to step in in situations of family violence. When such a tragedy takes place, it is of concern to our entire society, and we cannot remain unmoved.

Henceforth, we must work on lowering our tolerance for violence and increasing our understanding and efforts to help those who are suffering and have lost hope.

* * *

[*English*]

REFORM PARTY

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I received an encouraging fax from a Canadian who confirmed the principles of why I am here:

> I once supported the Liberals until I read Pierre Trudeau's remarks that Liberals will do anything, say anything and promise anything if it will get them elected. I believed him then and even more now. Just look at how they promised to kill the GST and broke that promise.
>
> I supported the Conservatives but they abandoned me when they decided to become a mirror image of the Liberals. I flirted with the New Democratic Party but gave up when it became obvious the NDP is merely a collection of special interest and radical fringe groups.
>
> Then I gave up on politics until I discovered the Reform Party and found a group of people like myself who believe our nation's future extends far beyond the next election.
>
> From the concept of equality for all Canadians to the concept of a secure financial future for me and my children and their children yet to come, and every issue and concern that lies between, I draw my reasons for supporting and voting Reform.
>
> Reform has seen the future and, unlike the three old-line parties, is living in the present. That is why I am a Reformer''.

• (1410)

BYELECTIONS

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Thunder Bay—Atikokan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party's response to the government's national unity proposals were nothing more than the same old tired decentralization arguments spewed by right wing pontificators everywhere.

The danger of Reform's approach is that it would leave Canada without a sense of common national purpose.

The Reform Party's fifty plus one referendum standard revealed its hidden agenda for separation. Upon realizing it could never lead a federal government with Quebec as part of Canada, it opted for this agenda. Through separation Reform hoped its future electoral fortunes would brighten.

Voters in today's byelections in Quebec, Ontario and Newfoundland will not be fooled by Reform's devious tactics. Today the voters will say bye, bye to the Reform Party.

* * *

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York—Simcoe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday a woman in the region of Gatineau who was a victim of abuse for many years died as a result of a stabbing. Subsequently her husband has been brought into police custody.

This case, like many others, once again brings to our attention the unfortunate tragedy of domestic violence. Family violence is a crime that affects all of us. It is a serious crime in which the police often hesitate to intervene, as the crimes often occur behind closed doors in the family home.

A tragedy such as this which occurred in Gatineau followed many years of abuse. We must bring the problem out from behind closed doors and into the forefront of public consciousness.

We must remain vigilant against these crimes against women, our children and our families. Fear and violence have no place in Canadian society.

I call on all members of the House to speak out against this serious problem and look at ways to rid society of domestic violence.

* * *

KREVER COMMISSION

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Krever inquiry into tainted blood was a victory for Canadians who wanted a safe, secure blood system.

The commission has spent countless hours receiving testimony under oath. There have been serious findings of wrong doing: untreated blood products used by the public when safer products were available; tainted donors not turned away in a timely fashion; tested infected blood products used when alternatives were available.

Other countries have made similar mistakes and have apologized in addition to making immediate corrections. Canada's reaction to individuals being held personally responsible is very different with court challenges that could literally stop Krever's final report.

If Krever has found criminal behaviour relating to blood safety, he must report it to the Minister of Health and to Canadians. Let Krever speak.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CENTRE LA MOSAÏQUE

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for almost 11 years now, the Centre d'action bénévole La Mosaïque, in LeMoyne, has been actively involved in the community.

The centre just opened a library for seniors who enjoy reading but are not mobile. Volunteers will bring to their door the books selected by these people.

La Mosaïque also took another initiative, in co-operation with local restaurant owners. Meals will be offered on a weekly basis, at a very low price, to seniors and volunteers accompanying them.

The idea is to provide an opportunity for seniors to go out and also develop healthy eating habits.

Congratulations to the Centre La Mosaïque for its worthwhile initiatives.

* * *

[*English*]

TAXATION

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have said that reform of the Income Tax Act is necessary, and I agree.

Some argue a simple system such as a flat tax or a single tax is the solution. Although simplicity may be desirable, the fact remains that the only thing simple about a flat or simple tax approach is that it simply reduces taxes for high income earners and increases taxes for low and middle income earners.

The real objectives of tax reform should be to ensure the system is fair and equitable for all Canadians.

• (1415)

As an example, the child care expense deduction should be converted to a tax credit. Under the current system the value of the deduction favours high income earners whereas a tax credit is of

equal value to all families. This kind of progressive change would enhance fairness and equity for all Canadian families.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last week, while talking about CBC funding, the Deputy Prime Minister said, and I quote: ''What makes it difficult, every time we seek new avenues of funding, is the block we run into, the Bloc Quebecois''.

I would like to remind the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage that the Bloc Quebecois is the only party fighting for maintaining the mandates of the CBC, the NFB and Telefilm Canada, but that we are opposed to a CBC tax.

My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. As the CBC faces cuts amounting to $150 million over two years, could the heritage minister finally tell us how she intends to go about funding this crown corporation?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to see that the Leader of the Opposition is open to new ways of funding the CBC. What is unfortunate is that the Leader of the Opposition's open-mindedness was not reflected by his own critics who, the day after the Juneau report was tabled, rejected any form of funding other than the current parliamentary appropriations.

If the Leader of the Opposition is willing, I, of course, will work in co-operation with the Minister of Finance to try to find new ways of funding the CBC in the long term and I would expect the Bloc Quebecois to support our efforts instead of blocking them as they have done so far.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Canadian Heritage should remember that, not so long ago, her predecessor's careless answers hurt his career.

My question is extremely serious and if we had an answer once and for all, we would move on to something else. The president of the CBC clearly stated—and he was the second president to do so—that they could no longer absorb $150 million in cuts without the corporation's mandate being affected. Yet the minister asserts that the CBC's mandate will be maintained.

Our question is very simple and quite legitimate and it deserves an answer: How will the minister allow the CBC to carry out its mandate if she cuts another $150 million?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, talking about careless remarks, it is not the government who, the day after the Juneau report was tabled, dismissed all funding recommendations. It was the Bloc Quebecois who immediately refused to consider any of the long term funding alternatives as proposed in the Juneau report.

I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that we in government are now considering all long term funding alternatives for the CBC. I hope that the Leader of the Opposition will at least lend his support, even though his former and current critics have not endorsed any new funding methods.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage that what we formally object to is the creation by the government of a new tax that would make Canadians pay twice for the CBC. We object to this. I understand that she is looking for ways to fund the CBC, but in the meantime the corporation itself is facing some serious problems. The minister should understand this.

This is not a trick question, but a request for information. How can the minister impose another $150 million in cuts without changing the mandate of a crown corporation which, at least according to its last two presidents, is unable to do what is required of it? What does she intend to do? It is her responsibility, and we want an answer. Is it possible?

• (1420)

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I see that the Leader of the Opposition still rejects the new funding methods recommended in the Juneau report, as they were by both the former and the current Bloc critics.

That said, when I work with the Minister of Finance on a new funding alternative, it is precisely so that we can achieve one of the major objectives in the Juneau report, namely the long term funding of organizations such as the NFB, Telefilm Canada and the CBC.

I think it is unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition refuses to consider new funding mechanisms that could in the long term, as proposed in the Juneau report, eliminate the need for an annual budget review of the CBC.

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to set the record straight. The Bloc Quebecois recognizes, and joins with others in recognizing, the importance of the CBC, the NFB and Telefilm Canada as cultural institutions, as set out in the Juneau report. Second, we also recognize the report's insistence on the need to settle the long term funding issue.

The Bloc is clearly opposed to a CBC tax being levied. Last week, the minister herself told me in this House that she was against imposing a CBC tax, but at the same time she is establishing a cultural production fund. My question is clear: What is the source of this cultural funding? Where will she get the money?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the idea put forward by the member opposite, to support the recommendations made in the Juneau report while not rejecting any new method of funding, as the Juneau report proposed, is typical of the politics practised by the Bloc Quebecois by constantly talking from both sides of their mouths. In fact, we agree with the Juneau report that long term funding should be provided through instruments other than parliamentary appropriations. And that is precisely what my colleague, the Minister of Finance, and myself are looking into right now.

This lack of open-mindedness on the part of the Bloc Quebecois is unfortunate.

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is quite simple, we are asking the minister to tell us what scenarios are being contemplated and what she is working on in terms of where the funds will come from. Given that both the past and the current presidents of the CBC agree that an extra $150 million in cuts will affect the CBC's mandate, are we to understand from the minister's response, since she stated that the mandate would not be modified, that the CBC will be allowed to run deficits, to be absorbed by the consolidated revenue fund?

[*English*]

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that I am not surprised the Bloc Quebecois is speaking out of both sides of its mouth.

The day the Juneau report came out, one of its important messages was that for the survival and the growth of the CBC, alternate methods of financing must be sought in the long term. That is precisely the work I am now undertaking with my colleague, the Minister of Finance.

What is sad is that a party that claims to support public broadcasting has turned its back on looking at new and innovative methods of funding such public broadcasting.

* * *

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, across the province of Ontario, Liberal MPs have been trying to convince their constituents that what they really meant was harmonizing the GST, not eliminating it.

There is only one problem with that. Canadians still have copies of the Liberal campaign pamphlets from 1993. Two weeks ago the member for Niagara Falls said he did not promise to scrap the GST but his election flyer has just surfaced from 1993 and he promised in it to fight to eliminate the GST.

My question is this. Which Liberal is telling the truth? The Liberal candidate for Niagara Falls or the Liberal MP for Niagara Falls?

● (1425)

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the position of Liberals throughout the campaign and the position of the government have been very clear. It was stated in the red book on page 22. It is conceivable that members of the Reform Party have not read the red book. I would suggest they do so as it would give them very good insight into what the country is all about.

In 1990 the leader of the Reform Party said that he would rip the GST out. Was he speaking for the Reform Party? Was he speaking for the Reform when he said it could not be repealed immediately because it would increase the deficit? Was he speaking for the Reform Party when he commended the government on its attempt to harmonize the tax with the provinces?

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yes we did say that and we still say that it should be phased out. We need to cut spending, that is the problem. We stand by that.

Liberal candidates across Ontario ran on the promise of killing, scrapping and abolishing the GST. Once they were safely in power they broke that promise. Now they are busy trying to bury the evidence.

After the minister of immigration gets through shredding her predecessor's pamphlets, there are 98 other ridings of Liberal propaganda and broken promises for her to get to work on with the shredder.

I ask the Prime Minister this question. Why did the Liberals break their promise on the GST? How many other Ontario Liberals are going to have to start shredding their campaign pamphlets?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every Liberal who ran in the last campaign ran on a platform that was very successful, which was the red book. The promise is on page 22. As it was tabled in the House, it is available to every member of Parliament. If some members do not want to read it there is not much I can do about that.

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, what amazes me is that when the Liberals fall back on the red book now, the member from Niagara Falls, in his local newspaper last week, said: ''I guess I could say that we were a little over-zealous and little over-anxious. I guess you could say it has haunted me''. Those are words from a Liberal MP, not me.

I ask the Prime Minister this. How many Liberal MPs has the Prime Minister haunted with his promise to scrap, kill and abolish the GST and then totally turn around on that? It makes no sense.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me repeat once again that, in 1990, the leader of the Reform Party said very clearly, when he was trying to get the member for Beaver River elected, that he was going to rip the GST out, to get rid of it. One year later, he wanted to keep it. Now, his position is exactly the same as ours in the red book, in that he wants to replace the GST with a harmonized tax. It took him three years to get to where we have been since the very beginning.

[*English*]

The Reform Party can go through this charade time after time on what the government's position is. The government's position has been very clear. The difficulty the Reform Party has is that it is caught by its own contradictions year after year on the GST, on social programs, on the commitment to bring in a new budget, on how fast it would reduce the deficit, on medicare and on virtually everything.

There is no consistent philosophy from Reform Party members. They only have one objective which is to confuse. The only people they confuse are themselves.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

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

The CBC's 1994 annual report tells us that the English network's budget was $750 million, compared to $275 million for its French counterpart. Yet, the two networks more or less have the same number of viewers and, according to their presidents, production costs are the same for both.

• (1430)

Since the Minister of Heritage agrees with the Bloc Quebecois that taxpayers should not have to be taxed, can she tell this House whether her magical formula to fund the CBC will allow her to eliminate the discrimination between the two networks and ensure that both cultures are treated on the same foot in this country?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's statement is wrong. Canadians currently do pay taxes to support the CBC.

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the minister missed my question, and such a good question too.

Since the Juneau report proposes, among other measures, to decentralize CBC's French language production and take it to regions outside Quebec, will the Minister of Heritage confirm that, to avoid a weakening of French language television in Canada, this recommendation will not be implemented, unless she minister allocates new funds to fund it?

[*English*]

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I answered the member. The premise of her question is false. What she said on Radio-Canada was that Canadians would not be taxed. In fact, Canadians are currently being taxed to the tune of some $900 million, specifically for the function of Radio-Canada.

What was recommended in the Juneau report was a different method which would see reductions of parliamentary spending being taken up by a more direct tax.

[*Translation*]

It takes money to promote CBC's activities in both official languages. Unfortunately, the Bloc Quebecois flatly rejects, without even giving it any consideration, any new funding method that would ensure, in the long term, the promotion of French and English programming from coast to coast.

* * *

[*English*]

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago when Brian Tobin was in town he told reporters that he was here to pick Ottawa' pocket. I would encourage the finance minister to check his wallet because now we hear that $100 million has disappeared out of their super slush fund that is being used to pay off provinces so that they will harmonize with the GST.

Is the minister so desperate to get the provinces to sign on to his harmonization proposal which, of course, is a breaking of their election promises, that he is willing to pay them off even when we have a $600 billion debt? And where is he getting the money to do that?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have been having discussions with a number of provinces which essentially recognize that it would be good for their small and medium sized business communities and their consumers if the GST were replaced with a new single tax.

We can go back and forth as the member plays games. Is the Reform Party adopting a fourth position? Is it reneging on the

position it stated in the finance committee that it sought to have a single tax and that it recognized that it would be a very difficult negotiation?

What is the Reform Party's position? Are you in favour of a single tax?

The Speaker: Sometimes the hon. minister forgets me. Please do not forget me.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on national television the government, the minister, the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister promised to scrap, to kill, to abolish the GST. Those are their words. If they hang on them, it is their fault.

The Liberals are not willing to create jobs by cutting premiums from the $10 billion UI surplus but they are willing to try anything, including spending money they do not have to save the Deputy Prime Minister's job.

Why is the finance minister attempting to salvage his government's pathetic attempt to fudge on their election promise at the expense of Canadian taxpayers?

● (1435)

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister has always said that she would replace the GST with another tax. That is it. The words in the red book are very clear in black and white.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard): Why is the Reform Party deliberately trying to distort very clear statements that have been made in the past and a position that is rock hard?

Is it because the Reform Party is embarrassed by its own internal contradictions? Is it because the Reform Party does not know which way to turn? Is it because the Reform Party has lost virtually every item of its agenda? Is it because the Reform Party is no longer relevant to the Canadian political scene?

* * *

[*Translation*]

BROADCASTING

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

In Halifax, in May 1995, the Minister of Heritage announced his decision to raise from 20 per cent to 33.33 per cent the figure for foreign participation in broadcasting parent companies. In November 1995, he repeated that commitment formally. To date, however, the order in council to authorize that harmonization with the telecommunications sector has not yet been issued.

Can the Prime Minister explain to us why his government is still dragging its feet on this order in council despite its repeated commitments to do so, while it knows very well that this delay puts broadcasting companies at a disadvantage compared to telecommunications companies?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we wish to guarantee Canadian content in the broadcasting policy. This is something I believe even the Government of Quebec endorses.

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil, BQ): Since the telecommunications and broadcasting industries are fighting for the same turf, can the Prime Minister assure us that they will be treated in the same way when it comes to regulations on foreign ownership levels?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the hon. member wishes broadcasting and telecommunications policies to be the same because, when the former Bloc critic organized a meeting with Télé-Québec on the subject, she agreed with the Government of Canada's policy on this.

As far as broadcasting is concerned, Canadian content is not the only important thing. It is also important for Canadians to own their culture.

* * *

[*English*]

UNITED NATIONS

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has bailed out the UN on so many occasions it is hard to keep track anymore, but at least we have always been promised we would be paid for expenses.

However, this time it is $50 million that is unpaid and it does not appear we are going to be getting payment in the near future.

Will the government assure taxpayers that it will not sign any more blank cheques for the UN until this matter is taken care of?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is important to point out that this year alone we have already received a $72 million payment from the United Nations, even during a time when it is desperately strapped for cash because of the very substantial arrears by other countries.

One of the most important initiatives that Canada is taking is to try to get the refinancing of the United Nations so it can continue on its peacekeeping missions.

It is an issue that the Prime Minister brought up at the G-7 during the last meeting in Halifax. I intend to raise it with the secretary of state for the United States while I am in Washington this week. It is very important that all those who have not paid their bills, pay their bills, so the UN can continue to do its job.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I believe Canadians have a great deal of difficulty understanding that sort of accounting.

The minister guaranteed that the command for our troops in Haiti would be 100 per cent in Canadian hands and that the mandate was for four months only. Now we find out we are paying the entire bill, the mission may be extended, the mandate is clouded and the control may be within the Haitian government.

Will the minister deny these reports, guarantee that this mission will be over in four months and that command decisions will remain in Canadian hands?

• (1440)

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me explain first that this was an authority originally given by the United Nations Security Council. The extension is also under the United Nations.

We were asked as a country to take responsibility for the command. Canadian Brigadier General Daigle is in command of the UN mission. He is also responsible for the additional forces we put in to supplement and ensure the mission had sufficient resources to continue to fulfil the task set for it. We are working exactly under the UN mandate as established by the security council. The Canadian troops that are there as auxiliaries are subject to exactly the same mandate. They both report to Canadian Brigadier General Daigle.

In this case it is very clear that we are still following the fundamental principle that we want a multilateral international solution to these problems.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SECURITIES

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, *Le Soleil* quoted the Minister of Finance as saying in an interview that it was urgent for the federal government to invade the area of securities, an area of exclusive provincial jurisdiction, because Canada was losing its capital markets to New York and Chicago.

Does the minister recognize that what makes New York and Chicago attractive to Canadian investors is the greater savings available in the U.S. as well as higher prices for an initial issue of shares, and has nothing to do with purely political motives like his excessive taste for centralization that makes him interfere in this exclusive provincial jurisdiction?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I never used the word ''invade''. I talked about co-operation, about creating partnerships and working together. In fact, the hon. member is right when he talks about the premium paid by American investors and the U.S. capital markets. There is a threat not only to Canadian but also to European stock exchanges.

That is why we must work together, we must co-operate. The idea is not to invade, but there is no doubt that it costs a great deal of money to send prospectuses to 10 provinces. We must find a way, as suggested by the Montreal business community, to co-operate to give the Canadian financial community a strong bargaining position.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, to justify his interference in the area of securities, the minister mentioned normal competition between stock exchanges but not reasons that might encourage investments in that area, something the minister could act on. One thing has strictly nothing to do with the other.

Will the Minister of Finance not admit that there is no need for him to interfere in the area of securities, since all the problems he mentioned, including how complex the share issue process is, will be resolved by next September, when a harmonized system designed by the provinces will be put in place without the federal government getting involved?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): The hon. member knows full well, Mr. Speaker, that we are in favour of harmonization, in terms of securities as well as taxation. That said, the situation is much more complicated and the problem much deeper that a mere matter of co-operation between stock exchanges.

This is not my own observation but rather the observation of the Montreal stock exchange president. In fact, the vast majority of stock brokers operating in Montreal know very well that co-operation is necessary. That is what we want to do, and I do not understand why the Bloc Quebecois is stalled in the sixties. They must stop looking at the future with their rear-view mirror. We must give the people of Quebec and Canada the ability to compete with anyone.

* * *

[*English*]

TAIWAN

Mr. Sarkis Assadourian (Don Valley North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Given the outcome of Saturday's presidential election in Taiwan, the first direct democratic election in that nation's 5000 year history, can the minister indicate to the House any foreign policy implications for Canada in southeast Asia?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know this country and its people support the emergence of the democratic process everywhere in the world. We want

to take this opportunity to congratulate the people of Taiwan for the very important step that was taken on the weekend.

The completion of the election provides a basis for the reopening of dialogue between the mainland and the island to ease the tensions that have been there, to begin developing the very extensive relations that were in place before the latest round of problems. We will use every opportunity we have in our discussions with both parties to encourage them to show restraint, to build creative relationships and we will offer all our good services toward that objective.

* * *

● (1445)

NISGA'A LAND CLAIMS

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Nisga'a deal was signed five weeks after it was initialled and made public. Despite assurances about consultation, the Nisga'a treaty negotiation advisory committee members, and these are the non-governmental people supposedly most in the know, did not recognize any part of the agreement.

Why is the minister so intent on fast tracking this process?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, I would say that after 100 years this is hardly a fast track.

In the process leading up to the agreement in principle, very sincere efforts were made at consultations in over 200 public meetings, open houses and other consultative mechanisms. Now that the process has moved to and through the next stage of actually signing the agreement in principle, the effort to keep all parties informed and to make sure that consultations are sincere and genuine will continue. I would certainly welcome the support of the hon. member and his party in helping to encourage this process toward a historic and successful conclusion.

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it has become very apparent that governments do not want public input into this deal.

During the five weeks since the Nisga'a deal was made public, many groups have struggled to digest the complex contents. No comprehensive independent analysis has yet been completed.

There is one sure way to tell if the public has a comfort level with this massive undertaking. Will the minister join with us in endorsing a provincially initiated binding referendum on the Nisga'a agreement in principle?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister of Indian affairs has obviously been participating in a genuine process to lead to a successful conclusion an outstanding matter that has been a glaring discrepancy for over 100 years. I think the hon. gentleman and his party would be well advised, rather than raising ideas and suggestions that could well scuttle the whole process, to be a slight bit more constructive and try to bring this to a successful conclusion as this government is trying to do.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN COAST GUARD

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

Last week, the Coast Guard commissioner claimed that his new proposal for marine service fees was largely accepted by all stakeholders. Nothing could be further from the truth. Marine stakeholders from the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes firmly oppose the new service fees.

How can the minister sweep away the objections of the majority of industries and stakeholders in these two areas, considering that they represent close to 50 per cent of Canada's commercial marine traffic?

[*English*]

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, nothing has been swept away, as the hon. member knows. I would not call the consultations that have gone on since January the sweeping away of anything. There have been very sincere and very delicate consultations with all members and all interested parties.

Despite what the hon. member says, there is general agreement that the system we are now using is much better than the system we started out with. That was the purpose of the consultations.

I want to assure the hon. member that even though the prices may have fluctuated on a tonne basis, in the case of Quebec we are dealing with a one cent difference in the consultation that has taken place. I would not exactly call a one cent difference a sweeping away, particularly with respect to the consultations.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, some consultations may have taken place, but I am not sure that the minister followed up on what was said.

● (1450)

I remind the minister that, last week, the commissioner himself admitted that the Coast Guard needs adequate impact studies regarding these new service fees.

Will the minister recognize that it is unthinkable to impose new service fees while being totally unaware of their impact on the

marine industry, including shipowners in the St. Lawrence, and on related industries?

[*English*]

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member I would like to make three points.

The first point is there is an agreement in principle that access to public facilities managed at public expense has to be charged a fee. The second point is we are graduating these marine service fees at $20 million, $40 million, $40 million, $60 million over a period of four years. I want to remind the hon. member that we are dealing with a service that cost $384 million and we are charging only $20 million for it.

The impact studies he talked about will be done between the imposition of the collection of the $20 million and the $40 million. There simply is not time to do all the studies. We have done the consultations. We will impose the fees. We will do the impact studies before we go into the $40 million fees for services that cost $384 million. That is not a bad deal.

* * *

DANGEROUS OFFENDERS

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a relevant question for the solicitor general.

The people of Toronto are now familiar with what kind of garbage this Liberal government dumps in their back yards. West Toronto residents were outraged to learn last week that Bobby Oatway had been secretly flown into their neighbourhood, leaving B.C. at five o'clock in the morning to avoid outraged residents and victims in my riding.

This pedophile originally faced 41 charges, mostly against children. Why did Corrections Canada shuttle this walking disaster out of B.C. and why were the Toronto police or the community advisory group in Toronto not advised?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am informed that Oatway reached the statutory release period of his sentence.

I am further informed that the Toronto police were advised that Mr. Oatway would be placed in the Keele centre the day before he arrived and that the advisory committee was informed the day after. I am further informed that Mr. Oatway is to be kept under strict supervision in the centre. The correctional service is taking his presence as a very serious matter.

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, that is my point. This man is not rehabilitated and I have the corrections and parole documents to prove it. I have a couple of quotes. March 1996 from the parole board: ''The concerns about your risk to reoffend remain'', and September 1994: ''The board concludes that you present an undue risk to reoffend, therefore day parole is denied''.

Why will the solicitor general not give his people the tools they are asking for to keep our streets safe? Why will he not give them the power to keep pedophiles like this one behind bars until they can prove they are safe to law-abiding Canadian citizens?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in point of fact as the hon. member has indicated, Oatway was not released on parole. He is in the statutory release period of his sentence. Furthermore, there is a provision in the new Corrections and Conditional Release Act whereby, if there is a referral for that purpose to the parole board, the parole board can rule that somebody in Mr. Oatway's category can be held to the end of their sentence.

I further add that the Minister of Justice and I, after consultation with law enforcement and other groups, are working on measures to deal with the issue of post-sentence detention of high risk violent offenders. Furthermore, we do intend to bring forward a number of measures to make the dangerous offender provisions more easily usable by prosecutors at the time of conviction. We also indicated that we want to present to Parliament measures to create a new category of long term offender.

If my hon. friend is serious about his concern, I look forward to him giving his full support to the measures we want to take to deal with public concerns about this kind of issue.

* * *

● (1455)

LACROSSE

Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

The House declared lacrosse to be Canada's national summer sport and at the same time Sports Canada stopped funding the Canadian Lacrosse Association. Will the minister recognize the more than 200,000 participants in this sport and acknowledge its place in our heritage by restoring funding to lacrosse?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the work of the hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton who, in the first instance, introduced a private member's bill that was supported by all sides of the House which declared lacrosse as our national summer sport.

As the hon. member knows, there are 200,000 Canadians, including many in his own area, who are involved in the sport. We have been happy upon receiving his intervention and the intervention of many other members to increase and restore funding levels to lacrosse. It is not only a sport which is important to the national fabric, it also has great cultural significance.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ENDANGERED SPECIES

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment.

In the throne speech, the government announced that it intended to introduce a bill on the protection of endangered species. When speaking to the media, the Minister of the Environment added that he was even prepared to extend the scope of the bill tabled by his predecessor, which for once respected Quebec's jurisdiction.

Is the minister aware of the serious warnings from the former Quebec environment minister to his predecessors, exhorting them not to provoke a new battle in an area of responsibility that comes under the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces?

[*English*]

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is correct that the government through its throne speech made a very determined effort to make the introduction of the endangered species legislation a priority. We make no apologies for that.

This issue is not one which should be posed as being of federal-provincial jurisdiction. Rather, in addition to federal legislation, there should be a determination across the country to have a national framework in place so that those endangered species as well as their habitats may be protected and that the federal-provincial jurisdiction take second seat. Of all the issues the public responds to in my ministry, this is the one issue which elicits the strongest and most emotional response by adults and young children alike.

* * *

KREVER COMMISSION

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the federal government is fighting the Krever inquiry in the courts.

The Krever inquiry is ready to make its final report and there are specific allegations that the federal government has done something wrong. If the federal government is innocent of all wrongdoing, why is it taking such forceful legal action to prevent Krever from making his report known to every single Canadian?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's description of what we are doing is not right.

We have said from the outset that we have done nothing to interfere with Mr. Justice Krever's findings. If he has the intention of making findings of wrongdoing, that is entirely up to him. We have supported and encouraged the inquiry at all points.

The only reason we are in court, and we are there on a very narrow ground, has to do with procedural fairness. We have made a submission to the court, which is best argued in court, with respect to the fairness of the way in which the commission went about its business in terms of providing late notice to certain individuals that they may have findings made against them.

As to the right of the commissioner to make findings of wrongdoing, we have never argued with that. We are happy to have him make his findings and to learn from the very good work he is doing.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

The GATT signing in Marrakech set in motion an ambitious round of trade talks to begin in 1999 aimed at agricultural subsidies, but also targeting state trading entities.

Since department of agriculture officials have begun to use the term ''state trading entities'' when describing the Canadian Wheat Board, having done so recently at the CFA convention, has the government already decided to rid itself of the wheat board, the dairy commission and the supply management boards by defining them out of existence through GATT as it did with the Crow rate?

• (1500)

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can be absolutely assured that, as I have said in the House on many occasions, the government will defend staunchly those vital marketing agencies and institutions that are so valuable to Canadian farmers, including our supply management system and most certainly the Canadian Wheat Board.

* * *

FOOD SAFETY

Mr. Glen McKinnon (Brandon—Souris, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, statements have been made recently by the U.K. government concerning a possible link between the consumption of BSE infected beef and serious diseases in humans.

Could the minister of agriculture outline the measures he took to protect the safety of Canadian beef, consumers and producers?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to food safety there is no room for smugness or complacency.

The attitude we have always adopted in Canada is one of great vigilance and care. We set and we enforce standards which are among the highest in the world. That is why we can say with confidence that Canada's meat supply is safe.

Under our surveillance system BSE has not been detected in any domestic Canadian cattle herd. The one reported case, in 1993, occurred in an animal imported from the United Kingdom. During 1993-94, as the House knows, the government took extraordinary measures to protect Canada's livestock industry and consumers to eradicate that disease in Canada, even though those measures were criticized by some, including both the opposition parties in the House.

* * *

[*Translation*]

APPEAL CENTRES

Hon. Jean J. Charest (Sherbrooke, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister, who was here a few seconds ago. In his absence, I think I can put my question to the revenue minister. It is about a project by her department to create an appeal centre for eastern Canada. This project could involve three cities, Shawinigan, Quebec City and Sherbrooke.

I would like to receive assurances from the Prime Minister that neither he nor his office intend to intervene directly or indirectly in the decision that is taken and that the three cities concerned will have an equal chance to make their case.

[*English*]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a result of comprehensive reviews the department has been looking at its services and operations. As a result of technology and changes we have been able to consolidate offices in different parts of the country.

We will definitely consider all aspects of the consolidation moves and they will be done in a fair and equitable manner.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's responses to two petitions presented during the first session.

* * *

● (1505)

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Jake E. Hoeppner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-244, an act to amend the Income Tax Act (deduction of interest on mortgage loans).

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in the House today and introduce my private member's bill, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, deduction of interest on mortgage loans for first time homeowners.

This bill proposes there may be deducted, in computing a taxpayer's income for a taxation year, an amount equal to the interest paid by the taxpayer in the year to the mortgage lender on the first $100,000 of a mortgage secured by an individual's qualifying home.

Some conditions apply to this bill, outlined in it.

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

* * *

DIVORCE ACT

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-245, an act to amend the Divorce Act (granting of access to, or custody of, a child to a grandparent).

She said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is in the same form as Bill C-232 at the time of prorogation of the first session of the 35th Parliament.

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The Chair is satisfied that this bill is in the same form as Bill C-232 at the time of prorogation of the first session of the 35th Parliament.

Accordingly, pursuant to order made Monday, March 4, 1996, the bill is deemed to have been read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

(Bill deemed read the second time and referred to a committee.)

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the House gives its consent, I move:

That Jim Hart be added to the list of associate members of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

(Motion agreed to.)

* * *

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

BILLS C-11 AND C-12

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition with over 1,500 names from the riding of Drummond. The petitioners call on Parliament to withdraw bills C-11 and C-12, and return to Quebec full responsibility for measures to protect and maintain employment and manpower training, including unemployment insurance and the associated budgets. They criticize the employment insurance reform and call on the government to establish real job creation programs.

[*English*]

TAXATION

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have two petitions to present today.

The first is from Calgary, Alberta. The petitioners draw to the attention of the House that managing the family home and caring for preschool children is an honourable profession which has not been recognized for its value to our society.

The petitioners therefore pray and call on Parliament to pursue initiatives to eliminate tax discrimination against families that decide to provide care in the home to preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill or the aged.

ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition, having to do with health warning labels on alcoholic beverages, comes from Sarnia, Ontario.

The petitioners bring to the attention of the House that consumption of alcoholic beverages may cause health problems or impair one's ability. Specifically, fetal alcohol syndrome and other alcohol related birth defects are 100 per cent preventable by avoiding alcohol consumption during pregnancy.

The petitioners therefore pray and call on Parliament to enact legislation to require health warning labels to be placed on the containers of all alcoholic beverages to caution expectant mothers and others of the risks associated with alcohol consumption.

● (1510)

SRI LANKA

Mr. Barry Campbell (St. Paul's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to Standing Order 36 to present two petitions. The first, signed by 40 constituents, draws the attention of the House to the situation of the Tamil people in Sri Lanka.

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Barry Campbell (St. Paul's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition, signed by 35 Canadians, is with respect to the repeal of section 43 of the Criminal Code.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES ACT

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.) moved that Bill C-7, an act to establish the Department of Public Works and Government Services and to amend and repeal certain acts, be read the third time and passed.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I thank the opposition parties for agreeing to proceed with Bill C-7 at exactly the point it had reached in the previous session of Parliament.

[*Translation*]

The opposition's co-operation in this saves time, energy and money.

[*English*]

I also thank members of Parliament from all parties for their advice in making Bill C-7 a good piece of legislation. I am particularly grateful to members from my party for their ideas to ensure this bill offers Canadians modern, flexible, accessible, innovative, efficient, affordable and improved government services.

Bill C-7 merges a variety of related government operations into one department. The new Department of Public Works and Government Services delivers virtually all common services to federal government departments and agencies. The bill creates a more streamlined, efficient and effective responsive department. It represents a rethinking of the delivery of government services to guarantee that new, alternative and better methods of service delivery are implemented. It represents an approach based on a spirit of partnership with other governments and the private sector.

The legislation saves money for Canadian taxpayers through the reduction of office space and administration and the elimination of overlap and duplication. By placing several government services in one department we make it easier for Canadians to do business with the government and easier for Canadians to receive information from the government.

The legislation provides single window access for suppliers and contractors to the government. It rationalizes government operations to provide specialized expertise and one stop service for client departments and Canadian citizens. It modernizes services to reflect the information age in which we live. It simplifies and strengthens the administration of federal programs and services.

[*Translation*]

The bill affords the federal government greater flexibility and a broader choice of options for collaborating with provincial and territorial governments and the private sector. The new legislation will make it possible for the department to join with other levels of government, if they are agreeable, sharing premises, purchasing and support services.

It will make it possible for the department to enter into partnership agreements with Canadian businesses in order to help them break into foreign markets, again if they wish to take advantage of that assistance. By consolidating programs, eliminating administrative constraints, stressing the essentials and taking advantage of the latest technology, the department will be in a position to effect rational and concrete changes, and thus to serve Canadians with equity, transparency and cost-effectiveness.

• (1515)

We will be able to serve Canadians better, while at the same time reducing the department's budget by $353 million over three years. The number of employees will be reduced by 30 per cent over the next five years.

The consolidation of skills and resources, the rationalization of systems, and the adoption of new service delivery approaches, are already making it possible to save money and to deliver improved services. By eliminating government office supply stores and warehouses, we have been able to cut 280 positions and to withdraw from that sector of activity.

The direct deposit of salaries and payments has allowed us to reduce processing and mailing costs. In 1994-95, we saved $28 million. Moreover, it is my pleasure to inform the members of the House that, since October 1995, as the result of an information campaign, more than 1.7 million recipients of federal government payments have registered for the direct deposit program, which means an additional saving of $7 million.

At the moment, some 40 per cent of payments by my department are made directly. We are aiming for 60 per cent over the next three years, and resultant savings of approximately $44 million. I would like to thank all Canadians who have signed up for the direct deposit program. I invite all those who have not yet done so to take advantage of the program.

Through agreements with other levels of government, we are able to combine purchases of medicines and vaccines in bulk, which means additional savings.

[*English*]

Those are exactly the kinds of practical and important partnership efforts stressed in the new speech from the throne. They are a fulfilment of our red book commitment ''to work closely with provincial governments to reduce duplication and improve service delivery in all areas where governments are involved''.

As the member of Parliament for Sudbury, I know how important it is for small businesses in my community to be able to compete on a fair footing for government work. All Canadians know that a more competitive contracting system means a better deal for taxpayers.

Through the electronic open bidding system, we are enabling Canadians from every part of the country to bid on government contracts and to know what contracts have been given to whom and for how much.

Bill C-7 will require the Minister of Public Works and Government Services to follow through with even more initiatives for enhancing integrity and efficiency in the contracting process.

Passage of this bill will also guarantee that the work of the department in seeking to co-operate with other levels of government has legislative authority. This will give my department permission to enter into constructive partnering arrangements with the private sector in order to benefit small businesses in Canada and to serve the economic well-being of Canadians.

It is important legislation to confirm the legal propriety of more than 70 bilateral discussions taking place with other governments to harmonize services for Canadians and reduce the cost of those services.

My department certainly wants to be in a position to enter into even more common sense arrangements with other Canadian

governments in the important fields of informatics, realty services and procurement. That too will be authorized by Bill C-7.

I cannot stress too much how essential it is for my department to work in harmony with other governments. It is essential for the department to work in harmony with the private sector as well. My department is not, should not and will not be in the business of competing with other Canadians. We are in the business of serving Canadians.

● (1520)

The legislation before the House underscores that point by stating explicitly that Public Works and Government Services Canada will enter into a partnering arrangement with a private sector firm only on request. I want to make it clear that my department will only offer its services to another level of government on request.

Bill C-7 states that the department can enter into these kinds of co-operative arrangements with other levels of government or can partner with the private sector only on the approval of the federal cabinet. This ensures the kind of political accountability which Canadians expect from their government.

What is really most exciting about this legislation is that it will allow the Department of Public Works and Government Services to advance the Team Canada approach so vigorously pursued by the Prime Minister at home and abroad. Through partnering initiatives with the provinces and territories, my department will help deliver high quality, low cost services to Canadians in all parts of our country. That is particularly important in areas of Canada such as northern Ontario where I come from. It is also particularly important in rural Canada.

Through new partnerships with Canadian businesses, we will use the department's resources, credibility and know how to help Canadian firms reach new international markets, increase their exports and fuel the job creation which those exports make possible. That is particularly important for providing the future oriented employment we all want for young Canadians.

This bill has received widespread support from professional organizations and industry groups in every corner of the country. We are changing the responsibilities of the Department of Public Works and Government Services today in order to serve the interests of Canadians tomorrow.

[*Translation*]

The passing of Bill C-17 does not mean that the way government services are administered will be cast in stone. On the contrary, the approach will be practical, flexible and intelligent. We will continue to modernize. We must continue to try alternate solutions to meet the needs of Canadians.

The federal government, as the throne speech promised, can and will be open to change and must continue to find new ways to better serve Canadians.

Right now, I am awaiting a report from my department on the planning, design and construction of architecture and engineering projects. The aim of the study is to determine which activities could be given to the private sector. The study is being done by a team of engineers, architects and technicians representing the private sector, unions and government.

Through their co-operation, we will ensure that the government really serves Canadians.

I know most Canadians are not aware of the details of this legislation, but I think I can fairly say that all Canadians would agree with the underlying objectives of the bill. We all want to stop wasting public funds. We all want government services to be effective, accessible, reliable and sensitive to our needs. We all want best value in terms of quality and price.

[*English*]

As members of Parliament, we want to move forward in rationalizing government services and in forging new partnerships with other governments. We want to be in a position to be an ally of Canadian businesses, particularly small businesses, in competing in a tough global market. We want to provide better services to Canadians, better access to those services, more efficiency from those services and new savings from those services.

● (1525)

These objectives are the very essence of this legislation. That is why Bill C-7 should receive the support of all sides of the House of Commons. I encourage members to pass this bill with enthusiasm.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in the debate at third reading of Bill C-7. This bill is in the same form as Bill C-52 of the first session of this Parliament. As a result of the government's manoeuvre, which was condemned by all opposition parties, this bill to establish the Department of Public Works and Government Services and to amend and repeal certain acts is now at third reading.

The Bloc Quebecois' position is as follows. Since the beginning, the Bloc Quebecois has objected to this bill and based its approach on four points: amending the operating rules regarding financial commitments; establishing a code for contracting out; greater involvement by members of Parliament; and regular statements on the awarding of contracts. Let us go briefly over these four points.

First of all, operating rules. We believe the federal government should set operating rules governing federal financial commitments. Under this process, all House of Commons committees

would be required to review four times a year all government spending in the areas under their jurisdiction.

This review of government spending would apply to all expenditures above $25,000. To set this process in motion, the federal government should follow the example set by the Quebec National Assembly, whose practices have proven very effective. Second, we ask that the bill clearly lay down a code for contracting out.

Third, we demand that members of Parliament from all parties be consulted on or kept informed about the process for awarding government contracts in the ridings they represent.

Finally, we ask that Public Works and Government Services Canada produce regular statements that clearly show the contracts awarded by the federal government and spell out its operating rules.

There are other points with which the Bloc Quebecois disagrees. First, the fact that there is no way federal MPs can know what government contracts, if any, are carried out in their own riding. We have also suggested that the government make federal officials accountable for the expenditures they make, so that any discrepancies can be reported.

We discussed the issue of advance payments, which result from a squandering of public funds at the end of every fiscal year of the department. Finally, we questioned the scope of the bill, which enables the department to offer its services to provincial and municipal governments.

In the wake of the last budget, this would leave the door wide open to more duplication and squandering, the two main causes of our being in debt, a debt that will amount to $600 billion in 1996-97.

Let us take a closer look at this bill, as third reading calls for taking stock of this government action. First of all, regarding the code of conduct to ensure the acquisition method's transparency. The main amendment put forward by the Bloc Quebecois was to reject the bill, because it did not provide for the establishment of a specific code of conduct to make transparent the method of procurement, for all goods and services purchased by the Department of Public Works and Government Services.

● (1530)

This was a major amendment in that its purpose was to completely change how the public, experts and elected representatives have access to information on government expenditures made through the department.

The approach favoured by the Bloc Quebecois was based on transparency as regards the money the government and its administration spend within the government and the work they contract out.

At present, both outside of government or within the public service, anyone who tries to get more information is confronted to this huge labyrinth and cannot get the information he or she is looking for. This bill will not solve this problem.

Another factor is definitely the complex structures and the technical terms that considerably hamper the research process and dampen the spirits of those interested in knowing what governments do with public funds.

The public service in general and the department in particular have created impressive obstacles to confuse those who try to understand how the federal administration allocates government contracts.

There are countless entrepreneurs who try to get contracts, but are unable to figure out all the intricacies of the government structure.

And there are also many who contact their MP to complain either about the process, the eligibility criteria, or the contracts awarded, because they feel the system is unfair.

Also, given the current legislation on the financing of federal political parties, any company or legal entity can contribute to the election fund of a federal political party, without any limit being imposed.

This lack of limit poses a number of risks. Financing political parties can help companies establish close links with the government and it can open doors for them.

Greater transparency and simplicity in the awarding process would no doubt help avoid such situations, and would provide all Canadians and Quebecers with a fair and easily accessible system.

The same logic applies in the case of lobbyists. Lobbyists are very powerful people because the companies or the interests they represent have provided financial help to political parties, which have thus become indebted to them.

It is for all these reasons that the Bloc Quebecois was in favour of rules to monitor the federal government's financial commitments. However, the latter always turned a deaf ear to that suggestion.

Let us now look at contracting out. Over the last few years, there has been a definite trend showing that the federal public service is relying increasingly more on contracting out.

For the year 1992-93 alone, the Treasury Board estimated at $5.2 billion the total dollar figure for that activity.

During the period from 1984-85 to 1992-93, all contracting out activities, whether for professional, computer or maintenance services, experienced unprecedented growth.

With the downsizing of the public service, that activity is bound to grow even more.

Such a level of spending should be subject to some guidelines reflecting the federal government's future plans in that regard.

The stakes are too high for federal public servants, contracting firms and Canadians to leave that issue in limbo indefinitely.

The Bloc Quebecois would have liked the bill to set provisions, rules, or a legal framework forcing the government to properly oversee the contracting out process and make it more transparent. Such a monitoring system would also have to be suited to all those involved in this important process.

• (1535)

Both the government and public servants, and the general public will agree that such a code would be useful, because it would facilitate relations between the government and its employees, on the one hand, and would ensure that contracting out does not take place in an unclear context, which would certainly please the public.

A modern government uses modern means to meet the expectations of the public. There is no doubt that contracting out is still one such means. A way must be found to get a better handle on it so that it is an acceptable part of our everyday affairs. At the present time, contracting out is seen by public servants and unions as a formidable adversary and an ideological enemy that must be eliminated.

We must ask ourselves why this perception of contracting out is so persistent? The reason is very simple. Contracting out is feared because it is uncontrollable, both in its present form and in its present volume.

As long as the federal government refuses to state clearly what its contracting out policies are now, and how it will go about contracting out in the future, the climate will continue to be unhealthy, aggressive and potentially explosive. It must be recognized that approaches to this issue are so divergent that the department will have to ask some serious questions.

The ideological differences are so great that they could lead to a crisis for the government, which has unfortunately not followed the Bloc's proposal to include in this bill sensible legislative provisions for the management of contracting out, with the emphasis on transparency, so that all stakeholders would have their concerns addressed.

In my opinion, contracting out ought to be guided by three factors: healthy competition, the specialized or uncommon nature of the product or service, and the need for a greater or lesser volume than usually available resources can provide. The question of contracting out is not merely the result of the current situation, but a trend that threatens good management and proper operation of the federal public service.

The third point: consultation of all federal MPs. It is important that all be given a sense of responsibility and kept informed and/or consulted about the awarding of contracts in their ridings. Regardless of their political stripe, all MPs are elected representatives and have been delegated with the legislative representation of their riding. Their jurisdiction is more than just legislative, in that when called upon to decide affairs of the state, there are obviously concrete administrative consequences as well.

Elected representatives are consulted in the House, called upon to vote on a considerable number of items, but denied the means of checking out in their ridings whether the state's decisions are in line with House recommendations and legislation.

Public expenditures fall in this category. Elected representatives have the right to question the government on all expenditures by the public administration, and ministers back up the administrative decisions from their departments. How then can an MP fully and worthily fulfil his role in the House, if he or she lacks the means to really find out what the federal public administration is doing in his or her riding?

In a word, I cannot understand why, in this day and age of modern telecommunications, MPs' offices cannot find out which companies in their ridings are responding to calls for tenders. Are they really meeting the criteria of these calls for tender?

• (1540)

In the Standing Committee on Government Operations, a Liberal member mentioned that he had managed to change a decision to move a Canada Post warehouse and thus saved the public treasury $1 million. All to his credit. However, the fact that this member knew what was happening in his riding is due to his having seen the call for tender inviting companies to bid on the contract. He had not been advised of this expenditure. By chance, or through research, he learned that projects involving this sort of expenditure were happening in his riding. How easy and logical it would be if this member, and all members, could be informed of government expenditures in their respective ridings. No one can say our proposal would be costly to manage. One single example of the type I have just mentioned represents a significant saving.

In short, to conclude this point, I would like to suggest that all members' offices have access, without additional cost, to all calls for tenders and all contracts. This sort of mechanism should have been in place long ago.

Public officials have a responsibility too. We have information that certain states are considering the right to report public waste. Without going into a whole lot of detail, this principle should be debated in this House, particularly because the bill concerns the Department of Public Works and Government Services, which

concludes most of the government's contracts for goods and services.

Questioning government expenditures from outside is certainly a good way to control public spending. This is what we were driving at earlier. However, for the picture to be complete, questioning must also come from inside on the practicality of the department's expenditures. This is what we proposed and what the government rejected.

We continue to believe that a mechanism giving public servants the right to report wastage of public funds should be put in place and this right promoted. For the major part, public expenditures are initiated or paid by public servants themselves, which is within the scope of their duties in the public service. However, the workings of the federal government, just as the workings of other western governments, are not perfect and one can easily imagine that all kinds of useless expenditures are made on a regular basis.

To sum up this paragraph, this act would have allowed public servants to blow the whistle on the government for spending millions of dollars during the campaign leading to the October 30 referendum, which was contrary to the Quebec Referendum Act.

The auditor general's reports are a delight for those who enjoy learning about the federal government's useless expenditures. There is no other way to become aware of useless internal expenditures. Moreover, too often, the government takes forever to follow up on the auditor's analysis and recommendations. We might consider legislation to compel the government of the day to act on the auditor's report. This is my suggestion.

Other measures should be put in place and we would have hoped that the review of this bill would have provided the opportunity to do so. But as is often the case, the government did not answer the call of common sense.

● (1545)

Let us move on to federal advance payments. An advance payment amounts to making the most of the resources available to a departmental service so that it has access to the same level of resources in the following budget year. This practice is used by public service employees and managers responsible for providing services for fear that, if they do not use all the resources at their disposal, their annual budget will be cut.

I have a suggestion to make in this regard. Why should the budget rules imposed on members of Parliament not also apply to all departments? We as members of Parliament can carry up to 5 per cent of our annual budgets over to the following year without suffering any cuts simply because we did not spend our whole budgets. On the other hand, we are responsible for any overbudgeting. Why should public service managers not have the same accountability?

Why should members of Parliament be responsible for their budgets in their ridings but not the government? These are all questions that deserve answers.

I will conclude by saying that, when establishing the Department of Public Works and Government Services and amending and repealing certain acts, the government missed a great opportunity to address the real problems, and especially to help resolve these problems. This is unfortunate. The four points that we brought to its attention and on which we expected developments have not been heard.

The government will not establish a code of ethics guaranteeing the transparency of procurement methods. The government will not establish a code for contracting out. The government will not increase consulting mechanisms for all members of Parliament. The government will not take steps to make public servants more accountable.

In a word, the government will continue to make promises it does not keep and to ignore the comments of others. It overlooks solutions that could work wonders, perhaps because the government is not the solution but the problem.

[*English*]

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today on Bill C-7, formerly Bill C-52 which was presented to the House back in 1993. Just a scant three years later we are looking for approval of provisions for which most in fact are probably already in place.

I do not want to dwell on this subject for an extended length of time because the bill was introduced and then became C-7 in 1994 and the changes within the bill are already in place. However, I would like to make a few points about the bill and the practices of the department in general.

I and my party have some serious reservations about particular sections of the bill which appear to give the minister unlimited discretion with respect to fees, business practices and other operations within the ministry which in itself is sort of scary. As a matter of fact, I have received quite a number of letters, faxes and calls from people who have concerns in relation to those aspects of the bill.

Clause 16 is particularly worrisome because of the broad range of powers it implies and gives to the minister. It states that ''the minister may do anything for or on behalf of'', and then it enters into a number of conditions. Given the history of the Liberal government when it has such a free rein, that can present a scary situation to a lot of people who are concerned about how the government spends money.

● (1550)

Given the government's penchant for spending money and its history of giving choice favours, if I may use that word or we can call it patronage, to friends of the government, giving a minister this kind of leeway and discretion is particularly worrisome to ourselves and indeed to many Canadians.

Clause 16(b) states that public works can do anything for ''any government, body or person in Canada or elsewhere''. The term ''in Canada or elsewhere'' is rather questionable. I thought the purpose of any government in Canada was to serve Canadians.

Why would this minister seek to have a provision that would allow the minister to do things on behalf of Canadians with people outside the country when we are talking about government operations and public works? The focus should be to deal within Canada in any area.

Why is the government giving powers to a department entering into contracts with foreign governments, companies or individuals? We have all those resources here in Canada.

One of the most worrisome parts of this bill is that the government appears to be and is getting involved in providing services that are already available in the private sector. It is our opinion that the government should not be competing with the private sector. The provisions of this bill allow it to do exactly that.

We question why the government would want to get involved in competition with the private sector which pays taxes, tries to do business in this country, provides jobs for Canadians, provides a living for the owners and tries to build a company. Instead, the private sector comes up against a government that is competing with its own tax dollars and generally far more resources than any private sector company has in this country. That is a real concern of ours.

Clause 16 also permits the minister to do what he or she pleases with whom he or she pleases. That is scary in itself. One can apply that principle to any of the functions that might occur in that department.

When we give a minister that kind of wide ranging power to do what he or she pleases with whomever he or she pleases, given the history of the Liberals' penchant for spending money, giving away very lush government contracts to friends of Liberals and appointing friends of Liberals to very well paying positions, we have to ask if this power is excessive. Should it not be curtailed more?

We have put forward amendments that would address these wide ranging powers and the freedom they give by curtailing the department's ability to compete with the private sector first. However, as history will show, when we put through common sense amendments they are defeated by the government. This is curious since the government operations committee just released a preliminary report on the contracting process entitled: ''Small Business is our Business''. The report flies in the face of what this bill intends to do.

One of the main findings of the report is that more contracts should be awarded to small and medium size businesses. It sounds good to me. However, here we have Bill C-7 which permits the government to enter into direct competition with those very enterprises the report states it should be doing more business with.

In our opinion, the government should have adopted the amendments put forward by the Reform Party which would have been in line with the report ''Small Business is our Business''. We think it should have listened and should listen to the committee and prevent the department from competing against the private sector.

● (1555)

Many letters have been written to many MPs in this House from private sector companies, whether they be small or medium size companies, stating their distress about the fact that the government can and is entering into competition with them using their own tax dollars to do so. Reformers believe these companies have a very legitimate concern. Why should their own government compete directly with them?

The government should have adopted some of the amendments put forward by Reformers and it should have listened to its own standing committee which dealt with this and provided a number of recommendations.

Ultimately the government should be downsizing the department and getting out of those areas that are controlled and well served by the private sector. Why should the government be involved in areas of operation that are served very well by the private sector business? However, we see the reverse when we examine Bill C-7.

The government operations committee identified a number of areas of concern with respect to the department that are not addressed in this bill. For instance, the committee was concerned that 40 per cent of the contracts, worth about $3.5 billion, given out by the government were sole source. In other words, those contracts did not go out to public tender. They were just given out with no tendering process to particular firms. Nothing in this bill addresses this situation.

As members know, sole sourcing can very easily lead to abuses within the system. This was one of the things we discussed at length in the standing committee. There were a lot of concerns from Liberal members themselves about sole sourcing of government contracts. We discussed it before the House prorogued and before the government decided to take an extra holiday in February. We were prepared to deal with it and hopefully we will now get back to dealing with it in committee. We will send more recommendations to the government in the hope that it will start to listen.

The committee recommended that Treasury Board and public works draft a code of conduct for contracting out which would lay out very strict guidelines on how contracting out would be done by the government. However, the committee report went further by stating that the reporting framework for contracting needs had to be significantly revised.

In all, there is a great deal of concern over the contracting process. What really concerned us was the amended tenders, the amendments that could be made to contracts given out by the government. In other words, someone can bid a price and after they have the contract they can go back to the government at the local level and request their tender or bid price be amended. How could any private business ever operate like this?

When I was in business, after an agreement was made to purchase something from a supplier, a price was quoted, the deal was made and we agreed to it. However, the situation here is that the government can put out a contract, someone can bid on it and win the bid and then turn around and ask for an amendment. Given that the contract is at a certain level, say $30,000 and under, the decision to amend the contract can be made locally within the region. We feel this opens up the process to all forms of abuse and we asked in committee to have it dealt with. We see nothing in the bill that deals with it. We hope that when the committee deals with it again some of the recommendations that come forward might be added into this bill as amendments.

● (1600)

Even though the committee's work is fairly recent, we are all well aware of some of these problems that are hounding the government's contracting procedures. I talked about the contract amendments which add on to the contracts and drive the price higher than what the original agreement was.

To talk about that for a moment, there are some astounding figures. For example, in 1990 contract amendments totalled $602 million. These are not the original prices; these are the add-ons. By 1993, in just a short three years, once the people who were submitting the bids found out how to work the loophole in the system which allowed for contracting amendments and get around the contracting process, the amendments went from $602 million in 1990 to a staggering $1.8 billion in 1993. That is totally unacceptable. No private sector operation could even dream of operating in that way.

This is another situation we feel the Liberals and the House of Commons have to deal with immediately. Reform has been talking about this situation for almost three years now. There have to be more controls to safeguard the public purse. We cannot allow the discretionary power within the department that exists. It is open to all forms of abuse.

There really are no procedures in place other than this discretion that will really safeguard the public purse. These are tax dollars we are working with. These tax dollars are given to the government by hard working Canadians who want to see their tax dollars spent in a prudent fashion. Let us never forget that the tax dollars are basically funds paid into trust by Canadians. The government should regard taxpayers' money as a sacred trust and should do everything it can so that there is no question by Canadians as to how the government spends that money.

Whereas there should be more controls to protect the public purse, Bill C-7 in fact increases the power of the department and the minister and loosens control. What on earth is this government thinking about when it puts in a bill like this and when it asks its members—let me rephrase that—when it tells its members to support a bill like this?

The department is famous for being partial in its provision of information which at best is very difficult to receive. Reformers put forward amendments which would ensure that the disclosure of information was complete and easily accessible which is not unreasonable. Our party appears to be the only one in the House concerned about how taxpayers' dollars are spent by this government. We asked that information on how the money is being spent be easily accessible. We asked for that in the form of an amendment. The Liberal government in an effort to protect its little empire, which gives it all sorts of powers to spend money and reward friends, defeated our amendment which asked for accessibility.

What kind of a message does that send to the Canadian taxpayers, who as we all know are among the highest, if not the highest taxed wage earners in the whole world? What kind of message does that send to the people who are paying taxes, that this government will not allow a party like the Reform Party, who want to be the guardians of the taxpayers' money, or for that matter any other interested and concerned people access to how the government departments spend their money? It is a very poor message indeed. We put forward the amendment for disclosure. It was defeated by the government.

● (1605)

When we consider that $9 billion was spent on contracting last year, we think the public has a right to know exactly how the money is being spent. However, Bill C-7 does not address this issue. It is almost laughable. For all the Liberal government's talk about transparency and openness, all the promises it made on the campaign trail and in the red book about being transparent and open, the public still has difficulty obtaining information from the department of public works.

Forget about the public having difficulty; Reform members have difficulty obtaining the information we want in order to check on how the government is spending the money. I have requested information through access to information a number of times only

to obtain about one-tenth of what I requested and even that was blanked out in many cases. What kind of a message does that send to Canadians?

All of this reminds me of a related issue, which is the privatization of Canada Communication Group I spoke about in the House the other day. Canada Communication Group falls under the control of the department of public works. In July 1995 the minister announced that it would be privatized. In some respects we do not have much of a problem with privatization if it is going to save money and increase efficiency. We thought we would wait to see how it was going to work.

The government struck a committee to advise it on a process which was to be fair, open and transparent. The committee was to advise the government on how the privatization should be implemented. The process was going to be open, fair and transparent, as the government says it would like to be some day. We and the public have yet to hear from that committee. Equally distressing, as I understand it the committee is reporting to the minister behind closed doors on an as required basis.

What happened to the fair, open and transparent process which was to be the committee's criteria? There has never been a report from the committee which has been made public. It is reporting only to the minister who at her discretion can advise Parliament as to how the privatization implementation is proceeding.

All of this is very disturbing to our party and to concerned Canadians who want a little more openness with respect to how their dollars are being spent. Once again the Liberal government promised one thing but did another. That is why we must be wary of the Liberals' promise that Bill C-7 does not confer broad powers on the minister. I would suggest that it does exactly that.

Furthermore, when the bill was before the government operations committee in November 1994, it was rammed through in typical Liberal fashion by the Liberal majority sitting on the committee. Amendments and witnesses were put forward by Reform. We submitted our lists, we submitted our amendments and the Liberals on the committee refused every one of them. So much for openness and transparency. So much for wanting to make available information on how the government operates.

One has to ask, what is the government afraid of? Why does it not want the Reform Party looking into the way it spends taxpayers' dollars? Why does it not want Canadians to have an understanding of how it spends taxpayers' dollars? Is the government trying to hide something?

We have seen contracting out. There is a company that does a lot of business with the government. SNC Lavelin is a very well known Quebec company that does a lot of business with Canada Post and other departments, including Transport Canada. It is a big company with a zillion subsidiaries and is involved in a zillion consortia.

• (1610)

I have been trying to find out why this company is getting so many government contracts. I know it has been getting them for years, contract after contract, untendered for the most part. It has received a number of multimillion dollar contracts from Canada Post through its subsidiaries, SLS Corp. and Clientech and others with no tendering process in place.

We can talk about the contract for the mine sweepers for the coast guard on the east coast. Fenco MacLaren, a company which bid on the work to be done for the government, outbid Halifax shipyards. I was not involved in the committee that was looking into that but I found out that Fenco MacLaren is not even a shipyard. I thought it strange that a company that does not even own a shipyard could get a huge government contract which common sense dictates must go to a shipyard. Yet Halifax shipyards which bid on the contract did not get it. Lo and behold, in looking into the research data on Fenco MacLaren what do I see? It is owned by SNC Lavelin. Well, my questions have been answered so far. We will delve into that one a little more, let the Liberal members be aware and particularly the minister who was in charge of that one.

The Liberals promise one thing and they do another. We put through common sense amendments to open up the process to what is going on and to make it more transparent and the Liberals shoot it down.

The amendments and the witnesses we proposed to the committee were refused by the Liberal members. They wanted to get out of the committee as soon as possible. They did not want a detailed examination of Bill C-7 in any way, shape or form. They rammed it through committee and let it flounder on the Order Paper for about 16 months.

The bill appears to be largely administrative but as I noted earlier, members should have some real concerns about some of the power conferred on the minister. Members should be asking why the bill permits the government to compete with the private sector. Why? If the government is so serious about creating jobs and helping small business as it claims in the flyer ''Small Business is our Business'', it would not allow particular clauses in the bill which allow it to compete with private sector small business to go forward.

I urge MPs who are concerned about job creation and the health of the small business sector to vote against the bill. Even Liberal members who feel this way are invited to vote against the bill as well. I know Reformers are going to be voting against the bill because we have serious concerns about the powers that are

bestowed upon the minister and her department. Reformers will certainly not be supporting the bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): We are now entering the next stage of debate where members will have 20 minute maximums for their interventions subject to 10 minutes of questions or comments.

Mr. John Harvard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on Bill C-7 I cannot help but note that this very straightforward piece of legislation has been under consideration by the House of Commons for a very long time. Members of Parliament have had the opportunity to examine the bill very closely and they have made a number of suggestions to improve the bill. That was very much welcomed by the government.

● (1615)

Key amendments have been put in place to satisfy the legitimate concerns that have been brought forward through the process. I hope that now, with a sense of goodwill on all sides, we can move forward to pass this legislation which has, at its very heart, the basic goals of providing Canadians with savings, efficiency and improvement in services.

Passage of this legislation will enshrine in law the merging of a variety of related government operations into one department. The Department of Public Works and Government Services delivers virtually all common services to government departments and agencies.

In essence, the bill creates a more streamlined, efficient, effective and responsive department. The department saves money for Canadian taxpayers through the reduction of office space and administration, and the elimination of overlap and duplication.

The federal government is by far the largest purchaser of goods and services in the country. Public Works and Government Services Canada is responsible for the orderly processing of about 65 per cent of federal procurement. Clearly the move toward a more consolidated approach to government purchasing is of benefit to all concerned.

It provides a single window access for suppliers and contractors to the government. It rationalizes government operations to provide specialized expertise and one stop service for client departments. It modernizes services to reflect the information age in which we live. It simplifies and strengthens the administration of federal programs and services.

As a government we have made a firm commitment to all Canadians that we will provide them with an administration that is efficient, innovative, co-operative and fair. Canadians are rightly concerned about the cost of government at all levels.

They are aware that overlap, duplication and poor co-ordination with other levels of government have contributed to the tax burden that they must bear. They expect, and they demand, that we take every measure possible to streamline government operations, reduce administration costs, cut out red tape and improve service delivery of government programs.

Bill C-7 responds directly to these challenges. The bill modernizes government services so that the federal government can concentrate on doing what it does best and most cost effectively and leave the rest for those who can do better. The department has had to rationalize all of its operations to achieve these savings, efficiencies and improved services.

For the department this has meant taking advantage of new technology. For example, thanks to more powerful computers, laser printers and developing technologies the number of cheque production centres in the country has been reduced from 11 to 4. This means annual savings of $4.8 million after implementation.

Efficiency means cutting costs but it also means whenever possible improving services. That is why the department has moved to make direct deposit the standard method of payment. This means annual savings of $20 million to Canadian taxpayers and at the same time increased security, privacy and convenience for recipients of payments. Efficiency means providing equal access to all suppliers to government.

Through the electronic open bidding service we are enabling Canadians from every part of the country to bid on government contracts and to know what contracts have been given to whom and for how much. The open bidding service is a nationally accessible service which 25 other departments and crown corporations as well as the provincial governments of New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta have chosen to use to advertise their procurement needs as well. It is sort of a one stop centre. This is a good example of co-operation between various levels of government in an effort to reduce overlap and duplication.

● (1620)

Through the open bidding service, the Department of Public Works and Government Services has long sought to provide a single window for suppliers on the estimated $57 billion Canadian public sector market from all levels of government. We are very optimistic that this can be achieved through this process.

Throughout the examination of Bill C-7, considerable attention has also been directed toward the availability of procurement information and the integrity of the system. Members and the public in general want to easily and effectively monitor government spending and ensure that contracts for goods and services are entered into in a fair and reasonable manner.

The Liberal government agrees that the procurement processes must be, and be seen to be honest, open and fair. If government is to play a positive role in society, honesty and integrity in political institutions is a definite requirement.

To this end, we promised to restore the public's confidence when we said in the red book: ''Open government will be the watchword for the Liberal program''. Since being elected 28 months ago, ministers have insisted on the highest standards of integrity and honesty in fulfilling their mandate. On that, members can refer to the speech from the throne on February 27, 1996. The government has taken many concrete steps to make openness and integrity a prime focus within the procurement process.

As already mentioned, the government has stressed the importance of the open bidding system. Not only is this system efficient, not only does it reduce the paper burden and lower the cost to the taxpayers, it also ensures that everyone with an interest has access to the government's contracting requirements.

This service is available not only to companies that do business or would like to do business with the government, but also to members of Parliament, provincial governments, the media or any Canadian citizen that wishes to track the course of government purchasing. What could be more open, fair and transparent than that?

In May 1994, a couple of years ago, guidelines were issued to regulate for the first time a fair and open regime for the purchase of advertising and public opinion research. Regulations were also brought in to curb the power of lobby groups to influence decisions regarding government purchasing.

One of the amendments that has been incorporated in the bill requests the minister to investigate and develop services for increasing efficiency and economy and ''for enhancing integrity and efficiency in the contracting process''.

Dealing fairly and honestly with the thousands of Canadian individuals and companies that do business with the government is a matter of very high priority. The public sector, at all levels of government, is under intense public scrutiny today. Canadians demand that governments not only control their expenditures but that they operate openly so that the public may judge the effectiveness of their operations.

The Department of Public Works and Government Services is meeting this challenge by providing equal access to the federal market by showing fairness in awarding contracts and by ensuring that contracting information is available and acceptable, whether accessible to all Canadians in the most efficient and cost effective way.

The government has taken these positive measures by operating the Department of Public Works and Government Services under order in council. The passage of this legislation will give parliamentary approval to that government decision.

The government wants to move forward in rationalizing its services. It wants to provide better service to Canadians, better access to those services, more efficiency from those services and new savings from those services.

Bill C-7, an act to establish the Department of Public Works and Government Services is a good bill made better by the suggestions of members of this House. I ask for support to give it speedy passage.

Mr. Harold Culbert (Carleton—Charlotte, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the comments made by my colleague, the parliamentary secretary. I have two or three questions that I would like to address to the parliamentary secretary.

• (1625)

First, I wonder how Bill C-7 accomplishes what the business community has requested for some time, a fair and equitable method of tendering for projects, regardless of size. Second, what is the amount of the estimated savings proposed as a result of this new bill and its amalgamation efforts? Finally, does the bill address our concerns of duplication of effort and if so, how will this be accomplished? Perhaps the parliamentary secretary might like to comment on those questions.

Mr. Harvard: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the questions from my colleague.

We are talking about a lot of money when we talk about savings. After this bill reaches its ultimate effectiveness, savings will be in the neighbourhood of $180 million by fiscal year 1997-98. To all taxpayers in the country that means a lot of savings.

I will give a micro example of that. I spoke about the direct deposit system. By directly depositing cheques the government save money on postage, bank fees and paper. Already about 40 per cent of government employees are enrolled in direct depositing. We would like to have that up to about 60 per cent in two or three years. Just that one initiative alone saves about $20 million. Twenty million dollars here and another million dollars there and it all adds up. In total it adds up to about $180 million.

Businesses know that the government is a big business. The government is involved in a lot of procurement. A lot of contracts have to be made out or extended. It works out to about 1,000 contracts a day, big and small. It is incredible. Businesses people want a system that is open, fair, transparent and above board. Through this open bidding system that is what they get.

Business people want information. They will make the judgments. To make the judgments they have to have information. All federal contracts are available on OBS. A number of provincial governments are tied into the system. It is all there: the price of contracts, the intentions of contracts to be let and so on. It is an enormous repository of information for business people.

In my humble opinion businesses are very happy with the kind of information that is made available to them. From time to time there may be difficulties. When dealing with a department that is as large as this and with a market that is worth billions and billions of dollars, it is hard to be perfect. There are going to be times when there are differences of opinion. In the main, Canadian businesses are very happy and very supportive of the open bidding service. I am glad that it is in place.

The minister wants the system to work even better. Nothing on the face of the earth cannot be improved. If it is made by human beings there will always be imperfections because we are imperfect, so we are looking for ways of improving the system. If there is a way to do it, if there is a way to save money, that is our objective, that is our target and that is exactly what we will do.

I appreciate the question from my hon. colleague.

• (1630)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would have a few questions to ask and also a few comments to make following the remarks my hon. colleague just made. The hon. member responsible for the Standing Committee on Public Works, who just spoke, chaired the Standing Committee on Public Works during both sessions of this government's mandate.

He reminded us that the Liberal government was elected to put an end to squandering and to administer public funds efficiently. I think that there is a far cry between the government intentions, as described in the red book, and reality.

First, I think that the best way of eliminating waste or squandering is through a procurement policy. The government should have its procurement policies in writing.

We know that the vast majority of government procurement transactions are conducted through tender or electronic bulletin board. I sat on the committee, and the Bloc Quebecois suggested that, to procure goods, materials and services, the government use, in addition to the electronic bulletin board, ads or public notices published in newspapers to ensure that it gets the best prices and that many people have the chance to bid and show their products to the government.

We know that, at present, only those who subscribe to the bulletin board can get referrals and know the government's requirements in order to bid.

In my riding of Charlevoix, there are people who would like to bid to offer their products or services, but they do not have the equipment required to offer their products or services to the government.

I would like the hon. member to tell me something. Does he intend to set himself the goal, in the performance of his duties, of bringing the government or the ministerial side to commit to going to public tender, after specifications have been drawn up, and to awarding the contract to the lowest bidder that meets the requirements?

Also, will there be a written material management policy? Will there be policies regarding equipment inventory? Let me give you an example for the benefit of hon. members. In my constituency office, in Charlevoix, I have only one person working for me, an assistant. When the government furnished my office, in December 1993, I was told that I was entitled to three computers. ''Why am I entitled to three computers if I have only one employee, I asked? All I want is one computer, but a good, efficient and efficient one''. ''No, based on government policy, on House of Commons rules, you need three computers, came the answer''. So three computers were installed: it took them a week to install three computers, two of which are never used. Just think of the costs of materials and labour.

This was under previous government policies. And even if this government was elected to eliminate waste, as promised in the red book, nothing came of it. Today, the same policies apply within the House of Commons.

[*English*]

Mr. Harvard: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the observations made by my hon. colleague from Quebec. He has a concern about waste, as he should as a member of Parliament. All members on both sides of the House are concerned about waste.

Over the decades all governments have had reputations of waste. I can say with enthusiasm that this government and especially the minister, since I am talking about the new Department of Public Works and Government Services, want to hear about waste.

I will not stand in my place and pretend everything works absolutely perfectly. When there is waste, when there is inefficiency, when there is a better way of doing things we want to hear about it.

• (1635)

I would always invite the hon. member whenever he comes across examples of inefficiencies to bring them to our attention. It is a big department and things will not always work well. I would be more than happy to entertain concerns, whether relatively small or relatively large.

The hon. member asked about an open process. I believe we do have an open process. If there is a better way to make it more open, transparent and fair, let us do that.

I appreciate the comments of the hon. member. We are working on it as best we can.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate on Bill C-7, which seeks to establish the Department of Public Works and Government Services. This bill was first reviewed during the last session and is now back before us at the same stage as it was in December.

This debate provides an opportunity to point out a number of things. We will not discuss the overall administration of the department; however, we want to discuss the department's mandate, ways, processes and practices, and to look at its effectiveness. This is basically what I intend to do in the few minutes that I have.

The Liberal government often accuses the official opposition of only criticizing. When a bill is before the House and Bloc Quebecois members discuss it, Liberal members and ministers often say: ''All you do is criticize; you have nothing else to say. You cannot make constructive proposals''.

In the case of Bill C-7, the official opposition worked very seriously, and I want to pay tribute to the Bloc members who sat on the public works committee during the last session for their excellent work. Unfortunately, we have no choice but to conclude that the government did not take into account the recommendations and suggestions made by the Bloc Quebecois, as is its habit.

This afternoon, the hon. member for Châteauguay raised four points on which I would like to go back. My colleague mentioned the need to monitor the government's financial commitments, and I will get back to this later on. He also talked about the contracting out process. As he mentioned in the question and comment period, the Bloc would like to focus on the need to have an open process so that all our fellow citizens can benefit from government services, especially business people who offer their services to the government. That is why we have contracting out rules.

The Bloc wants members of Parliament to be more involved in the process. Hon. members should be consulted at least on what is going on in their ridings and need to be kept informed, but I will also come back to this issue.

• (1640)

Lastly, I want to talk about ethics in government, by drawing a parallel with the party financing legislation which, of course, does not exist at the federal level. There is one piece of legislation which addresses the financing issue, but its provisions are so broad that I would rather draw a parallel with the rules we have in Quebec and which really set the province of Quebec apart from the other western democracies in this area.

Let us talk about control of financial commitments and the suggestion made by the Bloc Quebecois to ensure that all House committees can meet regularly, at least four times a year, to examine the financial operations and commitments of the departments they are responsible for. Again, we might want to refer to what is done in Quebec. We often hear our colleagues, especially the members from western Canada, criticize what is being done in the province of Quebec, but I think we should also focus on what deserves to be mentioned and recognized. In this instance, I think it would be well worth it.

In Quebec, parliamentary committees and commissions can, I guess any time they wish to do so, summon a minister, of course, but also senior public servants to account for their management. Any day they wish to, they can summon public servants before their committees and ask them to account for the decisions they made in their own department.

This request by the Bloc Quebecois to do the same thing at the federal level is quite in line with the will expressed by this Parliament to change the rules governing the auditor general and to allow the tabling in the House, four times a year, of the report of the auditor general, as asked by the former member for Vanier who now sits in the Upper House. In that context, it appears quite logical and normal—that is, if this government can be logical—to see to it that each committee of the House can proceed with the audit of the financial commitments of the departments or agencies for which they are responsible.

This is a positive and constructive suggestion, and instead of hearing the minister responsible for public works and my colleague for Winnipeg St. James, whom I hold in great respect, boast about what this government did in the contracting out sector, I would have preferred that he take action and announce, as we considered this bill, amendments to allow an audit of financial commitments four times a year.

This brings me to the code for contracting out. My colleague for Châteauguay suitably noted that the federal government is spending enormous sums of money through all sorts of contracts for the procurement of equipment, merchandise and services. Throughout Canada, it is estimated that more than $5 billion were spent for such purposes in 1993-94. Where I come from, that is not peanuts. These are significant sums of money that must be spent wisely and we must make sure that they serve the purposes they were meant for.

• (1645)

Even though it has been mentioned that changes have been made to the awarding of contracts and that some improvements have been made, there is still plenty of room for improvement, particularly with regard to contracting out.

First, it would be important, as I said earlier, that not only the suppliers of services but also the people who receive the services understand the way government works and understand the tendering process.

However, the experience of members of this House—particularly opposition members, who receive many complaints every day in their constituency office—indicates that the federal government's administrative practices for awarding contracts leave a lot to be desired. More often than not, it is a total mess and one has to wonder if officials who have to make decisions do not try to confuse everybody on purpose and to make things as complicated as possible to avoid scrutiny and to avoid being asked questions.

So if we are serious about spending government funds wisely, it is imperative that we establish a code for contracting out, that we have clear and simple rules that would help the Canadian public understand what the government or the public servants are doing on their behalf.

I would like to underline a few suggestions that have been made to improve the process. First of all, members should be consulted or informed. It is amazing that, as elected representatives, we have to rise in this House during consideration of this bill or any other bill to ask to be informed of what the government is doing in our ridings.

As Dr. Laurin, an MNA and former minister in a Parti Quebecois government, used to say, there is something wrong when an elected member has to stand in this House and ask the government to please inform the elected representatives of the people about what the federal government is doing in their riding.

We are raising this issue, because that is not what is being done right now. It is not standard procedure. There is no way our fellow citizens who cannot follow government operations day to day—may God spare them that chore, because they have other things to do, like taking care of their families and paying taxes—can get a clear idea of what government administration is all about when members themselves have to resort to amending a bill so that elected representatives will be consulted. I think the minister or the government should have readily recognized this deficiency and presented relevant amendments instead of waiting for the opposition to do it.

The opposition has kept a watchful eye, it has assumed its responsibilities, and suggested that members be consulted. The goal is not to determine who should get the contract, the way it is being done right now in Liberal fundraising events, but to know the motives behind government actions in different ridings, the spin-offs, and who is capable of providing the goods or services that are recommended. This is what the Bloc Quebecois is asking for. I would not want to conclude without—

• (1650)

Mr. Bélair: He has nothing left to say.

Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead): The member says I have nothing left to say, but I would ask him to just listen to what I will be saying over the next five minutes. He will learn and profit from it because if he gets his information only from his party's caucus, I can understand why he is so uninformed at times.

Let me conclude, if I may, by talking about—

Mr. Boudria: So soon?

Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead): No, not so soon Mr. Boudria, you still have five minutes to benefit from what I have to say. Oh. Please excuse me, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The hon. member for Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead just earned himself a 15 or 20-second penalty. Let me remind him he must always address the Chair.

Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead): You are perfectly right, Mr. Speaker, I agree entirely.

I would just like to conclude my comments by saying that it will be necessary not only to establish a code for contracting out, to consult members of the House, to make sure civil servants are responsible for their decisions, but also to assure the public that the government will make decisions based on political ethics. I am referring of course to the act on the financing of political parties.

Earlier, my colleague from the Reform Party complained about the fact that SNC-Lavalin gets many government contracts without any justification. Maybe he is right. He did not give any details on that. I wish he would have also given examples from elsewhere and not only from Quebec, but politics have reasons that reason very often ignores.

On that point, let me stress one thing: the fact that, at the federal level, the political party financing legislation authorises companies, corporations, to finance political parties greatly jeopardizes the awarding of contracts. As I mentioned a moment ago—some may have thought I was joking, but I am very serious—I believe a greater number of federal government contracts are considered within the Liberal Party financing system than in parliamentary committees.

It is totally inappropriate that things should happen that way. But why is it so? Simply because that is where companies, those who provide money to the Liberal Party, that is to say the government—and it was the same under the Conservatives—that is where

they are able to get information which otherwise might not be available to them.

I might have to conclude on that, but let us take the example of the Pearson deal. For weeks, even months, the Bloc Quebecois battled the government which settled the Pearson airport deal in a totally unacceptable way.

We all remember that during the last election campaign, the Prime Minister promised to undo the decision of the Conservative government and make sure that Pearson remained a public company, belonging to the government, and was not sold to private interests. We were in total agreement with that. However, lots of examples, each one more convincing than the other, showed that the interests which prevailed in the Pearson deal were those of lobbyists and bagmen of the various political parties which exercised power during the last few years, that is to say the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party. So much so that the government felt obliged, in order to regain an image of integrity, to introduce a bill on lobbyists, and have it passed by the House. It was actually a very timid piece of legislation.

• (1655)

If the government is serious when it says it wants government contracts to be granted in an equitable and fair manner, it must accept suggestions made by members regarding public disclosure of contracts to be granted.

But we must also make sure that the solution to this kind of problem is not found through the funding of political parties. This is why we have to introduce a bill to reform political party funding and make sure that not only the spirit but also the letter of the act which now applies in Quebec, which has set a precedent for all western democracies, is also applied at the federal level.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague for identifying the problem in this bill very well, but especially for raising an extremely important point, that is, consultation of elected officials.

I think that is at present a major flaw, one that is not being corrected in Bill C-7. Currently, and with the bill, it is impossible for federal members of Parliament to know what government contracts will be given out in their own riding. They are being consulted on almost anything, they are invited to vote on all kinds of pieces of legislation, but they are refused access to information allowing them to know exactly what will happen and what contracts will be given out in their own riding.

How do you think an attentive and combative member of PArliament, whoever he may be, can fulfill his role with dignity and efficiency if he does not know what government activities are going on on his own territory? I will give a concrete case that I am presently living in my riding. I will then ask a question to my colleague.

Transport Canada, Harbours and Ports, has decided to dredge the surroundings of Wharf No. 2, in Sorel, in order to restore the river to its initial depth, which was 9.1 metres. Over the years, sediment has accumulated and the depth is now 7.5 metres. So, they want to take away, on the Sorel side, 1.6 metre of sediment and contaminated silt, but to move it where? To the other side of the river, in my riding, on the shores of the municipality of Saint-Ignace-de-Loyola.

Who was informed of that? Hunting and fishing associations in Sorel, the outfitting operation in Tracy, the city of Tracy, the development corporation of Lake Saint-Pierre, Saint-Joseph-de-Sorel and Saint-Ignace-de-Loyola, but this latter is invited to an information meeting for the dredging of the port of Sorel.

The municipality does not wish to know about the impact of dredging at Sorel, so it is not represented at the meeting. The municipalities' representatives were never told: ''Come to the meeting, because we will dump the waste at your place''. No one felt the need to inform the federal member for Berthier—Montcalm, whose riding will get the waste. He would have known who would be interested. This issue has nothing to do with patronage, as the hon. member said.

An hon. member who knows his riding and knows people who might be interested in a particular project, as I would be, if contaminated waste was being dumped, incidentally, on an uncontaminated site, will inform the islands' hunting and fishing association, tourist agencies like the SIRBI and the SABA, boating associations, etc. The hon. member knows his riding, so he would have got these associations interested in the issue.

However, they do not wish to inform hon. members, because they wish to do as they see fit and, above all, to avoid being held accountable. Well, they are in for a surprise. In this particular case, I knew what was going on and they will have to justify their actions. That is another story though, but I hope the hon. minister got my message. She will certainly hear from me again about this unacceptable issue.

• (1700)

Here is my question for the hon. member. Does he not feel that, in such a situation where it is proposed to carry the equivalent of 40,000 ten-wheeler rigs full of contaminated silt from the south shore to the north shore, it would have been normal to advise at least the members concerned, the member for Richelieu and the member for Berthier—Montcalm, even before putting money into this project, in order to know what they thought and what they had to say about it, whether there were groups they wanted to have consulted, and whether they could give us guidance?

First, does the hon. member find it normal that the government did not advise us? Second, while we are overhauling these pieces of legislation, would it not be normal to deal right away with this flaw by making it a duty to inform the members concerned by a project even before putting money into it?

Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead): First, I would like to congratulate my colleague from Berthier—Moncalm on his speech. As I said at the beginning of my own speech, there was an opportunity to review a bill such as this one, which, at first sight, may seem technical or insignificant to most of our fellow citizens. When we study the bill more closely, however, when we take a closer look at it, when we analyze it like the official opposition did, we see right away the effects this bill or these bills will have on our fellow citizens, and the example given by the member for Berthier—Moncalm is eloquent proof of that. I hope the minister is listening carefully to my colleague's words, not only in this particular case, but also to realize that she has to consult all members of the House, whatever their political stripes.

I believe that if we were elected by the people, if we ran a campaign, it proves that we have been involved in our communities for some time. We cannot learn everything overnight, it takes years. Generally speaking, members of Parliament are knowledgeable people; they know what is going on in their riding. Consequently, they should be consulted.

Earlier, I described the suggestions the Bloc made to improve this process also. When we are speaking of the monitoring of government contracts, of departments' financial administration, which could be done by the committees, it would also be appropriate at the same time to ask questions to departmental officials, the minister and senior civil servants about situations like those that the member mentioned.

Finally, I would like to say to the minister and the government in general that it is in their interest to change their practices in this regard. Our fellow citizens are less and less willing to accept to be kept in the dark about government decisions, at all levels.

For example, right now in Quebec there is a group called Mouvement pour le redressement économique du Québec, whose aim is to question governments on the way they spend the money they have to provide services to the population. We see more and more of that kind of spontaneous grassroots organizations.

What message are they sending to our political leaders? They are telling them: ''We will no longer accept that you make decisions on our behalf without consulting and informing us in advance''.

• (1705)

It seems to me that the very least a government could do is to consult the men and women that were elected by the population. If the government is really serious when it says that it wants to improve the efficiency of its administrative structure, particularly with regard to contracts, then it should say so right now, during our present debate. It should say in a clear and open way that it intends to consult the elected members of Parliament on the contracts it is giving out.

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, I too would like to speak to Bill C-7, formerly Bill C-52. I must tell you that even as late as this morning, I was not going to speak, but upon closer examination of the issue, I am pleased to comment on this bill and to echo a number of my colleagues' concerns with respect to the nature of the Department of Public Works and Government Services.

A great deal of money flows through this department. It could become very closely linked to patronage, unless a very stringent code is developed that would place tight constraints on its ability to act without a transparent process, give everyone equal access to contracts, and allow effective control of the system for managing public funds.

First of all, I would point out that it is no small amount that Parliament and cabinet are called upon to manage. This year, the federal government will spend some $165 billion, of which of course close to $45 billion will go to interest on the debt; this aside, $120 billion are nonetheless spent on programs.

A good part of this budget will funnel through the Department of Public Works and Government Services, which approves the operating expenditures of the various departments, whether for rental of accommodation, or all the other sorts of things departments need to operate.

It is quite surprising to discover just exactly how difficult it is to obtain precise information in this regard. I had some fun a few months back trying to determine how much had been spent renovating buildings in the Abitibi—Témiscamingue region. It was a very difficult exercise because, even when it is possible to obtain overall figures, total amounts, there is never any very precise data on who won the contracts and how large they were. Were there cost overruns compared to tenders? Information like that requires painstaking research. I did not get the feeling that the people I consulted were very enthusiastic about helping me find out what I wanted to know.

The Bloc has made some very interesting suggestions. I would like to address each of these items briefly. One of the first suggestions made by the Bloc for improvement, to ensure that administration was more efficient, was to make sure that one or more committees—of the many House committees—the standing committees, would be able to make a quarterly examination of the expenditures of the various departments. Initially I think the suggested level for this was $25,000 and up.

So, all expenditures in excess of $25,000 ought to be assessed by parliamentary committees. This would get MPs more involved in government administration. It would increase monitoring and all those who might be tempted to fiddle with public funds would be more nervous if they knew that these expenditures would be examined in a public exercise where a number of people could voice opinions and even hold a debate. If it was felt appropriate, they could even call the people in question in to explain themselves. This strikes me as merely a normal process to ensure more efficient and more responsible administration.

• (1710)

At a time when the public is being asked to make sacrifices in the battle in which the various governments are engaged against the deficit, we must ensure that what we are administering is at least administered as efficiency as possible, in order to improve public confidence.

If I recall correctly, those words were used in the Liberal Party's red book, which talked of greater transparency and restoring public confidence. When the time comes to put their money where their mouth is, and to bow to the arguments suggested by the opposition parties, one might say that their reflex for self-protection, keeping the political machine as non-transparent as possible, won out over the Liberals' good intentions while they were in the opposition and were experiencing the frustrations a goodly number of MPs are now experiencing.

Of course, there must be some members of the government party who manage to obtain some information, thanks to their good relations with ministers or because of their participation in previous campaigns, the support they gave, or I might even say because of political debts tied to a leadership race or similar things. Nevertheless, this is not a normal situation because as elected representatives, whatever our political party, we were all elected in ridings and therefore each of us reflects a majority of electors in his or her own riding.

Of course, those constituents voted for a political party but they also voted for an individual and they expect their member of Parliament to be as effective as possible and to be the best representative possible in Parliament.

Therefore, being able to study all those expenditures in committee can harm no one. I would like the government party to tell us why it is against such a measure. How would the suggestion that all expenditures over $ 25,000 be thoroughly examined by a committee render Parliament less efficient and less vigilant regarding in terms of managing public funds?

We are aware that it would impose a large amount of work on members, but this is part of our role. We might be much more efficient if we did this rather than certain things done in committee and which, and I hope you will allow me to be sceptical, have very little impact on departments if they have not given directives, or circulated reports from the committees. This is why members of committees should be given more autonomy.

For those who are following this discussion, committees are composed of members of recognized political parties. There is a number from the government party and from the two opposition parties, the official opposition and the third party. These people could look at these expenditures over a few weeks, meeting a few times a week.

The government has said nothing about the follow-up to this suggestion, and today is not the first time we have made it, but nobody has considered it worth acting on.

Another aspect concerns contracting out. In recent years, the government has cut its staff drastically and contracts out increasingly. It can thus save money. We have nothing against this of itself, but it is very dangerous if it becomes a devious way to provide work for one's political friends.

Need I point out that, unlike Quebec, which has very strict legislation on the funding of political parties, here, companies can make donations to political parties. Recently I was looking at a 1994 report which revealed that a lot of companies contribute to political parties. I am talking about the traditional political parties, because this does not apply to the Bloc, which is funded by individuals. Companies provide most of the funding of these parties. I cannot believe that this is a disinterested gesture on their part. When an individual gives $75,000 or $100,000 to a political party, I am not so sure he is expecting nothing in return.

It is more complex than that. Contributions can even be made through numbered companies. So, trying to find out who really financed the political parties can be a very difficult and demanding task, requiring a lot of time and energy to see who financed what and whether contracts are awarded according to contributions as well.

• (1715)

As we know, there is a growing trend toward contracting out. How is it that the government did not deem it appropriate to clearly define a code of ethics on the awarding of those contracts that would be far more severe than the one in place? Here again, transparency, a word repeated over and over in the red book, is absent. They did not find it appropriate to act on that recommendation.

I will make the same argument as earlier. How would this make Parliament less efficient? It seems to me to be a good suggestion. You know, today people expect a lot from us. They ask us to not just criticize the government but also to make suggestions forcefully. That is what we do. We make concrete suggestions in order to make the management of public funds as efficient as possible.

I have a third point, and it is important. The member for Berthier—Montcalm referred earlier to something that occurs sometimes, and more often recently. One learns that important things, major things are happening. They may happen in our ridings without us being informed whereas if we, as representatives of those citizens, had been informed, we could have warned people and reacted as efficiently as possible. In his case, it was a problem with major environmental impacts. A similar example came to my mind.

Public Works has transferred, or is in the process of transferring, the management of docks to the municipalities. I represent a little municipality of barely 250 inhabitants called Moffet. There is a federal dock in Moffet. The kind of renovations done to that dock could have been managed much more efficiently by the municipal administration. One day officials from Public Works came to undertake the renovations—in co-operation with Fisheries and Oceans, of course—but these people did not take into consideration particulars or comments. Because the town's mayor showed up at the site. In a small town, when people from outside are coming in, they are spotted at once. On that day, the people rushed to meet them and seeask what they were doing. Then, they realized they were coming to repair the dock. It was obvious to the local population that what was about to be done would not be work, but nobody had told the contractor. He had the contract, and he had to abide by it to get paid.

The person who got the contract said: ''If I want to be paid, I must follow the specifications, and I will''. Six months later, everything had to be redone, because the repairs did not last. There had been an error in assessing spring flood levels and other factors.

If my office or myself had been advised that the government was considering such work, we could have contacted the municipality's officials or officials from other regional county municipalities that had carried out similar projects. We could have been more efficient and we would not have had to do it twice. Moreover, we could have informed local contractors that repairs were to be done and that the bidding process was open. We can say repeatedly that the process is open, but not everybody knows that. If we were more involved at the local level, we could be more efficient. There would be more economic spinoffs in our regions.

What the Bloc Quebecois suggested to avoid this kind of thing was to inform members of what is going on, and in the present case, namely the management of public funds under federal jurisdiction, to give notice to the elected representatives of the people of what is coming, what will have to be done, and even what has been done so far. But of course, acting in a more transparent and efficient way is not one of the present government's priorities. I insist because I am convinced that it will lead to more efficiency.

Why not try to be more efficient? This is a question we might well ask.

• (1720)

It might be to protect certain interests. To play politics, or worse, to use patronage to reward friends of the government by granting them a number of contracts and kickbacks in exchange for their political ties.

When people elect us they believe that we have a lot of power. They think we can change many things easily. Increasingly, they get the feeling that we are fighting a machine trying to protect itself, to be more or less transparent, to account for things in a certain manner. Three or four years later, the books are kept differently, the way data is presented is changed, it is very confusing, several sets of data are combined together, the whole of Quebec is lumped together, even the whole of Canada. It becomes very difficult to know exactly what was done in each area.

Returns which are more local in nature or deal more with specific ridings are more difficult to get. Sometimes, it is possible, but it is generally quite rare. They are certainly not available from the new Department of Public Works and Government Services. And yet, a lot of money is channeled through this department.

Perhaps, if there was more consultation, if people were more involved, there might be fewer buildings with empty offices, fewer very expensive buildings or fewer very expensive renovations.

Once I spoke with someone responsible for building maintenance or improvement, especially for federal buildings. This person benefited from the spinoffs and said to me: ''I certainly have no right to complain, but it is incredible to see the amount of waste''.

That is what he said. And I, a member of Parliament, felt totally powerless in front of that situation. When you call for information, you would think you were asking for the moon because it takes quite a considerable effort to obtain a statement of expenditures for a specific building and to find out if there were misuse or squandering.

Naturally, people who authorize squandering try to justify it. To prevent that, we should act before and not after the fact. This is one of our problems. Our society is largely focused on remedial action; we try to solve problems but we do not try hard enough to prevent them. It is the same with the management of public funds. It would seem only normal to ask for statements.

The year 2000 is almost here. Computer services are well developed and it would be very easy to obtain statements from the different ridings.

The auditor general is supposed to be the watchdog of government. It costs nearly $50 million a year for us to monitor the

government, for the government to check its own administration. His task would be made easier if elected members were more involved in the monitoring of public spending. Everybody knows that we have administrative assistants, people who work for us, and we could follow very closely the spending of public money in our ridings, and influence the way things are done.

This would greatly enrich the role of elected members—and especially members of the governing party—who would feel that they have real influence on the decision making process in their communities. If the public knew that their local representatives can watch very closely, can monitor, and even influence or neutralize things which are not done efficiently, they would feel a little closer to politics.

What worries me the most is seeing how far they can go. This reflects the attitude of the Prime Minister, a slight lack of respect for democracy as a whole. Whether it be through a desire to influence the rules of democratic consultation, or through processes like the one dealing with the Pearson airport or by an attitude when faced with suggestions like the ones we have made, which would serve to reinforce democracy—because MPs are representatives of their constituents—one wonders to what extent politicians are protecting each other with the backing of the bureaucracy. I am talking about the highest ranks of the bureaucracy, because local civil servants usually act in good faith and are willing to co-operate. There are some departments where things are going very well.

In my riding, for example, in the Department of Human Resources Development it is working very well. In that department, they are in the habit of consulting members of Parliament. However, it is getting less common, because previously the signature of an MP was required, but now it is less often the case, although consultations on a voluntary basis remain, depending on the person in charge, on whether he or she was appointed by the present or the previous government, on the mood of the minister in charge, etc.

• (1725)

I believe this was a very valid component of organizational culture that recognized the role played by the elected reprresentatives. It is very dangerous to get away from that.

Before closing, I would like to give an example of something similar, which is happening with the appointment of people who are going to be in charge of the Statistics Canada census. There was a usual, familiar processus, but it would appear that political interference is on the rise, and this is not necessarily sound and not necessarily desirable.

So, in closing, we have very interesting suggestions which will ensure that the worst that could happen for the government is that it be more efficient. So I wonder why government members are opposed to that. If they are acting in good faith, they will adjust their bill. We are at the third reading stage, there is still time to improve it and then we could considere supporting these government actions, which will ensure that we will become more efficient and above all more responsible.

[*English*]

Mr. John Harvard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it behoves me to respond to some of the statements made by members of the Bloc. I do not think they can be allowed to go unchallenged.

A few minutes ago the member for Berthier—Montcalm raised the issue of the dredging contract at Sorel, Quebec. He more or less implied that the public has been ignored, that certain concerns have been overlooked and that people who have legitimate concerns have been shut out of the process. I say unequivocally and categorically that is not true.

Yes, there are environmental concerns surrounding that project. Those environmental concerns are being met. Already there have been public meetings on this issue. There were two meetings that I know of, one on January 5, 1996 and another on March 14, 1996. Those meetings involved public consultations.

For the hon. member to somehow suggest that the public is being ignored in this process, he is just not being factual and is not rendering a service to the House. I can state that if further public meetings are required that will happen. As I said, there are environmental concerns. The Department of Public Works and Government Services has a responsibility to address those concerns.

I want to put those statements on the record. I do not think that the hon. member from Berthier—Montcalm had all the information at his fingertips. I would hope he would take what I have said into account.

I also want to address one of the issues raised by the hon. member for Témiscamingue. If I can put it in my own words, the hon. member for Témiscamingue was asking out loud what is going on in his riding or in other ridings in Quebec. He was saying that the government issues contracts and he, the hon. member for Témiscamingue, does not know what is going on.

I would suggest that he should do his homework better. There are means available to the hon. member for Témiscamingue and for other members from the Bloc, other members from the province of Quebec, other members from all provinces in this country. There is ample opportunity for—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The member is now in question and comment period concerning the speech made by the member for Témiscamingue.

• (1730)

The member is now responding to allegations that I am making. If we want to set the record straight, the member is giving false information, Madam Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): This is not a question of privilege.

[*English*]

Mr. Harvard: Madam Speaker, let me continue with respect to what the hon. member for Témiscamingue was saying. In effect he was saying he did not know what was going on in his own riding and that members of the Bloc Quebecois should know more about what is going on with respect to the letting of government contracts, that it should know more about what is going on in its ridings.

If the members do their homework they can find out. We talked about the open bidding service before and I will talk about it again. For example, I cite what is available on OBS: all contract opportunities; notices of plans, sole sourced contracts as well as notices of contract awards; the open bidding system also offers contract histories, that is information on contracts that have been awarded in the past to whom and for what amount.

He is also somehow suggesting we should make all this information available on a riding to riding basis, which would invite all kinds of red tape. We already have red tape in the government. We already have too much paper and we are providing this information through the electronic system, OBS.

If the hon. member really wants to know what is going on he can do it. It may take a little work but if he ties into the open bidding system he can get the information he needs.

I go back to what the member for Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead said. I am not exactly sure what he was talking about. I know the hon. member. He is a personable, engaging fellow, but I think he has had a bad day. Somehow he was talking about promoting a contracting out code.

We have the system in place that is open, that is fair, that is transparent. It is above board. What the members from the Bloc are suggesting is that we draw members of Parliament into the system—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sauvageau: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. I think the hon. parliamentary secretary has just woken up from a long sleep, and before he goes back in time to the throne speech or his election in 1993, we should remind him that this is the question and comment period following the speech of the member for Témiscamingue.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Your point of order was not valid at all.

[*English*]

Mr. Harvard: Madam Speaker, I will finish my last point in a moment. I thought I was doing a service to the members of the Bloc by providing this information. I believe I am providing a service to all Canadians watching this debate.

The hon. member for Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead seems to be suggesting we politicize the public service. I think we have one of the greatest public services in the world. It is professional and public servants do their jobs in a professional manner. The last thing I want is to politicize that service. I believe we have a system in place.

If the members of the Bloc do their homework, if they need information, if they want information, it is there. They may have to do some work but after all that is what they are paid for. We have a system that works and we should be very proud of it.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): I would like to remind you that the question and comment period is 10 minutes long. As should be obvious by its name, it is a period for questions or comments.

Mr. Brien: Madam Speaker, in the three or four minutes I have left, I will respond to the parliamentary secretary. First of all, I would like to remind him of a few points. In his comment, question or lecture, if you like, the hon. member referred to my work as a member of Parliament. I say to him that the constituents in my riding will decide for themselves in the next election and I invite him to come to my riding to discuss this matter, perhaps sooner than he expects. I will then be pleased to be accountable to my constituents.

• (1735)

He referred to the situation in the riding of my colleague, the hon. member for Berthier—Montcalm. I wish to tell him that some of the information he gave is wrong. He should ask the people in his department to do the job if he does not want to do it himself. First of all, the first public assembly was held January 15 and not January 5, and it was in Sorel by invitation. Only one person from the north shore had been invited and was present.

The second public assembly, which was held March 14, was organized by my colleague for Berthier—Montcalm and not by his department or by the Department of Public Works and Government Services.

So I would ask the parliamentary secretary—

An hon. member: To apologize.

Mr. Brien: Not to apologize, it would be asking too much, but at least to congratulate my colleague in some future speech, because we know that he likes to revisit past issues, the next time he has an opportunity to do so in about 20 minutes.

In closing, I would like to get back to what the hon. member said about working harder and not being afraid of work. We are certainly not afraid of work. What we are asking him is to submit contracts worth $25,000 and above to House committees, to elected members, for review and analysis so that we can do our job properly. We are not afraid of work. If he himself is afraid, that is his problem. We, however, want to be more effective and, as I was saying earlier, more accountable.

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in this House to participate in the debate at third reading on Bill C-7 to merge two former departments, namely Public Works Canada and Supply and Services Canada.

This bill does not change the legislation much at all. On the surface, the bill is not controversial. That is the problem. Since Bill C-7 was introduced, the official opposition has taken issue and continues to take issue not with what the government has done but rather with what it has not done. Basically, the old system is being kept. Change the designation, change the first page and put everything back together unchanged.

Members will recall that this is the department handling the majority of the federal government's goods and services procurement contracts. Billions of dollars are involved, and with billions of dollars at stake, almost nothing is being done, no effort made to determine how this money could be spent more efficiently. Contrary to what they had promised in the red book, they are not taking the time to put in place a transparent system to make these expenditures more efficient and effective. I will give you more examples from my riding in a moment. If the hon. parliamentary secretary who wants to see whether we have done our job, he could start by telling me if he has done his.

When tabling Bill C-52, now Bill C-7, the federal government had an opportunity to innovate. It had an opportunity to establish a model department, a department from which all the cumbersome red tape would have been removed. As a rule, a modern government uses modern tools to meet public expectations. The federal government, thanks to proposals from the official opposition, had a chance to fulfil its electoral promises and ensure maximum transparency in all aspects of power.

As my colleagues said earlier, people generally feel that opposition members object for the pure delight of it, but our party proposed four clear and precise amendments that would allow the government to improve its supply and services system, boost its popularity, and, at the same time, restore public faith lost because of the all too present patronage seen in government. What have they done? Absolutely nothing. They replaced the front page, changed the title and the number of the bill, and trotted it out again.

So, nothing at all was done. Of all the amendments presented by the Bloc Quebecois during the previous debates on the bill, none was retained. Let me recall a few just to show how appropriate they could have been to improve the bill's effectiveness.

• (1740)

First of all, I must state the Bloc Quebecois's concern that there were no simple and transparent rules. If a contractor in my riding wishes to deal with the federal government, he will have to go some distance to locate a resource person. Before knocking on the right door, before speaking to the right person, before reaching the appropriate service, this contractor, or his business, must have the following qualifications: he must be very familiar with the system, be a generous donor, have a lifelong knowledge of the system, and have friends in the right places.

This is precisely what we wanted to change. We wanted to change that perception regarding access to an imposing structure that discourages anyone, including ordinary citizens, experts and elected representatives, interested in finding out more about the department and how public funds are spent. I will give you some examples later on.

As I said earlier, it should be possible and in fact easier for anyone, such as a contractor, to have access to that structure and offer his services. I want to remind this House of the experience of some of my Bloc Quebecois colleagues who, a few months ago, sent a written request to Public Works and Government Services Canada to obtain a list of the contracts awarded by that department in their ridings.

Such a request from an elected representative is perfectly in order. After all, in the case of the infrastructures program, we regularly receive in our offices a list of the projects submitted in our ridings. The list also specifies which projects are approved and which ones are rejected. That list is a public document. We can quite appropriately discuss it with local politicians.

So, some Bloc Quebecois members simply asked the department responsible for awarding the supply and services contracts how the government spends public funds. As member for Terrebonne, I should know how that money is being spent in my riding.

These members sent their written request to the Department of Public Works. The minister's reply was especially surprising and disappointing. The Minister of Public Works and Government Services answered that it was unfortunately impossible to reply to their requests because it would entail too much expense. We do not know how he did it, but he gave an estimate of $160,000 for those expenditures at that time.

This example clearly shows how cumbersome the department is. It also shows how members who, like my colleague for Témiscamingue, like my colleague for Berthier-Montcalm, like myself and like all my colleagues, including Liberal members and Reform members, want to do their job—

Mr. Landry: And the member for Lotbinière.

Mr. Sauvageau: And my colleague for Lotbinière, I am sorry. It shows how impossible it is for those members to do their job well and to know about the expenditures that have been made in their ridings. Departmental officials tell us that it is impossible to give us an answer, that they do not know how much they are spending and they do not know either how the contracts are awarded.

The public service, and more specifically the Department of Public Works and Government Services, have set up impressive obstacles to confuse people, like members of Parliament, who try to understand the workings of the federal machinery for awarding government contracts in our ridings.

The number of contractors who try to get contracts from the Department of Public Works and Government Services, but do not manage to understand all the ins and outs of the government machinery, is very large. I think every member from every party gets that kind of complaint in his or her constituency office. That explains how a select club of contractors came to exist, people used to the workings of the system, who too often take advantage of the government largesse.

Official opposition amendments providing for simple and transparent rules have all be defeated. Another amendment I will deal with momentarily provided for a contracting out code. It has met with the same fate. As the hon. member for Témiscamingue mentioned a while ago, I think we need easy, clear and transparent rules and standards. Contracting out is a fact, and I will give figures later on, but it could be made more effective.

The Bloc Quebecois amendment simply reflected a tendency to contract out that has been growing over the years in the federal public service. The last available data are for fiscal year 1992-93. According to Treasury Board estimates, services that have been contracted outside the federal government totalled $5.2 billion during that year.

• (1745)

The federal government was certainly not unaware of that trend when it introduced Bill C-7. It should have taken this opportunity to regulate this new procedure.

The President of the Treasury Board has told us year in and year out: ''The number of public servants has dropped by 3 per cent, or 5 per cent, and the public service has been shrinking''. What he forgot to tell us is that, in the meantime, contract budgets have been rising. What we would like to know, as elected representatives of the people, is how much money is being wasted—yes, wasted—in contracts and how these contracts are awarded.

Why is the number of public servants decreasing year after year while contracting out is on the rise? We have a good idea. It means fewer responsibilities in terms of labour relations and job security, fewer responsibilities for the employers towards their employees.

Should we issue a contracting out code? We did propose one. What did we get for an answer? Nothing. The Bloc Quebecois thought Bill C-7 would establish such a code, or at least rules for the government to properly control the contracting out process and to make it more open.

Everyone from the government and its employees to the general public would have benefited from such a contracting out code. This is the kind of code that ensures better work relations between the government and its public servants, while contracting out is often perceived by the public service and unions as a fearsome enemy they have to fight all the time.

By developing clear contracting out rules, everyone's role would be well defined and everyone would benefit. Also, such a code would have cleared up the whole contracting out process, something the population would have appreciated. We would have solved the problem. It is by setting these kinds of standards rather than by rejecting a whole series of proposals to make positive changes to the awarding process that we will restore the Canadian population's confidence in our abilities and revive their expectations.

By refusing to follow up on the two recommendations from the official opposition regarding the importance of establishing a contracting out code and establishing clear guidelines, the Liberal government is encouraging or giving the appearance of encouraging outmoded practices, for which the public is still and always the first to pay.

I would remind you that in a recent survey, school board officials and municipal, provincial and federal politicians had the trust of about 4 per cent of the population. If we add up the number of school board officials and municipal, provincial and federal politicians, they represent about 4 per cent of the population. This was not a very strong vote of confidence and it is not going to get any better with standards like these. If we then look at the error rate, something like 4 per cent, we did not do very well.

In another vein, I would like to draw the attention of this House to another recommendation of the Bloc Quebecois which never went anywhere, that being the involvement of MPs, regardless of affiliation. This is not a partisan recommendation, to involve them in the letting of Public Works and Government Services contracts in their respective ridings, as is now the case with infrastructure projects.

At the present time, it is literally impossible—let anyone correct me—for an MP to find out about contracts let by the department in

question in his or her riding, as we mentioned earlier. This makes no sense, if we accept the principle that MPs are the people most aware of what is going on in their own ridings.

The problem of the wharf in Témiscamingue was mentioned earlier, as well as another problem in the riding of Berthier—Montcalm. It is now my turn to tell you about a problem in my riding. It concerns the unemployment office.

We learned at one point that, because it did not conform to standards, the Terrebonne unemployment office had to be moved—which is quite commendable—to another location that was larger, better suited, more modern, with new carpeting, new furniture, new lights, a new computer system, etc.

The move was made about six months ago. It cost hundreds of thousands of dollars with the work that was done at the new location and the signing of a ten-year lease. To show you the great consistency between government departments, a month later, we learned that the Terrebonne unemployment office was going to be closed.

● (1750)

How many tens of thousands of dollars, how many hundreds of thousands of dollars, were spent on a ten year lease for beautiful, brand new premises, just to announce one, two or three months later that the office was being closed down? When? Unknown. That makes for an excellent work atmosphere. They tell the workers: ''You will be cut, and the office will be shut down. We do not know when, but give us a year or two and it will all be over. We have just set up fancy new offices, but forget about an office-warming party''. There was not even an official opening ceremony. No time, it was closed. Or going to be closed. Now, that shows a really coherent policy. How more with it can anyone be?

So that is another example, and we could go back a bit in time for several more. As my colleagues have said, MPs need to be aware of what departmental contracts are being awarded in their ridings, so as to be effective and efficient, and to help the government as well. Whether Liberal, Bloc Québécois, or Reform, who are the ones who should be informed of what is going on in our ridings? The MPs, first and foremost, not the public servants, but the MPs. Not so that we can carry out our own political patronage, but to offer our opinions, as is done everywhere.

Besides, this recommendation of the official opposition was based on the principle that the competence of members of Parliament goes beyond the legislative framework, inasmuch as they have to study matters of state and this, of course, has practical administrative consequences. Nevertheless, even if members of Parliament are consulted, even if they are invited to vote on various kinds of issues, as they will be called to do in a moment, they are still denied any means of verifying if votes, expenditures, income tax and government decisions comply with the recommendations and legislation of the House.

In a few moments we will vote on one bill and tomorrow we will vote on another. Then we will try to see whether our vote is well represented in our riding, and we will be denied this information. If members cannot have access, as the minister wrote, to information on the expenditures by the various departments in their ridings, how can an ordinary individual unfamiliar with the intricacies of government machinery obtain information? It is impossible.

The government's refusal to inform a member about federal government activities in his or her riding is another of its failings. Why not consult, or at least inform a member, as in the infrastructure program, when a contract is awarded in his or her riding? This would be an opportunity to encourage transparency and efficiency in an overloaded system.

Furthermore, members of Parliament could be used as safeguards against the blind waste of public funds. They could, for example, advise a public servant who does not know how things work in Témiscamingue and who, in turn, could advise an architect before any plans were drawn up. A public servant could visit the riding to consult other public servants before setting up premises, drawing up a 10-year lease, etc. if the office is to be closed before its official opening. I think there may be more intelligent standards to be set in the public service if we want to get more than 4 per cent.

In addition to stressing the merit of having members of Parliament involved in the system, the Bloc Quebecois stressed the importance of making public servants accountable since these are the first to know how public funds are used. The Bloc Quebecois recommended the implementation of an instrument allowing—even though I do not like the term—exposure of waste of public funds by civil servants and valuing the practice. What we mean by that is not a ''stooling'' system revealing situations where someone is spending more than the other. It is simply a system allowing civil servants to report the inadequacy of some program without being penalized.

As I said, the underlying principle is not to frighten employees who would suspect others of checking up on them, but rather to admit that useless spending is made regularly.

Finally, I would conclude this short speech by reminding the House of another recommendation we made and which is largely approved by many MPs of all parties.

The Bloc Quebecois seized the opportunity to firmly condemn the practice of advance payments. What is advance payment? It is a practise which consists in using all the resources available to a

departmental unit. This way, the department makes sure it will have the same budget for the following year.

What does this mean? It is simple. If, in a department, you have $1,500,000 to spend, you must make sure you spend it all. If, towards the end of the last month, you still have $150,000, buy $150,000 worth of dictionaries if you want, but spend it all.

• (1755)

Practices like these account for a rating of 4 per cent in people's confidence in the government. Practices like these have been condemned by the Bloc Quebecois throughout consideration of Bill C-7.

To conclude, these four amendments, these four proposals by the Bloc Quebecois would have allowed every one in this House, not only the Bloc, not only the sovereignist movement, to regain some respect and improve their public image.

[*English*]

Mr. John Harvard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I really cannot believe my ears. I am absolutely amazed that members of the Bloc would propose the politicization of the letting of contracts. It is really hard to believe in this day and age that any member of Parliament would suggest that they should directly intervene in the letting of contracts.

What is the point in having a professional civil service? What is the point of setting down an objective set of criteria if members of Parliament, even with the best of intentions, were allowed to interfere in the letting of contracts or in the invitation of bids. It simply would not work.

If we hear today outcries about patronage, which we do from time to time, can you imagine, Madam Speaker, the kind of outcries you would hear if we were to pursue the course suggested by the Bloc? I suppose if the government were to let a contract to someone who had ties to the Bloc, then of course everything would seem open, fair, transparent and above board. It would be seen as okay.

What would happen if the government ever let a contract to someone who may have some kind of remote ties to the government? Right away the accusation of patronage would be heard.

We went through this in the 19th century. Surely the Bloc would not want to have that kind of political patronage come back on to the political scene.

The Bloc members have been more or less implying or suggesting that we do not listen and if only we would listen we would do a far better job. Let us talk about Bill C-7 or in its former incarnation Bill C-52. Members voiced concerns about clause 16. They were concerned about the discretion that the original version of clause 16 gave to the minister. They were concerned that the minister would have too much power.

What was done? The clause was amended. Under clause 16 the minister no longer has that discretion. Now the discretion must be exercised by order in council, in other words by full cabinet. Not only that, but it was amended so that when it came to entering into contracts with other governments, whether they were inside the country or outside the country, it cannot be done by the federal government on its own, in other words, it cannot be done proactively. It has to be done as a result of an amendment only on request.

Even if the government thought it would like to enter into some kind of contractual liaison with another province, it cannot do it unless that province approaches us and asks us specifically to enter into a contractual liaison. That is an example of listening.

When the members of the Bloc talk about us not listening, I would submit very sincerely that they are being disingenuous. To put it in clearer language, they are not being sincere.

With that kind of talk, I do not think the members of the Bloc do service to themselves, their constituents, the people of Quebec, and certainly not to Canadians in general. We have what is called an open bidding system, which is open, fair, above board and transparent. If members of the Bloc want to acquaint themselves with the system they will find that it is a good system and it is working.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADA TRANSPORTATION ACT

The House resumed consideration at report stage of Bill C-14, an act to continue the National Transportation Agency as the Canadian Transportation Agency, to consolidate and revise the National Transportation Act, 1987 and the Railway Act and to amend or repeal other acts as a consequence.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): It being six o'clock, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at the report stage and second reading of Bill C-14, an act to continue the National Transportation Agency, to consolidate and revise the National Transportation Act, 1987 and the Railway Act and to amend or repeal other acts as a consequence.

Call in the members.

• (1815)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 69.

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

Government Orders

(*Division No. 20*)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Bachand
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Chatters
Dalphond-Guiral
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Grey (Beaver River)
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lefebvre
Mayfield
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Ramsay
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)
Asselin
Bélisle
Benoit
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Charest
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Duncan
Frazer
Gilmour
Gouk
Grubel
Harris
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Lalonde
Langlois
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Manning
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
Meredith
Morrison
Ringma
Sauvageau
Silye
Speaker
Venne
Williams —58

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Assadourian
Barnes
Bernier (Beauce)
Bevilacqua
Boudria
Brushett
Calder
Catterall
Cohen
Collins
Cowling
Culbert
Dingwall
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Fry
Gallaway
Goodale
Harb
Hopkins
Irwin
Jordan
Kraft Sloan
Lee
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Marleau
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
O'Reilly
Peric
Phinney
Pillitteri
Alcock
Anderson
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Bélair
Bethel
Bodnar
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Campbell
Cauchon
Collenette
Copps
Crawford
DeVillers
Dromisky
Dupuy
English
Finlay
Gaffney
Gerrard
Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Knutson
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Loney
Malhi
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Nault
Pagtakhan
Peters
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Reed
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Stewart (Brant)
Telegdi
Wells
Young
Robillard
Simmons
Szabo
Ur
Whelan
Zed—90

PAIRED MEMBERS

Arseneault
Bakopanos
Bertrand
Canuel
Chamberlain
Crête
Debien
Dhaliwal
Duceppe
Fillion
Guay
Harper (Churchill)
Jacob
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier
Maloney
Ménard
Nunziata
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Regan
Skoke
St-Laurent
Stewart (Northumberland)
Torsney
Verran
Augustine
Bergeron
Cannis
Caron
Chan
Daviault
Deshaies
Dubé
Dumas
Gauthier
Guimond
Iftody
Kirkby
Lebel
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln
MacAulay
Marchand
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Paradis
Patry
Pomerleau
Shepherd
Speller
Steckle
Terrana
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wood

[*English*]

Mr. Blaikie: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member for Mackenzie and I voted at the beginning and at the end. We are not trying to vote twice but we did not hear our names over the microphone either time. I would like to be assured that we were recorded as voting in the affirmative for this amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): You can rest assured it was called.

[*Translation*]

I declare Motion No. 1 negatived. Motion No. 69 is therefore negatived as well.

The next vote is on Motion No. 25.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe that you would find unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion before the House. Liberal members will vote nay.

I also wish to add the name of the Secretary of State for Agriculture to the list for this vote.

Mr. Charest: Madam Speaker, my colleague for Saint John and myself being the sponsors of this motion, I wish to inform the government whip that we consent to apply the vote on the previous

motion to this motion, and also, of course, to add the name of the Secretary of State for Agriculture to the list.

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: Madam Speaker, members of the official opposition will vote nays.

[*English*]

Mr. Ringma: Madam Speaker, except for those who might wish to vote otherwise, we will vote yes to this motion.

Mr. Blaikie: Madam Speaker, the NDP votes yes on this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernier (Beauce): No, Madam Speaker.

● (1830)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): I invite the honourable member for Sherbrooke to repeat the comments he made earlier about the vote because they were not recorded.

Mr. Charest: Madam Speaker, of course I intend to vote in favour of this motion. Therefore, if I heard my colleagues well, there is unanimous consent.

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

(*Division No. 21*)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Charest
Duncan
Frazer
Gouk
Grubel
Harris
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Manning
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
Mills (Red Deer)
Ramsay
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
Williams —37

Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Chatters
Epp
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Mayfield
Meredith
Morrison
Ringma
Silye
Speaker
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Barnes
Bélisle
Bernier (Beauce)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bevilacqua
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Campbell

Alcock
Anderson
Asselin
Bachand
Bélair
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bethel
Bodnar
Brien
Brushett
Calder
Catterall

Cauchon
Cohen
Collins
Cowling
Culbert
DeVillers
Dromisky
Dupuy
English
Finlay
Gaffney
Gallaway
Godin
Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Knutson
Lalonde
Langlois
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Loney
Malhi
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Mercier
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
O'Reilly
Peric
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Robillard
Sauvageau
Simmons
Szabo
Ur
Wells
Young

Chrétien (Frontenac)
Collenette
Copps
Crawford
Dalphond-Guiral
Dingwall
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Fry
Gagnon (Québec)
Gerrard
Goodale
Harb
Hopkins
Irwin
Jordan
Kraft Sloan
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Marleau
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
McWhinney
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Nault
Pagtakhan
Peters
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Robichaud
Rocheleau
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Stewart (Brant)
Telegdi
Venne
Whelan
Zed—112

PAIRED MEMBERS

Arseneault
Bakopanos
Bertrand
Canuel
Chamberlain
Crête
Debien
Dhaliwal
Duceppe
Fillion
Guay
Harper (Churchill)
Jacob
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier
Maloney
Ménard
Nunziata
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Regan
Skoke
St-Laurent
Stewart (Northumberland)
Torsney
Verran

Augustine
Bergeron
Cannis
Caron
Chan
Daviault
Deshaies
Dubé
Dumas
Gauthier
Guimond
Iftody
Kirkby
Lebel
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln
MacAulay
Marchand
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Paradis
Patry
Pomerleau
Shepherd
Speller
Steckle
Terrana
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wood

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): I declare Motion No. 25 negatived.

The next question is on Motion No. 2. The vote on this motion will also apply to Motion No. 29.

[*English*]

Mr. Ringma: Madam Speaker, I have a problem. The Reform Party would like to support Motion No. 2 but it has been tied to Motion No. 29 which we do not support. I wonder if you would pry these apart and give us separate votes on Motion No. 2 and Motion No. 29.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): That was in the Speaker's ruling, therefore we cannot change this unless we have the consent of all the MPs in the House. Do we have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, if you were to seek it I believe that you would find unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion before the House. Liberal members will vote nay.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: Madam Speaker, members of the official opposition will vote nay.

[*English*]

Mr. Ringma: Madam Speaker, Reform members, except those who do otherwise, will vote against the motion.

Mr. Blaikie: Madam Speaker, the NDP votes yes on this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernier (Beauce): I vote against it, Madam Speaker.

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

(*Division No. 22*)

YEAS

Members

Althouse Blaikie—2

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Barnes
Bélisle
Benoit
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bethel
Bodnar
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Campbell
Cauchon
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Collenette
Copps
Crawford
Dalphond-Guiral
Dingwall
Duhamel
Dupuy
English
Fewchuk
Frazer
Gaffney
Gallaway
Gilmour
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Grubel
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Hubbard
Jackson
Jordan
Kraft Sloan
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Manning
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Mercier
Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
Pagtakhan
Peters
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Reed
Robichaud
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Silye
Solberg
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Ur
Wells
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)
Young
Alcock
Anderson
Asselin
Bachand
Bélair
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Beauce)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bevilacqua
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Brushett
Calder
Catterall
Chatters
Cohen
Collins
Cowling
Culbert
DeVillers
Dromisky
Duncan
Eggleton
Epp
Finlay
Fry
Gagnon (Québec)
Gerrard
Godin
Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)
Harb
Harris
Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Irwin
Jennings
Knutson
Lalonde
Langlois
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Loney
Malhi
Marleau
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
McWhinney
Meredith
Milliken
Minna
Morrison
Murray
O'Reilly
Peric
Phinney
Pillitteri
Ramsay
Ringma
Robillard
Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Simmons
Speaker
Stinson
Telegdi
Venne
Whelan
Williams
Zed—146

PAIRED MEMBERS

Arseneault
Bakopanos
Bertrand
Canuel
Chamberlain
Crête
Debien
Dhaliwal
Duceppe
Fillion
Guay
Harper (Churchill)
Augustine
Bergeron
Cannis
Caron
Chan
Daviault
Deshaies
Dubé
Dumas
Gauthier
Guimond
Iftody

Jacob	Kirkby
Laurin	Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Lincoln
Loubier	MacAulay
Maloney	Marchand
Ménard	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Nunziata	Paradis
Paré	Patry
Picard (Drummond)	Pomerleau
Regan	Shepherd
Skoke	Speller
St-Laurent	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Terrana
Torsney	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Verran	Wood

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): I declare Motion No. 2 lost.

• (1835)

The next question is on Motion No. 29.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent that the members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion presently before the House, with Liberal MPs voting nay.

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: Madam Speaker, the Official Opposition members vote no.

[*English*]

Mr. Ringma: The Reform Party votes no on this motion.

Mr. Blaikie: The NDP votes yes on this motion, Madam Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernier (Beauce): Madam Speaker, the only elected independent member votes no.

[*English*]

Mr. Epp: Madam Speaker, I hope the Table has noted that the member for Sherbrooke has absented himself and should not be counted in any of these future votes.

[*Translation*]

[*Editor's Note: See the list under Division No. 22.]*

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): I declare the Motion No. 29 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 31.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I wish to seek unanimous consent that the results of the vote taken a little earlier today on Motion No. 1 at report stage be applied to the motion presently before the House, adding of course the presence of the Secretary of State (Agriculture) who will vote too against the motion.

I wish also to seek unanimous consent that this vote applies to the following motions: Nos. 36, 37, 38 and 68.

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: Madam Speaker, members of the official opposition will vote yea.

[*English*]

Mr. Ringma: Madam Speaker, we do not give unanimous consent to apply to Motion No. 38 or Motion No. 27. We would like a standing vote on those two, please.

Mr. Blaikie: Madam Speaker, there seems to be some confusion concerning the procedure. If we agree to reverse or to apply votes we do not have to get up and say how we vote. We just agree to apply them. We agree to apply them.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernier (Beauce): Madam Speaker, I will vote against the motions.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, perhaps I should reword this to say that I am seeking unanimous consent to apply the result of vote 1 to report stage Motions Nos. 31, 36, 37, not 38 just for greater clarity, and 68.

I believe that would find unanimous consent.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

(*Division No. 23*)

YEAS

Members

Althouse	Asselin
Bachand	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Brien	Charest
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Dalphond-Guiral	Duncan
Epp	Frazer
Gagnon (Québec)	Gilmour
Godin	Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)	Harris
Hart	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoeppner
Jennings	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Manning
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
Mercier	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Ramsay	Ringma
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Silye
Solberg	Speaker
Stinson	Venne
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)	Williams —58

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Assadourian
Barnes
Bernier (Beauce)
Bevilacqua
Boudria
Brushett
Calder
Catterall
Cohen
Collins
Cowling
Culbert
Dingwall
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Fry
Gallaway
Goodale
Harb
Hopkins
Irwin
Jordan
Kraft Sloan
Lee
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Marleau
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
O'Reilly
Peric
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Robillard
Simmons
Szabo
Ur
Whelan
Zed—90

Alcock
Anderson
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Bélair
Bethel
Bodnar
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Campbell
Cauchon
Collenette
Copps
Crawford
DeVillers
Dromisky
Dupuy
English
Finlay
Gaffney
Gerrard
Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Knutson
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Loney
Malhi
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Nault
Pagtakhan
Peters
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Robichaud
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Stewart (Brant)
Telegdi
Wells
Young

PAIRED MEMBERS

Arseneault
Bakopanos
Bertrand
Canuel
Chamberlain
Crête
Debien
Dhaliwal
Duceppe
Fillion
Guay
Harper (Churchill)
Jacob
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier
Maloney
Ménard
Nunziata
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Regan

Augustine
Bergeron
Cannis
Caron
Chan
Daviault
Deshaies
Dubé
Dumas
Gauthier
Guimond
Iftody
Kirkby
Lebel
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln
MacAulay
Marchand
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Paradis
Patry
Pomerleau
Shepherd

Skoke
St-Laurent
Stewart (Northumberland)
Torsney
Verran

Speller
Steckle
Terrana
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wood

● (1840)

The Acting President (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): I declare Motion No. 31 defeated.

The next question will be on Motion No. 36.

[*Editor's Note: See List under Division No. 23.*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): The next question will be on Motion No. 37.

[*Editor's Note: See List under Division No. 23.*]

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): The next question is on Motion No. 38.

(The House divided on Motion No. 38, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 24*)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Bachand
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Duncan
Frazer
Gilmour
Gouk
Grubel
Harris
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Lalonde
Langlois
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Manning
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
Meredith
Morrison
Ringma
Sauvageau
Silye
Speaker
Venne
Williams —57

Asselin
Bélisle
Benoit
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Chatters
Dalphond-Guiral
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Grey (Beaver River)
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lefebvre
Mayfield
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Ramsay
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Assadourian

Alcock
Anderson
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)

Barnes
Bernier (Beauce)
Bevilacqua
Boudria
Brushett
Calder
Catterall
Cohen
Collins
Cowling
Culbert
Dingwall
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Fry
Gallaway
Goodale
Harb
Hopkins
Irwin
Jordan
Kraft Sloan
Lee
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Marleau
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
O'Reilly
Peric
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Robillard
Simmons
Szabo
Ur
Whelan
Zed—91

Bélair
Bethel
Bodnar
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Campbell
Cauchon
Collenette
Copps
Crawford
DeVillers
Dromisky
Dupuy
English
Finlay
Gaffney
Gerrard
Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Knutson
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Loney
Malhi
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Nault
Pagtakhan
Peters
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Robichaud
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Stewart (Brant)
Telegdi
Wells
Young

PAIRED MEMBERS

Arseneault
Bakopanos
Bertrand
Canuel
Chamberlain
Crête
Debien
Dhaliwal
Duceppe
Fillion
Guay
Harper (Churchill)
Jacob
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier
Maloney
Ménard
Nunziata
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Regan
Skoke
St-Laurent
Stewart (Northumberland)

Augustine
Bergeron
Cannis
Caron
Chan
Daviault
Deshaies
Dubé
Dumas
Gauthier
Guimond
Iftody
Kirkby
Lebel
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln
MacAulay
Marchand
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Paradis
Patry
Pomerleau
Shepherd
Speller
Steckle
Terrana

Torsney
Verran

Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wood

● (1845)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): I declare Motion No. 38 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The next question will be on Motion No. 4 in Group No. 5. The vote on this motion will also apply to Motions Nos. 9, 14 and 15.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I was under the impression we were now voting on report stage Motion No. 4. If that is incorrect perhaps the Chair could indicate it to me.

[*Translation*]

The Acting President (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): We will now proceed with the question on Motion No. 4, in Group No. 5.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe that you would find unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion before the House. Liberal members will vote nay.

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: Madam Speaker, members of the official opposition will vote yea.

[*English*]

Mr. Ringma: Madam Speaker, if the Chair will confirm that we are voting on Motion No. 4, the Reform Party votes no, except for those who might vote otherwise.

Mr. Blaikie: Madam Speaker, the NDP votes no on this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernier (Beauce): Madam Speaker, I vote nay on this motion.

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

(*Division No. 25*)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bélisle
Bernier (Gaspé)
Brien
Dalphond-Guiral
Godin
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lefebvre
Rocheleau
Venne—21

Bachand
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Gagnon (Québec)
Lalonde
Langlois
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Mercier
Sauvageau

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anderson	Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)	Barnes
Bélair	Benoit
Bernier (Beauce)	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Bodnar	Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Chatters	Cohen
Collenette	Collins
Copps	Cowling
Crawford	Culbert
DeVillers	Dingwall
Dromisky	Duhamel
Duncan	Dupuy
Eggleton	English
Epp	Fewchuk
Finlay	Frazer
Fry	Gaffney
Gallaway	Gerrard
Gilmour	Goodale
Gouk	Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Harb	Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoeppner
Hopkins	Hubbard
Irwin	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lee
Loney	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi	Manning
Marleau	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Meredith
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Peric
Peters	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Ramsay
Reed	Ringma
Robichaud	Robillard
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Silye	Simmons
Solberg	Speaker
Stewart (Brant)	Stinson
Szabo	Telegdi
Ur	Wells
Whelan	White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)
Williams	Young
Zed—127	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Arseneault	Augustine
Bakopanos	Bergeron
Bertrand	Cannis
Canuel	Caron
Chamberlain	Chan
Crête	Daviault
Debien	Deshaies
Dhaliwal	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Gauthier
Guay	Guimond
Harper (Churchill)	Iftody
Jacob	Kirkby
Laurin	Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Lincoln
Loubier	MacAulay
Maloney	Marchand
Ménard	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Nunziata	Paradis
Paré	Patry
Picard (Drummond)	Pomerleau
Regan	Shepherd
Skoke	Speller
St-Laurent	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Terrana
Torsney	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Verran	Wood

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): I declare Motion No. 4 defeated. Motions Nos. 9, 14 and 15 are therefore also defeated.

• (1850)

The next question is on Motion No. 17. The division on this motion will also apply to Motions Nos. 72 and 73.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the present motion, with Liberal MPs voting nay.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: Madam Speaker, members of the official opposition will vote yea.

[*English*]

Mr. Ringma: Madam Speaker, Reform members will vote no, except those who wish to do otherwise.

Mr. Blaikie: Madam Speaker, the NDP votes yes on this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernier (Beauce): Madam Speaker, I vote nay on this motion.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 17, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 26*)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Bachand
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Brien
Dalphond-Guiral
Godin
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lefebvre
Rocheleau
Venne—23

Asselin
Bélisle
Bernier (Gaspé)
Blaikie
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Gagnon (Québec)
Lalonde
Langlois
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Mercier
Sauvageau

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Assadourian
Barnes
Benoit
Bethel
Bodnar
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brushett
Calder
Catterall
Chatters
Collenette
Copps
Crawford
DeVillers
Dromisky
Duncan
Eggleton
Epp
Finlay
Fry
Gallaway
Gilmour
Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)
Harb
Harris
Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Irwin
Jennings
Knutson
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Loney
Malhi
Marleau
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
McWhinney
Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
Pagtakhan
Peters
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Reed
Robichaud
Schmidt
Silye
Solberg
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo

Alcock
Anderson
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Bélair
Bernier (Beauce)
Bevilacqua
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Campbell
Cauchon
Cohen
Collins
Cowling
Culbert
Dingwall
Duhamel
Dupuy
English
Fewchuk
Frazer
Gaffney
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Grubel
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Hubbard
Jackson
Jordan
Kraft Sloan
Lee
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Manning
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Meredith
Milliken
Minna
Morrison
Murray
O'Reilly
Peric
Phinney
Pillitteri
Ramsay
Ringma
Robillard
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Simmons
Speaker
Stinson
Telegdi
Ur
Whelan
Williams
Zed—125

Wells
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)
Young

PAIRED MEMBERS

Arseneault
Bakopanos
Bertrand
Canuel
Chamberlain
Crête
Debien
Dhaliwal
Duceppe
Fillion
Guay
Harper (Churchill)
Jacob
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier
Maloney
Ménard
Nunziata
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Regan
Skoke
St-Laurent
Stewart (Northumberland)
Torsney
Verran

Augustine
Bergeron
Cannis
Caron
Chan
Daviault
Deshaies
Dubé
Dumas
Gauthier
Guimond
Iftody
Kirkby
Lebel
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln
MacAulay
Marchand
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Paradis
Patry
Pomerleau
Shepherd
Speller
Steckle
Terrana
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wood

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): I declare Motion No. 17 negatived. Therefore, Motions Nos. 72 and 73 are also negatived.

The next question is on Motion No. 27.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to apply the division on the previous motion to this motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No.26.*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): I therefore declare Motion No. 27 negatived.

The next question is on Motion No. 68.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 23.*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): The next question is on Motion No. 6.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I wish to seek unanimous consent to apply the results of report stage Motion No. 25, the second item we voted on tonight, to the motion presently before the House, Motion No. 6, as well as to Motions Nos. 8, 23 and 66.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 21.]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Therefore, I declare the motions negatived.

The next question is on Motion No. 8.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 21.]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): The next question is on Motion No. 18.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I seek the unanimous consent of the House to apply the result of the vote on Motion No. 17 to the motion now before the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under division No. 26]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): I declare Motion No. 18 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 23.

[*Editor's Note: See List under Division No. 26.*]

● (1855)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): The next question is on Motion No. 24.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I seek unanimous consent to apply the results of report stage Motion No. 2 in reverse to the motion now before the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 24, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 27*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anderson
Assadourian	Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)	Bachand
Barnes	Bélair
Bélisle	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bernier (Beauce)
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bodnar	Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Brien
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Calder
Campbell	Catterall
Cauchon	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Cohen
Collenette	Collins
Copps	Cowling
Crawford	Culbert
Dalphond-Guiral	DeVillers
Dingwall	Dromisky
Duhamel	Duncan
Dupuy	Eggleton
English	Epp
Fewchuk	Finlay
Frazer	Fry
Gaffney	Gagnon (Québec)
Gallaway	Gerrard
Gilmour	Godin
Goodale	Gouk
Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Harb
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)	Harris
Hart	Harvard
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoeppner	Hopkins
Hubbard	Irwin
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lee
Lefebvre	Loney
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Manning	Marleau
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mercier	Meredith
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Peric
Peters	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Ramsay
Reed	Ringma
Robichaud	Robillard
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Silye	Simmons
Solberg	Speaker
Stewart (Brant)	Stinson
Szabo	Telegdi
Ur	Venne
Wells	Whelan
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)	Williams
Young	Zed—146

NAYS

Members

Althouse	Blaikie—2

PAIRED MEMBERS

Arseneault	Augustine
Bakopanos	Bergeron
Bertrand	Cannis
Canuel	Caron
Chamberlain	Chan
Crête	Daviault
Debien	Deshaies
Dhaliwal	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Gauthier
Guay	Guimond
Harper (Churchill)	Iftody

Jacob	Kirkby
Laurin	Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Lincoln
Loubier	MacAulay
Maloney	Marchand
Ménard	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Nunziata	Paradis
Paré	Patry
Picard (Drummond)	Pomerleau
Regan	Shepherd
Skoke	Speller
St-Laurent	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Terrana
Torsney	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Verran	Wood

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): I declare Motion No. 24 carried.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 57. The vote on this motion will also apply to Motions Nos. 58 to 65.

If Motion No. 57 is carried, it will obviate the need to vote on Motion No. 66. If Motion No. 57 is defeated, Motion No. 66 will have to be voted on.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe the House would give its unanimous consent to apply the result of the vote on Motion No. 4 to the motion now before us.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See List under Division No. 25.*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): I declare Motion No. 57 negatived. I also declare Motions Nos. 58 to 65 negatived.

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.) moved that the Bill be concurred in at the report stage with further amendments and read the second time.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe that the House would consent to apply the result of the vote at report stage on Motion No. 1 in reverse to the motion now before the House, with the addition of the Secretary of State for Agriculture, who, I believe, will vote in favour.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Is there consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

(*Division No. 28*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anderson
Assadourian	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Barnes	Bélair
Bernier (Beauce)	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Bodnar
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Copps
Cowling	Crawford
Culbert	DeVillers
Dingwall	Dromisky
Duhamel	Dupuy
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Finlay
Fry	Gaffney
Gallaway	Gerrard
Goodale	Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Harb	Harvard
Hopkins	Hubbard
Irwin	Jackson
Jordan	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Loney
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Marleau	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Peric	Peters
Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Proud
Reed	Robichaud
Robillard	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Simmons	Stewart (Brant)
Szabo	Telegdi
Ur	Wells
Whelan	Young
Zed—91	

NAYS

Members

Althouse	Asselin
Bachand	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)

Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Chatters
Dalphond-Guiral
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Grey (Beaver River)
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lefebvre
Mayfield
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Ramsay
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)
Bridgman
Charest
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Duncan
Frazer
Gilmour
Gouk
Grubel
Harris
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Lalonde
Langlois
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Manning
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
Meredith
Morrison
Ringma
Sauvageau
Silye
Speaker
Venne
Williams —58

PAIRED MEMBERS

Arseneault
Bakopanos
Bertrand
Canuel
Chamberlain
Crête
Debien
Dhaliwal
Duceppe
Fillion
Guay
Harper (Churchill)
Jacob
Augustine
Bergeron
Cannis
Caron
Chan
Daviault
Deshaies
Dubé
Dumas
Gauthier
Guimond
Iftody
Kirkby
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier
Maloney
Ménard
Nunziata
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Regan
Skoke
St-Laurent
Stewart (Northumberland)
Torsney
Verran
Lebel
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln
MacAulay
Marchand
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Paradis
Patry
Pomerleau
Shepherd
Speller
Steckle
Terrana
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wood

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): I declare the motion carried.

(Motion agreed to, and bill read the second time.)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): It being 7 p.m., the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24 (1).

(The House adjourned at 7 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Monday, March 25, 1996

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

MAIL POSTE
Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes
Postage paid Port payé
Lettermail Poste–lettre
8801320
Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:
Canada Communication Group — Publishing
45 Sacré–Coeur Boulevard,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non–livraison,
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:
Groupe Communication Canada — Édition
45 boulevard Sacré–Coeur,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :
http://www.parl.gc.ca
