



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 134 • NUMBER 071 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, September 20, 1996

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

Please note that the Appendix is now included in the Friday Hansard.

The House of Commons Debates are also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, September 20, 1996

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

FOREIGN EXTRATERRITORIAL MEASURES ACT

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved that Bill C-54, an act to amend the Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I wish to seek the unanimous consent of the House that the first 40-minute time slot accorded to the government, notwithstanding the standing orders, be split between two members as opposed to one speaker as is normally the case. I believe you will find unanimous consent for that proposition.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the members of the opposition allowing leave for a joint presentation of this legislation by myself and the Minister for International Trade.

In the last several months Canadians have been heavily engaged in a variety of debates about the imposition of the Helms-Burton law by the United States Congress.

The legislation being presented to the House today at second reading is basically a defensive measure to allow Canadians to protect themselves against parts of that act and to demonstrate that we will provide a basic tool kit for Canadians to ensure that their interests are protected. In the amendments there are a number of technical features with which the minister of trade will deal.

• (1005)

At the outset I want to address the fundamental principle that is at stake in the legislation. The Helms-Burton bill is an attempt by the United States Congress to unilaterally decide the rules of the

game for other countries. That runs counter to the basic principles on which an international economy or an international society can work.

We have debated in the House in the past weeks the importance of a fundamental rule of law to govern the actions between individuals. The rule of law is also important in governing the relationships between nations if we want to develop an open international economy for trade, investment, telecommunications, commerce and culture. We have learned our lessons over the last 40 or 50 years that the best way to do that is to come to an agreement on basic laws that we agree to, basic principles that we adhere to. If there are to be changes to those, nations come together to negotiate and discuss them and arrive at some consensus.

The minister of trade has been actively involved in the development of a World Trade Organization. It is an enormously important development for the world. The whole premise is that there have to be rules by which countries abide. If one country, especially an extremely powerful country, perhaps the most powerful country in the world, begins to adopt a unilateral approach that it can declare on its own, without any consideration for the rights of other individuals or states, then it begins to break down the international system that we have laboured so diligently in the last half century to build.

It is ironic that the United States has over that 50 years been a leader in developing those rules. Not only has it been a leader, but it has been a beneficiary. Perhaps no country in the world has gained more of its economic strength by helping to open up the international system. Yet at the very time the rhetoric and the pronouncements in various fora around the world by United States representatives of a need to put rules into globalization and ensure that we expand and augment our openness, its Congress passed a law which basically tells Canadians: "We will decide for you what your policy will be in relation to a third party. And if you do not adhere to what we decide is right, then we will penalize your companies and your individuals". It makes absolutely no sense. It is totally contrary to the interest of the international community and is certainly contrary to the interests of Canada. I would dare say, it is contrary to the interests of the United States.

It is interesting that in a recent Angus Reid poll which was done in the United States, 64 per cent of Americans who know about the Helms-Burton bill support the right of Canada to have its own independent policy vis-à-vis Cuba. That has been our point. We have not argued the question of whether the United States policy

Government Orders

toward Cuba is right or wrong. We do not agree with it. We have a different approach. But it is certainly their right how they want to deal with another country.

We will use all avenues and venues to talk with the United States and other countries about how we can work together to improve and make the system in Cuba more open. For the United States to tell us how to carry out our policies and if we do not agree with them, to impose a penalty, is an enormous step backward both in our relationships and also in terms of the wider international community.

Therefore, it is important that the House in the legislation send a message that Canadians will not accept that kind of unilateralism and that we will stand firm to protect the interests of our companies, the interests of our citizens and the interests of Canada to be able to maintain its independent sovereign right to decide how to do its international business.

I say that in the confidence of knowing that on both sides of the House there has been basic support for this approach. It is a good example of how, when we unite as a country on a matter of fundamental importance, we can speak with a very strong voice.

• (1010)

One of the most important developments during the debate on the Helms-Burton legislation is the way that not only has the country united—provincial governments have been in support, the public has been in support, members of this House on both have been in support—we have been able to mobilize a very active and a very effective campaign to counter Helms-Burton.

The United States has become virtually isolated on this. In the Caribbean, in Latin American countries, in Europe and in Asia there is total condemnation of the bill. That is due in some large part by the leadership shown by Canada.

The Prime Minister started that when he went to the Caribbean nations just weeks after the imposition of Helms-Burton and was able to get full agreement from the Caribbean countries. The Minister for International Trade has been working actively with his colleagues in Mexico and other members of the trade organization, in NAFTA and WTO.

Our secretary of state for Latin American affairs was an effective floor manager at the OAS at which time a resolution was passed 30 to 1 condemning the United States for its actions. Those of you who are historians of the OAS would know that is a very unusual happening and one that was taken notice of by the United States because it demonstrated that the United States had stepped across the boundary of what is a fair, equitable and useful system.

As a result of our unity in this matter we have been able to provide real leadership in the international community and to provide a very strong message. I think the message has been received.

One of the things we can take some satisfaction from is that in title III, which is the part of the Helms-Burton bill which gives the right to U.S. companies to sue foreign companies that they believe may have been involved in confiscated property in Cuba, the United States president has deferred the implementation of that part of the act as he has a right to do under the legislation. He has not totally deferred it.

Canadian companies are still accruing liability under that portion but a deferment on a six month by six month basis is not good enough. The act has to be changed to eliminate that position altogether. One of the very effective ways of doing that is by this House passing this legislation. It will demonstrate that any American action in U.S. courts, first, will not be recognized by the our authorities, and, second, give the right to Canadian companies to counter sue. We can go into more details on that and I know the minister of trade will deal with that extensively.

That is the reality we will now put in our arsenal, the right to counteract. It will provide as well a further signal to the international community that other nations will do the same. Our friends in Mexico have already proposed similar legislation. Certainly Europe is considering similar legislation. Once there is in effect an international alliance in which the legal instruments are at hand to enable companies to provide that defensive responsive posture, I believe that once the U.S. election is concluded and things settle down and they begin to review these matters, then the United States administration and I trust that Congress will take another hard, second look at Helms-Burton and realize just what a serious mistake they have made.

We welcome the points of view of our various members but this legislation is a very important and very significant statement on behalf of Canadians and also a very significant statement on behalf of other countries around the world. The direction to become unilateral arbiters of what is right and wrong is not given by divine right to one state alone. We must begin to work in the area of co-operation, consensus building and rule making in the international community. That is how countries like us survive and that is how the international community will survive.

• (1015)

Before I turn this over to my colleague, I want to make one other important observation. We do not simply by our opposition to the Helms-Burton bill in any way ignore the responsibilities of Canadians to begin to conduct our relationships with Cuba in a way that will promote and encourage a more open system. I can say to the House we are actively engaged in developing discussions, dia-

Government Orders

logues and initiatives that down the road we believe will help to work in that country, to have a more open market system economically and a system of government that will provide more transparency and accountability.

We in no way withdraw from our responsibilities as a member of the international community to help promote human rights, democratic development and more accountability particularly in our own hemisphere. We happen to believe that our approach of engaging in that kind of active involvement with the Cuban people and the Cuban government is a much more effective and useful way to proceed.

It is not simply a matter of Helms-Burton by itself. It is also the right to maintain, develop and promote a more active engagement, to build bridges with the Cuban government and the Cuban people. In that way we can help make transitions in our own hemisphere and promote the fact that we are able and willing to work with our fellow countries in this hemisphere in the promotion of a better system of government, better economic development and a system in the hemisphere that will recognize the rule of law.

I strongly recommend these amendments to the House. I am very pleased to turn the debate over to my colleague, the minister of trade, for his comments. I hope we can quickly conclude this debate and send the kind of statement and message which I think Canadians would like us to do.

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are certain pieces of legislation that one would prefer not to be putting forward and this bill falls into that category. However, Canada has been compelled to strengthen the provisions of the Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act because of the actions taken by the United States in passing the Helms-Burton law.

[*Translation*]

No one is looking for confrontation, no one wants to take the risk of aggravating the dispute.

[*English*]

But certain fundamental principles must be respected. The freedom to maintain our own foreign policy and trading relationships is one of them, as my colleague the Minister of Foreign Affairs has so correctly pointed out. Canadians have the right to expect that their government will act to respond to threats to our sovereignty and this government is fully prepared to accept that responsibility.

Helms-Burton is wrong on many levels. I will deal with a few of these today. At the most fundamental level it is objectionable because it attempts to enforce uniformity of approach and to deny the freedom to other nations to make up their own minds and implement their own policies. It says: "Our foreign policy must be

your foreign policy; our trade relations, your trade relations; our friends, your friends; our foes, your foes; and if you do not agree, our laws become your laws" .That is wrong.

Many years ago President Kennedy said of the relationship between our two countries: "The geography has made us neighbours, the history has made us friends". That is true. We welcome that relationship. We welcome that friendship. History has indeed made us friends, but it has not made us the 51st state. We are not subject to American laws and we are not obligated to follow their rules. Our foreign policy and our trade policy are made in Ottawa, not in Washington. That is something this nation has always declared and is something this government will always defend.

Both Canada and the United States are trading nations, not only with each other but with the world. The Americans have always played a key role in promoting and supporting freer trade around the world. That commitment stretches as far back as President Woodrow Wilson and was reaffirmed as recently as 1994 by President Clinton at the Summit of the Americas in Miami. There, led by the host the United States, we launched the free trade agreement of the Americas which seeks to build bridges to the newly emerging economies of Central and South America and the Caribbean.

• (1020)

Americans know that trade is bringing the world together as never before. With the free exchange of goods and investment comes a greater openness to new ideas and new approaches. Again and again history has shown us that closer trade links lead to closer relations between nations. So freer trade and a clear system of rules to enforce it are important objectives and ones that this government is fully in support of. However, recently we have seen disturbing indications that the American commitment to freer trade may be flagging. First there was the isolationist rhetoric which reverberated throughout the American presidential primaries and now there is Helms-Burton.

Those of us who are committed to tearing down barriers and opening up opportunities cannot be selective in our approach. We cannot defend this principle and then defy it in practice. As the leader of the movement to freer trade, the United States cannot say: "The world should follow this path except when we tell them not to". It cannot oppose a system that it says is closed and anachronistic by passing laws which imitate that system. It cannot oppose isolationism by isolating selective adversaries.

Canada and the United States no doubt share a common objective in Cuba and that is in democracy, economic reform and respect for human rights. The difference is in the best way to achieve the result. The Americans believe in isolating Cuba; we prefer to engage Cuba. History will have to judge which approach is better. I would only note that the American policy has been in place now for

Government Orders

30 years. Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan and Bush have all come and gone but Fidel Castro remains in power.

Why this particular approach to Cuba? The United States has profound differences with China and some other countries as well, but that does not stop them from doing billions of dollars worth of trade with China. No one would suggest that because the United States carries on trade with China they disapprove any less of certain Chinese policies. So why this double standard with respect to Cuba? The confusion does not end there.

On June 21 the state department's co-ordinator for Cuban affairs said that Helms-Burton is designed to discourage foreign investment in Cuba. That is what he said. It was a candid, straightforward statement of fact. Yet just last month the president's special envoy to Cuba told an Ottawa press conference that the United States was in no way telling Canadians to stop their trade or investment with Cuba. There was no gun to our head. Rather, he went on to say that Canadians should invest in a strategic way that would help to advance democracy in Cuba.

It would seem that trade and investment with Cuba are okay as long as they meet U.S. approval. This is what happens when policy is made on the run in response to election year pressures. It is no way to conduct sound long term policy. It is a throwback to the old days when governments believed that trade should be controlled according to circumstances and not according to agreed upon rules. It is a look back, not a step forward.

There is another aspect of this legislation which is troubling in that it affects both friend and foe alike. Helms-Burton has taken a U.S.-Cuba problem and made it a much broader international trade and investment issue. Two sections of the act are particularly offensive. Title III allows U.S. citizens with claims on expropriated property in Cuba to sue foreign nationals, such as Canadians, in the United States courts. If the company has no assets in the United States that it can seize upon, an American could try to come to the Canadian judicial system and ask the courts to enforce the ruling and seize assets here. Two months ago President Clinton suspended this right to sue for six months. He can change his mind though at any time. As long as Helms-Burton is on the books, the threat of lawsuits exist.

• (1025)

Title IV of the act allows the U.S. government to deny entry to executives of companies which the U.S. state department deems to be trafficking in property subject to a U.S. claim. This ban extends also to the families, the children of these executives.

The special envoy said that there was no gun to our head. However, it seems to me that there are two guns: one is title III and

the other is title IV. Both are fully loaded but one of them, title III, has the safety catch on until it is decided by the Government of the United States to release it.

Helms-Burton is also regressive in other ways. At a time when our hemisphere is coming together as never before, Helms-Burton seeks not to integrate but to isolate. With initiatives such as the Miami summit and the free trade area of the Americas, we have the chance to tie the disparate elements of this hemisphere into a new relationship, one built on openness and the free exchange of ideas, individuals and products. Helms-Burton runs counter to this impulse and would erect barriers, not bridges, create resentments, not relationships and introduce tensions, not trusts.

Finally, Helms-Burton is unacceptable because it flouts long established international legal practices for settling disputes between nations regarding claims by foreign investors who have had their property expropriated. These established practices have served the world well in the past. By choosing to ignore them now, Helms-Burton sets a dangerous precedent.

If the U.S. behaves in this way today, what is to stop other countries from adopting similar measures tomorrow? If such an international free for all ensues, we will undo much of what has already been achieved in bringing trade under international rules.

For all of these reasons, Canada has objected to Helms-Burton. We have raised this matter to the highest levels of the American administration. I have met with my Mexican and American counterparts for consultations under chapter 20 of NAFTA.

Canada has also raised this matter with other trading partners both within the World Trade Organization and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. In fact in the current negotiations going on at the OECD on the multilateral agreement on investment, we are seeking protection against just this type of measure. We are certainly not going to be letting up on our efforts there.

Led by Canada's opposition to Helms-Burton, both the European Union and Mexico are drafting legislation which is similar to these FEMA amendments. Other nations are considering doing the same.

Nor is the criticism and concern just coming from outside the United States. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the U.S. National Association of Manufacturers have urged the President not to implement title III of Helms-Burton. The United States, they said, benefits as much as anyone—which is true—from strong, stable and reliable rules regarding trade. In other words, even the business associations which represent many of the companies that might be able to sue under title III are opposed to its applications. They know the dangers. They know what is at stake.

All of this pressure both from within the United States and abroad helps, but there is still more we can do on our own which is to make the changes that are necessary to the Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act.

[*Translation*]

We believe the amendments before this House are an appropriate response.

[*English*]

The amendments that we are proposing will strengthen FEMA in two ways. It will permit the attorney general to block any attempt by a foreign claimant to enforce a judgment under a law such as Helms-Burton, and it will give Canadians recourse to Canadian courts if awards are made against them in American courts. In other words, Canadians can apply in our courts to recover or claw back from the American claimant an amount equivalent to that awarded against them by the American court.

• (1030)

Let us take the example of a U.S. national that wins a suit under Helms-Burton against a Canadian in an American court. The Canadian has no assets in the United States. The U.S. national would have to ask a Canadian court to enforce the judgment. The Attorney General of Canada would now be able to issue an order blocking this process under the amendments we propose. If the American court ordered the Canadian to pay damages, he or she could sue the American in the Canadian courts to recoup the full amount of the award. This amount plus costs in both countries would be applied against the American assets in Canada.

One of the problems we have encountered in the past is the refusal by Canadian companies to comply with FEMA because the penalties from the foreign country are higher than those extracted by our own law. In order to increase the chances of compliance we are increasing financial penalties under the act from a maximum of \$10,000 to \$1.5 million.

The amendments would also allow the attorney general to place foreign laws that he considers objectionable on the list under FEMA. This listing would give the government greater flexibility and would provide for a quicker response time in defending Canadian interests.

All of the amendments we are proposing are moderate and defensive in nature. It is our hope that they will never need to be employed. They are a reactive antidote if we need them, but it is vital that they be available to Canadian companies in order to do the best we can to help them protect themselves should this ever be required.

I call again upon the United States to remember the principles for which they have fought and through which such progress has

Government Orders

been achieved. I ask them to remember the benefits that freer trade has brought them and others in the past, and the still greater promise of freer trade in future.

[*Translation*]

We have come too far and made too much progress to stop now.

[*English*]

We have broken down too many barriers to begin constructing new ones. We must not sacrifice those principles to expedience. Let us work together to expand the circle of opportunity by expanding the benefits of freer trade. Let us work together to engage, not isolate, Cuba and all the other Cubas around the globe so that the freedoms, the hopes and the opportunities of freer trade will be brought to all people in all parts of the world.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in this House to participate in the debate at second reading of Bill C-54, an act to amend the Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act, which has been a while in coming.

By finally introducing Bill C-54 after months of stalling, the Liberal government is again putting up a smoke screen by trying to prove to Quebecers and Canadians that Canada will defend their freedom to invest and trade anywhere in the world.

I say "trying to prove", because what is both laughable and sad in this extraterritorial measures saga is that the carelessness and wait-and-see attitude the Liberal government stubbornly clung to in the several months preceding the introduction of this bill could have been more costly for our business people. This situation is very troubling, because the Liberal government let way too much water flow under the bridge before responding to a law with extraterritorial implications passed by a foreign country but directly affecting our business people.

And this foreign country is not an obscure, little known nation led by a dictator or located far away from Canada, but our main trading partner and international ally, the United States of America.

The U.S. government, which bills itself as the champion of free enterprise, will always amaze the international community by enacting laws such as the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act, better known as the Helms-Burton law. What is surprising though is that this is not the first time that the U.S. has passed this kind of legislation and that we have to react to it.

• (1035)

In 1985, to impose an embargo against the small central American country of Nicaragua, the American government passed

Government Orders

legislation with extraterritorial implications that could have adversely affected the interests of Quebecers and Canadians.

The Republican administration claimed that the American legislation would apply to any foreign company whose operations might have repercussions in the U.S. or on American companies.

In response to the American embargo against Nicaragua, in which the U.S. wanted to involve the international community, Canada passed Bill C-14, an act respecting foreign extraterritorial measures.

Note that the provisions of this act were never used, which may well be the case again with Bill C-54 to amend the Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act in response to two new pieces of American legislation.

Under conservative pressure from the Republican majority in Congress, the Democrat administration just approved two pieces of legislation allowing Americans to sue companies in Quebec, Canada or anywhere in the world. The first one is commonly known as the Helms-Burton law and is designed to extend the embargo against Cuba, while the second one is the Iranian and Libyan economic sanctions law of 1996.

As the Minister of Foreign Affairs indicated earlier, the U.S. is certainly quite free to impose sanctions on any country if it deems it appropriate to do so, but we will not permit a country, any country, to pass extraterritorial legislation affecting companies operating out of another sovereign state.

In the present case, we must recall the context in which this American legislation was passed. The Helms-Burton law is the political expression of the American response to the Cuban air force shooting down two small American civilian aircraft for presumably violating Cuban airspace.

As for the legislation imposing sanctions on Iran and Libya, two countries suspected of supporting international terrorism, it was passed after a TWA airliner mysteriously crashed just after taking off from New York, this summer.

However, regardless of how justified the American administration might be in adopting sanctions against these countries, we cannot accept that the United States, or any other country, can unilaterally pass laws affecting Canadian businesses and nationals outside their boundaries.

The Helms-Burton law and the legislation seeking to extend sanctions against Iran and Libya not only violate every international agreement on trade liberalization—including the Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA and the Uruguay Round agreements establishing the World Trade Organization—they also do not promote the type of harmonious, productive and positive relations that close allies such as Canada and the United States should maintain.

As the Minister of Foreign Affairs said earlier, we cannot accept that the Americans can go ahead and use international trade agreements when it is convenient to do so, while adopting unilateral measures such as these when it suits them.

It is as much a matter of principle as it is an economic issue, given that Canada's economic relations with Cuba are relatively limited. In 1995, imports from Cuba totalled \$320 million, while Canadian exports to that country reached \$250 million.

Obviously, such an arrogant and authoritarian attitude on the part of friendly countries is not conducive to a relation based on trust and dialogue. This is why we feel that these two new American laws are totally unacceptable.

The U.S. government seems prepared to risk offending friendly countries for the sole purpose of destabilizing the Cuban, Iranian and Libyan regimes. We are always surprised to see how relentless our American neighbours can be when they target certain members of the international community, on the grounds of noble and generous principles that they conveniently forget in other situations.

For instance, the United States is much more permissive with China and Vietnam where democracy and human rights are concerned than with Cuba. But China and Vietnam are, need I remind you, growing markets, which make principles that more flexible.

• (1040)

On this issue, I must say that the Canadian government is marching to the beat of the same drummer as the American administration. However, lamentable cases like that of Trần Triệu Quân, a Canadian citizen sentenced to hard labour in Vietnam, must continue to make us aware that an increase in trade does not necessarily entail more respect for human rights.

Anyway, upon closer examination, you realize that there are two sections at the heart of the Helms-Burton law. First of all, section 3 permits American nationals to prosecute in the American courts any foreign corporation which has benefitted from real estate or facilities that used to belong to these American citizens and that were confiscated by the Cuban government following the 1959 revolution.

It is as if, when they left the country, those corporations retained a right to their properties and facilities in perpetuity ensuring that no one else could ever benefit from them.

And then there is section 4, which denies entry into the United States of managers or majority shareholders of foreign corporations along with their spouses and under age children allegedly trafficking—as the law defines it—in U.S. property confiscated by the Cuban government.

Government Orders

The problem with Bill C-54, which the House is debating today, is that, on July 15 of this year, the American president exercised his discretionary power to suspend title III concerning legal proceedings. He can renew this suspension every six months if he deems it to be in the national interest of the United States.

Therefore, Bill C-54 is nothing more than a symbolic measure for the time being since its sole purpose is to neutralise the effects of title III. This way, the Canadian government can have the impression that it bared its teeth, that it stood up courageously for businessmen from Quebec and Canada, but this unexpected show of courage came only after the government had made sure the Americans did not intend to enforce this provision.

However, it is revealing as well as disturbing to see that title III of the Helms-Burton law banning people from travelling to the United States is in force and that the Canadian government has not included any protective or retaliatory measures in the bill before us today.

The federal government is giving the impression that it is reacting strongly and diligently when it knows its actions are of no consequence, but it continues to show the same lack of courage when effective and significant measures need to be taken.

It is therefore very surprising to see that the Liberal government waited for the American president to exercise his discretionary power to suspend title III for a period of six months before going ahead with Bill C-54.

When it announced last June 17 that it was going to table a bill to amend the existing Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act, the government already knew that the president was going to suspend this title.

I was happy to hear the Minister of Foreign Affairs saying earlier that suspending the application of Title III was not enough for Canada, that what Canada was calling for was no less than the amendment and even the outright withdrawal of this legislation and of Title III, which more particularly concerns us.

But something has been overlooked. Title IV of the Helms-Burton legislation has prevented a number of Canadian nationals from entering the United States since August 1. To date, at least seven people, essentially members of the management of Sherritt International Corporation, have been affected by the application of this title. And what is the federal government doing about it? Nothing, absolutely nothing. It waits for the other shoe to drop and ceases all action, probably for fear of ruffling the feathers of our American neighbours.

This Toronto based Canadian company holds shares in Cuba in the nickel mines, in petroleum development, and in the agricultural and tourist sectors. Its completely respectable commercial activities have made the directors of this company persona non grata on American soil. Yet, these people have never committed any crime,

either in Canada or in the United States. They have no criminal record. They are simply guilty of having invested and conducted business in Cuba.

• (1045)

For example, how would the U.S. government react if the Canadian government decided to apply this type of legislation to American nationals?

Even if it is not always in agreement with the United States' political and trade choices and priorities, the Canadian government has never gone so far as to consider American nationals as criminals on its territory solely on the grounds of nationality. Bill C-54 is, therefore, incomplete because it counteracts only one portion of the Helms-Burton law, which is currently inoperative. The step that now becomes necessary, if the Canadian government really intends to protect the interests of Quebecers and Canadians, is to call for the striking of a special group to settle the dispute under NAFTA.

Even though in recent months a number of federal departments have made strong representations to protest the consequences of the Helms-Burton law, even though the American president has suspended for six months the right of American nationals to institute legal proceedings under Helms-Burton, and even though the Liberal government is proudly presenting Bill C-54 today, the Helms-Burton law is still in existence, nevertheless, and is causing serious harm to citizens of Quebec and of Canada, and is liable to cause still more in the coming months.

What is the government waiting for, under these circumstances, before bringing this dispute before NAFTA?

Even if Canada has risen to object to the Helms-Burton law in such international fora as the World Trade Organization, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development and the Organization of American States, it still must take concrete legal action.

Canada has some formidable allies in its fight against the Helms-Burton law. Mexico, for example, also a signatory to NAFTA, is equally affected by application of this act. Already the Mexican telecommunications group Domos has seen five of its directors refused entry into U.S. territory because of its investments in Cuba, which are in excess of \$700 million.

We urge the government to submit the Helms-Burton act to competent authorities under NAFTA, in association with Mexico which is also affected by this legislation.

Frankly, I must admit I have doubts about the determination of the government to protect efficiently the interests of Quebecers and Canadians. We may actually have before us a bill aimed at protecting their interests but we have reasons to believe that it will probably never be used.

Government Orders

Indeed the Minister of International Trade himself has candidly admitted in the House, on June 18, that the legislative measures proposed by the government would only be used as a last resort and that he hoped he would never have to use it.

By seeking to avoid a confrontation with the United States at all costs the Liberal government will hurt Canadian citizens.

However, we do support a clause of Bill C-54 which requires Canadian businesses to abide by Canadian laws. In a news release dated September 16, the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade announced, and I quote: "The Government is also amending FEMA to update penalties so that Canadians will be less likely to abide by objectionable foreign laws and more likely to follow Canadian law".

We have already mentioned in this House the case of a company operating on Canadian territory which scrupulously applies the American embargo against Cuba. I am referring to American Express, whose case has already been mentioned to the Minister of International Trade. The Canadian branch of American Express has violated Canadian law for many years, since it still follows the guidelines of its head office which prohibit doing business with Cuba.

We have a letter sent by American Express to a resident of Quebec. In that letter, the addressee is informed that the American head office and all subsidiaries throughout the world abide by U.S. government regulations. I will read you part of this letter:

[*English*]

"We regret that you are unable to use travellers cheques in Cuba. This is due to U.S. government regulations prohibiting the exportation of goods and services in Cuba. These regulations apply to all companies incorporated within the United States and their foreign branches and subsidiaries"

• (1050)

[*Translation*]

The Minister of International Trade said previously in this House that he would look into the case of American Express, and the official opposition is still waiting for him to do so. It is shocking to see that subsidiaries of American companies established in Canada abide by laws and directives emanating from a foreign government.

Under the amendments proposed in Bill C-54, a company located in Canada that observes the law of a foreign jurisdiction instead of Canadian legislation may be liable to financial penalties in excess of those prevailing today. Penalties that before were about \$10,000 could now be as high as \$1.5 million. In similar cases, the United States imposes fines of up to one million dollars in U.S. currency.

Passing legislation alone is not enough. It must also be enforced. If companies located in Canada do not abide by Canadian law, then we must make sure that law is enforced.

In concluding, the Bloc Québécois agrees with the position taken by most of our foreign partners who are opposed to the Helms-Burton law and the law imposing sanctions against Iran and Libya. We believe that the Canadian government should stop claiming it maintains its independence vis-à-vis our main ally if it is not prepared to act accordingly.

Since the government proposes to authorize non-recognition of foreign judgments against companies or individuals in Quebec and Canada, and since it suggests increasing the penalties for observing foreign laws instead of Canadian legislation, we do support the bill to amend the Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act.

However, we feel that we should go one step further by asking for a special dispute settlement panel under NAFTA. The Minister for International Trade told us last March that Canada would ask for a consultation under Chapter 20 of the North American Free Trade Agreement. By pursuing this, the government will ensure the invalidation of legislation that contradicts all the efforts deployed in recent years to achieve free trade.

[*English*]

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin my speech on Bill C-54 by stating that the Reform Party will support this legislation, although I believe it is only a half measure to resolve this dispute.

My advice when this matter first arose was to take this to a dispute resolution panel under NAFTA and get the Helms-Burton act overturned. Had we moved on this quickly we would be well on our way to settling this dispute once and for all. A dispute settlement mechanism was negotiated in NAFTA. It is in place and we should not be afraid to use it.

It is clear that Helms-Burton is in contravention of the NAFTA agreement with United States. Helms-Burton is also an affront to Canada's right to set its own foreign policy and to continue trading and investing in Cuba. We cannot allow this American act to go unchallenged. Passing Bill C-54 is one more defensive action that we can take, but a much more effective one would have been to take the Helms-Burton bill to a dispute resolution settlement under NAFTA. I repeat that this should be done immediately, not after the American election in November.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs said that under the Helms-Burton bill liabilities continue to accrue. This is a stopgap measure, we support it to that extent, but we believe that it should be settled once and for all.

We must take a firm stand. We cannot allow the United States to push us around as it has on softwood lumber, as it has on wheat. Now it is telling us where to invest and do business. If we keep letting the Americans get away with these bullying tactics we will only encourage them to keep threatening us.

Just two days ago there was another report in the press that the acting American trade representative and the agriculture secretary had issued a joint statement that they were going to use U.S. trade laws to keep our wheat exports from growing. Canada capitulated to the Americans in 1994 and agreed to caps on wheat exports, at 1.5 million tonnes. Things have been quiet this past year because U.S. wheat supplies grew and Canadian prices were no longer competitive. Clearly that action is contrary to the free trade concept that Canada wants to establish throughout the world, a market economy.

We have been one of the forerunners, and rightly so, in negotiating free trade deals and I believe that we have to ensure that countries play by the rules. This year we have a bumper crop and the Americans are afraid that our wheat will once again become attractive. Various American interest groups have seen us buckle time and time again. That is a very bad precedent and encourages only further strong arm tactics. I believe we have to use whatever avenues we can to fight Helms-Burton and other attempts to fetter free trade.

• (1055)

Bill C-54 makes certain amendments to the Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act which allow the Canadian government to stymie some of the more aggressive aspects of the Helms-Burton act. They are good as far as they go.

I would like to get into the specifics of the Helms-Burton act and how the proposed amendments to FEMA will help defang that legislation. The Helms-Burton act allows U.S. nationals who have claims on expropriated property in Cuba to sue Canadian companies and people who traffic in that property. Trafficking is defined quite broadly in the act to include things like holding an interest in confiscated property, engaging in commercial activities using confiscated property or participating in profits through another person who is trafficking in that confiscated property.

Under Helms-Burton a U.S. national who has a certified claim to expropriated property can start an action in a U.S. court under title III. U.S. officials have said that almost 6,000 claims of expropriation have been recognized by Washington as being legitimate. Of those, about 800 were above the threshold of \$50,000 in commercial value in 1959 when Fidel Castro took power. Many of these are not subject to claims by U.S. nationals any longer.

It is true that President Clinton has waived until January certain provisions allowing suits against foreign firms. We cannot take for

Government Orders

granted that he will do so again. The legislation is there and it is there to protect ourselves. Further, we should start an immediate action under NAFTA to resolve this issue once and for all. As we heard earlier liabilities continue to accrue.

Under Helms-Burton, once court proceedings begin and a U.S. court is presented with a certified claim it can award up to three times the damages claimed by the U.S. national. If the Canadian company refuses to pay the damages that are awarded the Helms-Burton act allows the U.S. national to ask Canadian courts to enforce this judgment.

Here is where the amendments to FEMA kick in for the first time. The new and improved FEMA will allow the attorney general to declare such an order cannot be recognized or enforced in Canada. That is a step in the right direction.

If the Canadian company has assets in the United States, Helms-Burton allows the U.S. court to seize and sell those assets and pay the awarded damage to the U.S. national. Here again the strength in FEMA will step in. It will allow the Canadian company to recover in Canadian courts any amounts that have been awarded in the United States.

However, a glitch in all of this is that the U.S. national would have to have assets in Canada to be counter seized. I do not know of many U.S. nationals who can sue under Helms-Burton that would have assets in Canada, certainly not a whole lot. Therefore we are going to be questioning this and making some recommendations in committee on how this may be improved.

Helms-Burton is meant to intimidate foreign individuals and companies from investing in Cuba and carrying on any business activities there. Here again an amendment to FEMA shows the Americans that the Canadians have backbone. We are going to raise these penalties from \$10,000 to \$1.5 million on Canadian companies that refuse to trade with Cuba for fear of U.S. sanctions.

For instance, if a company was planning a business venture prior to the passage of Helms-Burton but got cold feet later, it could be fined for allowing the American legislation to influence its decision. I have read that the RCMP has conducted about two dozen investigations of complaints that subsidiary companies in Canada were violating earlier provisions of FEMA not to let American head offices influence their trade with Cuba. I understand that there have been no prosecutions to date.

It is easy for a subsidiary to say that it walked away from a sale to Cuba for valid commercial reasons that have nothing to do with Helms-Burton. That is why I believe that making these amendments to FEMA, although good, are only a stop gap measure. We must try to get Helms-Burton overturned.

S. O. 31

The aspects of Helms-Burton that Bill C-54 does not address is that provisions for barring entry into the United States of senior officials of selected Canadian companies. Clearly these are in contravention of NAFTA. Article 1603 of the NAFTA trade agreement specifically states that each party shall grant temporary entry to business persons who are otherwise qualified for entry under applicable measures relating to public health and safety and national security. What is happening here is that the senior officials of these Canadian companies would not be in contravention of NAFTA and we should make that case very clearly.

Does the United States have the right in the wake of NAFTA to stop healthy law-abiding Canadian business people from entering that country? I do not think so. Not after we signed NAFTA. It is clear that it does not.

The Speaker: My colleague, I must interrupt you. You will have the floor immediately after question period. I understand that you have approximately 30 minutes left.

It being 11 a.m., we will now proceed to Statements by Members.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

THE DEATH OF ROSE OUELLETTE

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on Friday, at the age of 93, Rose Ouellette, affectionately nicknamed "La Poune", a legendary figure in Quebec burlesque, passed into history at the end of a long career spanning three quarters of a century.

During the most painful depression years in the 1930s, this lady so close to the people gave her audience a ration of good humour that carried them through the harsh reality of their daily lives. Beyond the stage, her friends and neighbours at the Chez-nous des artistes confirm that Rose Ouellette was generous and jovial.

Making frequent appearances at the Cartier theatre, Dominion theatre, National theatre, Mocambo, Café de l'est, she was a pillar of Quebec culture. Together with her stage partners, Olivier Guimond, Juliette and Arthur Pétrie, Paul Desmarteaux, and Jean Després, she touched Quebecers' hearts.

Madame Rose, our people will remember you for ever.

* * *

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a letter which was forwarded to me by a constituent, Mr. Doug Leitch, Sr. The letter reads:

This country was built by its people, not the government. Let's get the country back in the hands of the people through less government. Let the citizens determine how they will live and determine their own destiny—not a few people in Ottawa.

This means empowering that level of government closest to the people to deliver the services, allowing people to make their own decisions versus government making them for them. It means a smaller federal government of 250 MPs, not expanding it to 301. It means less duplication and overlapping and red tape of federal and provincial government services. It means that governments should govern the country at arm's length, not compete directly with their citizens and businesses through selective subsidies and grants. Finally, it means less power to the politicians and more power to the people.

* * *

CHILDREN

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we look to children as the future of our society. Why then do some members of society treat children as chattels rather than treasures?

One million children under 18 work as prostitutes in Asia and another one million children worldwide enter the sex trade every year. These are shameful statistics. This is an international problem, one we must eradicate not only in Canada but in the rest of the world.

A first step is to pass Bill C-27, which would assist in the apprehension and prosecution of those who seek out and use child prostitutes, whether the crime is committed inside or outside Canada. This law will protect children from those who prey on them.

I call on the government to initiate other measures as well which would serve to protect our most important natural resource, our children.

* * *

NEW BRUNSWICK ROUND TABLE MEETINGS

Mr. Harold Culbert (Carleton—Charlotte, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the past two months I have met with business leaders, representatives of chambers of commerce, boards of trade representatives and municipal officers in the six regions of New Brunswick. These meetings were co-ordinated through the efforts of New Brunswick's industrial commissions and provided an opportunity for round table discussions focusing on jobs and small business.

Through these presentations we were able to discuss what has been accomplished to date and exactly what must be done in the future in order to attain our goal of continued growth in small business and jobs.

● (1105)

While we have met or exceeded our deficit reduction goals and achieved over 600,000 new jobs in Canada, there is still much to

be done. These regional meetings were helpful in developing new initiatives so that new opportunities may be created.

I would like to thank the industrial commission managers and all participants who made the round table meetings in New Brunswick such a great success.

* * *

FORMAL SYSTEMS INC.

Mr. Andy Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to your attention the major expansion of a leading edge Fredericton company.

Formal Systems Inc. has announced it will create 100 new jobs. These jobs are being created with the help of a \$750,000 repayable loan from ACOA as Formal Systems undertakes activities leading to the development of new technologies. These technologies will address the date change at the turn of the century which is less than 1,000 working days away.

Computers are set up for a two digit date and when the clock turns to the year 2000, the computer will read the date as being the year 1900, resulting in obvious disruptions in everything from billing phone calls to calculating interest. Most computers are not set up to adapt properly to the date change. Formal Systems will develop an automated conversion tool set to remedy this problem.

New Brunswick companies are once again showing they have the solutions, the technology and the drive to lead the way in meeting worldwide information technology requirements.

* * *

HIGH RISK OFFENDERS

Mr. Elijah Harper (Churchill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, two years ago this week, Sarah Kelly, a young constituent of mine from The Pas, was brutally murdered by a man known to be a dangerous offender. After this tragedy I joined my constituents in mourning the loss of this young life and in calling for tougher laws to deal with dangerous offenders and repeat sex offenders.

This week, two years after Sarah's death, the Minister of Justice introduced Bill C-55 which targets dangerous offenders and sex offenders. I believe that this legislation will honour Sarah's memory by helping to prevent tragedies like this in the future.

I call on all my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

S. O. 31

[Translation]

THE CANADA—ISRAEL FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on July 31, the Canadian Minister of International Trade and the Israeli Minister of Trade and Industry signed a free trade agreement between Canada and Israel, which is to come into force on January 1, 1997.

Of course, the Bloc Québécois applauds the signing of this treaty, which will give our businesses greater access to the Israeli market. However, although it concerns a host of companies across Canada, it should be pointed out that this agreement was negotiated behind closed doors, without any real debate or public consultation.

We strongly condemn this lack of openness on the part of the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. We believe it is the duty of the federal government to keep the public informed of what is at stake when negotiating trade matters with other countries. This is the least one should expect from a so-called transparent government.

* * *

[English]

IMMIGRATION

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see that the minister of immigration took a hands on approach to her portfolio this past summer by getting out into the field and witnessing Canada's refugee laws at work.

And what did the minister discover? Lo and behold, she was amazed to learn that some refugees were not legitimate. She was shocked to learn that when a Chilean claimed refugee status because he was unable to find work in his native Chile he was allowed to remain in Canada.

The minister has since announced a crackdown on bogus refugees and a plan to revamp the Immigration Act. At last a government minister has finally decided to listen to the Reform Party and has found out that what we have been saying in this House for the past three years has been right all along.

But I hear the Liberals have been inspired by the unemployed Chilean who had claimed refugee status. Since the Liberal strategy to resolve our unemployment problems has failed, they are likely considering sending the one million unemployed Canadians across the border to claim refugee status in the United States.

*S. O. 31***BREASTCANCER**

Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Wellington—Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to speak on a topic of great importance: breast cancer.

Statistics tell us that in their lifetime, one in nine Canadian women will be diagnosed with this disease. They also tell us that one in every three women diagnosed with this disease will die. However, the statistics do not begin to tell the real story behind this disease: the fear, the pain and the uncertainty.

• (1110)

Two constituents of mine, Paul and Mary Knowles, understand fully the terror of this disease. Mary is a breast cancer survivor. Recently the Knowles published a book entitled *Close to the Heart*, an anthology of Canadian poetry and short stories supported by poets across this country. All the proceeds from the sale of this book will go to the Canadian breast cancer research initiative.

I congratulate Paul and Mary Knowles for their hard work and dedication to this cause. I encourage all Canadians to give generously to the fight against this terrible disease.

* * *

[*Translation*]

COMMERCIAL SIGNS

Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to draw the attention of the House to the issue of commercial signs in Ottawa, which has an impact not only on the francophone community in Ottawa but also on national unity.

Must we always remind the stubborn people on both sides of the linguistic war that Canada is a bilingual country with two official languages? Ottawa business people are certainly not required by law to put up signs in French. Still, simple courtesy requires them to put up signs in both French and English, just as Montreal shop owners ought to have signs in both official languages as they are allowed to under the law.

Canada prides itself on its ability to adapt to the differences between people. Everyone must contribute, otherwise the Canadian ideal will die.

* * *

BLOC QUEBECOIS LEADER

Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint-Denis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, September 20, 1996, the Bloc leader said, and I quote: "As far as I am concerned, the Bloc's mission is not to sell the idea of partnership to the rest of Canada".

Yet, on June 16, the Bloc leader had this to say, and I quote: "—as we speak, I have a task force that is looking at how we could co-ordinate our efforts in the rest of Canada to explain the partnership portion of our political program that is consistent with sovereignty".

[*English*]

The only thing that is clear in the contradictions of the Bloc leadership is that they invite Quebecers to follow them blindly without really knowing where they are going.

Once again for them, the end, sovereignty, justifies the means.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PARLIAMENT

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works and Government Services recently inaugurated her department's new web site on the Internet. According to her press release, a video camera will transmit images of the Parliament buildings on the World Wide Web 24 hours a day.

The minister justifies this expenditure by arguing "that the Peace Tower is one of the most widely recognized symbols of Canada, just like the beaver and the maple leaf". Perhaps she wanted to announce the imminent appearance on our screens of interactive maple leaves and beavers.

What the minister is not telling us is the number of loonies taxpayers will have to shell out to promote the beaver. This new web site is nothing more than another element in the strategy of her colleague, the Minister of Canadian Heritage, to promote artificially and at great cost a feeling of belonging among Canadians.

Since the referendum, the people of Quebec know that Canada is living on borrowed time, but what we did not know is that its Parliament has now become a virtual reality.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. Allan Kerpan (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this week in question period the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food quoted both myself and the member for Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia.

He quoted the two of us from a CBC Radio report saying that calls to our offices showed a majority of callers wanted the CWB to retain its monopoly. That is true, but calls to one's office are hardly a scientific survey and are a country mile away from a plebiscite.

However they do indicate a high level of concern on both sides. That concern is that the minister is fiddling while the industry is

burning. He did not get the answers he wanted from his own grain marketing panel so now he is digging himself a hole like a gopher on the run.

Farmers on both sides of this issue are becoming agitated. I warn the minister that this inaction puts him at risk of losing all the good things about the CWB.

I also warn the minister of fence sitting. It is going to get hot on that part of the anatomy that meets the rail. At least Reformers are listening to what farmers are saying.

* * *

[Translation]

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that, after more than ten years of sustained efforts and investments totalling several billion dollars, the federal-provincial program called St. Lawrence Vision 2000 is starting to yield results.

• (1115)

Indeed, at a press conference held in Montreal, officials representing the Canadian and Quebec governments announced that the discharge of waste by the 50 largest polluters in the St. Lawrence has been reduced by 96 per cent.

Other measures are currently being implemented and will affect about 50 additional businesses located on other affluents of the river.

The cleaning up of the St. Lawrence is not completed, far from it, but given these results, we have every reason to be proud of what we have achieved. This is an incentive to keep up our efforts to eventually give people a clean river they will be able to enjoy safely.

* * *

[English]

OLYMPIC ATHLETES

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Oakville—Milton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, September 21, will be a great day in Oakville when my constituents will welcome home and honour our four Olympic athletes: our boxer Domenic Filane, our cyclist Eric Wohlberg, our paddler Gavin Maxwell, and our sprinter Donovan Bailey.

After a breakfast with a representative group of children, the four Olympians will proceed through town in a motorcade to a big rally in a waterfront park. CBC Newsworld will cover the rally live at 12 noon.

I want to invite you, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in the House, and indeed all Canadians to share the joy and pride that will explode in Oakville tomorrow. Join us by watching CBC Newsworld at noon.

Oral Questions

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance stated that he has no intention of removing the GST on reading materials because he cannot afford the loss of \$140 million in revenue.

Yet the minister can afford the obscene MP pension plan, the Deputy Prime Minister's flag propaganda machine and the \$1 billion buyout offered to Atlantic premiers to join the harmonization scheme. This is despite a personal pledge from the Prime Minister and the Liberal Party policy to remove the tax on reading.

This government continues to pay lip service to encouraging literacy while taxing it. The harmonization scheme will force Atlantic Canadians to pay \$15 on a \$100 science textbook.

In twisted logic, to further promote literacy, the government will be collecting GST on special 50 cent stamps being sold by Canada Post. The corporation will donate five cents of every stamp sold to a literacy fund while the government collects four cents on the same stamp.

This government clearly lacks integrity, not only on failing to remove the tax on books, but on taxing literacy itself.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[Translation]

AUDITOR GENERAL

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Finance seemed proud of the Liberal majority report on the family trust scandal, a report he said he applauded. However, the former auditor general, Mr. Dye, maintained that Liberal members failed to understand the watchdog role of the auditor general, and the auditor general himself stated this week, after the report was published, that his position had not changed. Thank goodness, because that is what he is there for.

I have this question for the Minister of Finance. Although it is obvious that Liberal members made a terrible mistake in this report by attacking the auditor general, why does the Minister of Finance insist on endorsing the report? And I repeat the question that was asked yesterday: Who is this government trying to protect?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the majority report is very favourable. Actually, there are plenty of very favourable comments on work done by the auditor general. I admit that they disagree with the auditor general on one particular point. However, a standing committee of our House has the right to criticize or to disagree with an employee of Parliament, whether, as

Oral Questions

I said yesterday, he happens to be the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, the Governor of the Bank of Canada or the auditor general.

The hon. member asks me why we endorse the majority report. It is because the report endorses the vast majority of remarks and comments made by the auditor general. That is why.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, to say that a committee has the right to express its views does not prove anything. After all, in a democracy we have the right to be wrong. It is not a sin.

We know the government is wrong, but we are asking whether it could act responsibly to do something. Because as far as important issues go, it is no accident that all editorial writers, at least those in the French newspapers, are saying this does not make sense.

• (1120)

The former auditor general says it does not make sense, and the current auditor general says so too. The consensus is growing. And of course we agree. "On a minor point", the Minister of Finance says. Actually, on May 9 this year he said:

—we certainly said clearly when we came to office that there were weaknesses in the taxation system that needed to be corrected. We have supported the actions of the auditor general in this area and will continue to do so.

That is what we are asking the government to do. What we are asking is this: Once again, whose interests are they protecting by not responding to the judgment made by the auditor general? They say it is only a minor point, but we think they disagree on the main point made in the auditor general's report.

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the auditor general's main point is that the problem today is how to treat capital gains when someone, an immigrant, a person, a trust, a company, or partnership wants to leave Canada.

That was the auditor general's main point, and the majority report endorsed it, saying that action must be taken. We agree, and we intend to take that action.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the loophole is still there. The auditor general said so and they are trying to rap the knuckles of the auditor general because he did. They are telling the auditor general: You should have left that alone.

I have the impression that the Minister of Finance took Camouflage 101 with the Minister of National Defence. They are sitting side by side, and I am sure they are comparing notes. I want to ask him why he endorsed what the committee had to say about the auditor general. Who gave the order to cover up this scandal? The

Prime Minister or some generous party supporter who might want to use this loophole?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous. The government asked the Standing Committee on Finance to consider the auditor general's report and to give us its opinion on the main point: How do we treat capital gains when an immigrant wants to leave the country?

The majority report was very thorough in the way it dealt with this point, and the government intends to take action. It is certainly not our policy to cover up the situation. We wanted to shed some light on the matter, and the majority report did so, and we intend to act.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance asked the finance committee to look into the problem but not to take a partial look. When will the Minister of Finance start looking out for all Canadian taxpayers, not just Canada's ten wealthiest families.

In its report, instead of plugging the tax loophole that allowed \$2 billion to be transferred out of Canada tax free, the Liberal majority on the finance committee throws the door wide open for wealthy Canadian families. It concluded that this scandal was legal, thus upholding a decision made by Revenue Canada that may cost Canadian taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

My question is for the Minister of Finance. Does he recognize that his acceptance of this report, yesterday and again today, flies in the face of the recommendations of the auditor general and allows huge assets to be transferred out of the country by wealthy Canadian families that end up not paying taxes in Canada?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that capital gains considerations may be a concern for wealthier families. But they can also be of concern to families with lower incomes.

I mentioned yesterday the case of the widow of an immigrant, who decides to go back home. If she happens to be a shareholder in a small private company, she too will be affected because, in every case, the question is: How do we deal with capital gains when an individual, any individual, leaves the country? It could be a retiree who moves to Florida, as many do. That is the question, a very serious question that must be considered thoroughly.

• (1125)

The hon. member raised the issue of loopholes. I have a list three pages long of loopholes that we have closed since taking office. The point of the matter is: how to ensure that the tax system is fair. That is our objective. I wish the opposition would at least contribute to the debate.

Oral Questions

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister referred to tax planning and forward averaging. We have nothing against that. We have a problem however with such vehicles and provisions of the Income Tax Act, which the minister refuses to change, being used to transfer millions of dollars to the U.S. or elsewhere tax-free. Something is wrong. Everyone has to pay taxes to Revenue Canada, but when it comes time to deal with the rich friends of the Liberal Party, nothing is done. Something is wrong.

My question to the minister is as follows: Is this report not being concurred in to protect the interests of those in high political circles, with the approval of the Minister of Finance?

[English]

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard): Mr. Speaker, in the three years we have been in office we have closed more loopholes, more openings in the tax system than any previous government. As a result of our actions the tax act is more fair. Wealthy Canadians are paying far more taxes. I have three pages of measures which we have taken to deal with this.

This issue is not one that only applies to rich Canadians. It applies to Canadians of very ordinary circumstances who for one reason or another decide to leave the country, whether it is to retire in another country or return to the country of their birth. These people ought to be treated fairly. They ought to be treated in a way that does not deprive the state of taxation.

At the same time we have tax treaties with some 60 countries. We are operating in a way that the OECD has established. Our system is tighter than the vast majority of other countries. I am sure members opposite do not want us to act in a way that would be unfair to ordinary Canadians. That is why we asked the finance committee to look at the issue and they did. That is why we have said we are going to act quickly on their recommendations.

* * *

SOMALIA INQUIRY

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, double standards and conflicts of interest abound in the Somalia inquiry. The defence minister is interfering with the inquiry at every turn. He has allowed General Boyle to receive preferential treatment by giving the government's own dream team of lawyers' access to confidential military police reports and, possibly the biggest conflict of interest of all, the designing of the Somalia inquiry mandate.

Will the defence minister confirm that General Boyle played a part in the drafting of the mandate and the terms of reference of the Somalia inquiry?

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the terms of reference for that inquiry originated in my office in consultation with departmental officials.

They were amended by me at a late stage to ensure certain things were put in which I thought were germane to the efficacy of the inquiry. The terms of reference for the inquiry are mine and I take responsibility for them. I think they have been widely acknowledged as being comprehensive, all encompassing and they will get to the bottom of the matter.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the minister again for not answering my question. I wanted to know if General Boyle was involved in the drafting of the mandate and terms of reference.

Not only is the government hiding behind the inquiry, it is interfering with it at the same time. The Prime Minister attacked the inquiry in the most flagrant fashion. His next barrage went to the noble members serving in the Canadian Armed Forces who choose to leave. These men practice leadership and responsibility with accountability. The Prime Minister attacked them. Does the Prime Minister think it shows moral fibre to attack retired generals who were honourably serving this country?

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if anyone has been interfering with this process it is the hon. member and his colleagues. As I said yesterday to his colleague from Beaver River, they have reflected on evidence, impugned motives of individuals, and made all kinds of wild accusations in the House.

• (1130)

This demonstrates the reason why we had to have the inquiry in the first place, to take it out of the partisan atmosphere of the House of Commons, to put it in a judicial setting, an impartial setting so that everyone could be heard fairly and all the evidence could be examined clearly and thoroughly.

The hon. member is the best advertisement for the reasons why we set up the inquiry: to take the partisan aspect out of it. All the hon. member and his colleagues have done in the last number of months is to turn this into a partisan issue. I do not believe that the people of Canada appreciate that very much.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the people of Canada will judge the government on this issue.

The minister would have us believe that the cuts to national defence have caused the low morale in the forces. It was not budget cuts that shredded documents. It was not budget cuts that lied to the military police. It was not budget cuts that broke the Access to

Oral Questions

Information Act. It was General Boyle and this minister and this government approves of it.

Why will he not admit that it is the Liberal government's lack of integrity and lack of ethics, not the lack of money, that is hurting our Canadian Armed Forces?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it seems quite obvious that as the days go by, the hon. member is becoming more and more hysterical about this problem. We prefer to deal with things in a calm and rational way and let the inquiry do its work.

He talks about the people of Canada judging us. Mr. Speaker, if you look at the opinion polls, the people of Canada have judged his party already and they have found it totally wanting on just about every issue that affects Canadians and it will be the same thing on this problem.

* * *

[Translation]

THE JUDICIARY

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

Yesterday, the Canadian Judicial Council voted unanimously in favour of removing from the bench Mr. Justice Bienvenue, a judge of the Superior Court of Quebec. Last July 5, the justice minister indicated clearly that he was awaiting the council's recommendations before taking action regarding Mr. Justice Bienvenue.

Will the Minister of Justice tell us whether or not he agrees with the recommendation of the Canadian Judicial Council that Mr. Justice Bienvenue be removed from the bench?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have not yet received the formal decision from the Canadian Judicial Council. We expect it perhaps today or next week.

When I have received the report, it is my intention to discuss it with my colleagues in order to decide on the next step.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the board of inquiry recommended that Mr. Justice Bienvenue be removed from the bench, and now the Canadian Judicial Council has endorsed this recommendation. What is the minister waiting for to take action, and why is he stalling? It is in the news, everyone knows about it, it has been in the news for a long time now.

What is the minister waiting for to table a resolution, right now or early next week, in order to close the final chapter on this case and ask the House to remove Judge Bienvenue from the bench?

[English]

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will not have to wait long but the process will be followed. That process involves me receiving the official notification of the council's decision, it involves me consulting with my cabinet colleagues and then taking action. That is exactly the way we are going to approach this matter.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we saw after General Boyle's speech on Wednesday that he has now invented an entirely new military phrase. It goes like this: "If you cannot stand the heat get out through the kitchen". Now it is okay for the general to avoid scrutiny but the minister cannot avoid the scrutiny of this House and the questions that have been asked.

The minister was asked: "Was General Boyle involved in drafting the terms of reference for the Somalia inquiry?" Was he involved? Yes or no?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I answered the question fully in my first answer.

The terms of reference which I tabled in March 1995 were a reflection of the government's thinking in trying to get to the bottom of this. A number of people, a number of officials, worked on these terms of reference in conjunction with the deputy minister and the judge advocate general. The point is that these terms of reference belong to the government. They reflect the government's thinking clearly.

• (1135)

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, obviously this is question period and not answer period.

I want to say this again slowly so the minister understands. We are asking a simple question on ministerial accountability. We are asking, was General Boyle involved in the drafting of the guidelines for the Somalia inquiry? Was he involved, yes or no? Tell the Canadian people.

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, these are the people who ask about ministerial responsibility. I am the minister. I take responsibility for those terms of reference.

They reflect the thinking of the government. They were drafted by officials in the department in conjunction with the judge advocate general on my authority and I take responsibility for them.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

BERTRAND LITIGATION

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

Yesterday, Guy Bertrand announced, before a select group of VIPs close to the highest echelons of the Liberal Party of Canada, that he wished to pursue his legal crusade against Quebec's attaining sovereignty. Last May, the minister stated that the main reason for the federal involvement in the Bertrand court case was the position the Government of Quebec had taken.

Now that the Government of Quebec is withdrawing from the case, could the minister tell us what could now motivate his intervention alongside Mr. Bertrand?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said last Monday in response to the same question from another hon. member, we intend to decide what we will do within the next few days.

I hope to have an answer on the government position on this by next week.

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, speaking of the Bertrand litigation, the leader of the Quebec Liberal Party, Mr. Johnson, told the daily *Le Soleil*, and I quote: "I find it is not appropriate to start up the legal squabbling over sovereignty all over again".

Can the minister tell us whether he shares that opinion?

[English]

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have said from the outset that there are important legal principles to be considered. This is both a political and a legal matter.

We said also that we would take whatever steps that may be necessary to fulfil our commitment. If there is to be another referendum the question will be clear, the discussion will be full, the process will be fair, the consequences well understood and that all Canadians will have a role to play in deciding the future of their country.

Those are our objectives and we shall take what steps are appropriate to achieve them.

* * *

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

The Minister of National Defence has been asked very clearly whether General Boyle was involved in drafting the terms of reference for the inquiry. The minister has not indicated the names

of any officials who were involved. By inference General Boyle was involved in drafting the terms of reference.

Would the minister confirm that, if not, confirm very clearly that he was not involved?

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the hon. member for Lethbridge. He should know after all his years in government something about parliamentary democracy in this country.

There is ministerial responsibility. We do not attack, we do not berate public servants on the floor of the House of Commons, no matter who they are.

Questions are asked of the government. The government is accountable for all of the actions within the respective departments.

I have answered the question two or three times. I, and I alone, take responsibility for the terms of reference on behalf of the government. I consulted cabinet colleagues and it was a collaborative effort in that particular—

Mr. Hart: Then he'll have to go.

Mr. Harris: Cover up, cover up.

Mr. Hart: Resign.

Mr. Collette:—it was a collaborative effort on that particular score. In a parliamentary government the ministers and the ministers alone take responsibility. Those terms of reference are comprehensive, they are thorough and they will get the answers Canadians want.

• (1140)

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I want to say very clearly to the Minister of National Defence that by not answering the question there is a cover-up.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Colleagues, we must not impute motive in our questions. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw the word "cover-up".

Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I withdraw it in that context.

My question is very straightforward to the minister. Will the minister table the names of those officials who were involved in drafting and recommending the terms of reference for the inquiry so that it is clear to the Canadian public who is involved and so that we clarify the matter that there was no conflict of interest and that there was no inferred, assumed or perceived cover-up in any way? Would the minister table those names next Monday in the Parliament of Canada?

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again the hon. member and his colleagues ignore a fundamental principle of

Oral Questions

responsible government in the parliamentary context. I would invite him over the weekend to go back and look at some textbooks to see how our parliamentary system has evolved.

The fact is that ministers elected by the people are responsible for the actions within their own department. I and I alone am responsible for those terms of reference.

* * *

[Translation]

THE CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

The latest in a long list of scandals involving the armed forces was made public yesterday on TV. Several senior officers at the Valcartier base have developed a system involving embezzlement and kickbacks. Worse yet, it is alleged that this practice, which has been going on for at least 15 years, is common place in several other military bases across the country.

Given the fact that this kind of systematic fraud is part of the already long list of scandals we know about, what is the Prime Minister waiting for to clean up the armed forces command, starting with the defence minister and his protégé, the chief of staff?

[English]

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, these allegations of fraudulent practices at CFB Base Valcartier have been known for some time and have been the subject of some investigations. A number of people have been charged and other charges are pending.

Again, we have to let the investigative and judicial processes take effect. Obviously we are concerned when anything of this nature occurs, especially since the allegations are that these practices have been going on at least for ten years.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this latest scandal, which is costing taxpayers a fortune, is in fact part of the ongoing waste of public funds in the department nine months after the appointment of General Boyle. For instance, over \$31 million are literally squandered every year as the result of an inefficient pay system.

Can the Prime minister not see that this is the direct consequence of his insistence on keeping General Boyle? The armed forces are floundering while the general is wasting time fixing up his blunders with his lawyers.

[English]

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said in answer to earlier questions, this is a department that needed much

reform in its administrative practices. Apparently now we have had allegations of fraudulent practices which obviously cannot be accepted and cannot be tolerated. They have been investigated. There are charges that are about to be laid and some that have already been laid. Actions have already been taken against at least one individual.

The key thing is that once the information comes to light, no matter how disquietening, one must act and act with alacrity. That is what the department is doing in this particular case.

* * *

● (1145)

BOSNIA

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the opposition seems so preoccupied with taking over the work of the Somali inquiry that everybody seems to have forgotten our hard working men and women serving in Bosnia.

I wonder if the minister could tell the House, when he attends the meeting of defence ministers of NATO next week in Norway, what our position will be on the continuing commitment of Canadian men and women to Bosnia.

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously this is a matter that will be the subject of cabinet discussions. My colleague, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, will be leading that discussion.

I am glad the hon. member made a tribute to the hard work of the men and women now serving in Bosnia.

The Canadian government's position has always been that we want stability in that region. That is why we committed 1,000 troops to the IFOR force. It is quite obvious to most people that some continuation of the force will be required once IFOR's mandate terminates. That will be the discussion between ministers next week.

Once it is determined what is required, Canada will have to decide whether we shall continue to participate and at what level.

* * *

SOMALIA INQUIRY

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we have had a regiment disbanded, we have had key people, witnesses, taken out of the country at the last minute. We now have a general who appears to have an obvious conflict of interest.

Will the minister file now a list of those people who were responsible for drawing up the frame of reference for the Somalia inquiry?

Oral Questions

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this says something about the mentality of the members of the Reform Party. They are not content just to attack ministers. But that is fair ball because we run for office and we have to defend our policies.

The mentality of the Reform Party is not to stop with the politicians, which is an acceptable part of our democratic process. These people want to attack public servants who are doing their job, public servants who are unable to defend themselves here on the floor of the House of Commons like I am.

This is why the Reform Party approach is being rejected by Canadians every single day.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this minister talks about ministerial responsibility. He also talks about accountability. He also talks about perception. Right now it is perceived by all Canadians that we now have a conflict of interest in the very terms of reference of the Somalia inquiry.

Why will this minister not answer, yes or no, was General Boyle involved in setting the frame of reference for the Somalia inquiry?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have a perception of the Reform Party as one that does not understand parliamentary traditions. It does not understand that public servants work for the government and do not have the right to defend themselves in a political arena.

I think the hon. member would be much more comfortable sitting in the House of Representatives in Washington than he is sitting in the Parliament of Canada in Ottawa.

* * *

[*Translation*]

IRVING WHALE

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment.

Last week, we learned that there are still large amounts of PCB-contaminated sediments on the site of the *Irving Whale* wreck. Before the operation to lift this barge, concentrations of 400 to 900 parts per million had been found in contaminated samples.

Given the substantial and troubling presence of PCBs, what does the minister intend to do in the very short term to correct this situation, which directly threatens all the fishery resources in that part of the Gulf of St. Lawrence?

[*English*]

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me first thank my hon. friend for the question. It is an issue that we are taking very seriously. As the member knows,

there was overwhelming support from both the people of P.E.I. as well as Isle de la Madeleine in terms of ridding the ocean of this environmental hazard. There was overwhelming support for lifting the barge, as we did earlier this summer.

Following the lifting of the barge a number of boats stayed for a number of days doing remediation in terms of the footprint area at the bottom of the ocean.

• (1150)

We did take a total 20 samplings after the barge was raised, 35 before, and in a number of small instances there were a number of samples of PCBs that were certainly of concern. Sampling continues to take place so that we can ascertain the extent of these samples with the possibility that there may be further remediation.

Both my department as well as the Department of Fisheries and Oceans are working on it. In the first days of October there may be further developments that if there needs to be further remediation that we do so before the winter season comes upon us.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a sediment contamination level of 10,000 parts per million. The situation is extremely serious.

Can the Minister of the Environment assure us that the PCBs will be recovered before the winter so that the fishing industry will not be threatened next year?

[*English*]

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, there were some 70 barrels of sediments around the footprint that were collected and brought into the Halifax port and are being destroyed. The sample which contains the 10,000 parts per million is one sample near that footprint area.

We are talking to scientists as well as to technicians on it because we have to determine whether it is a small concentrated sample which is showing this 10,000 parts per million or whether it is a larger extended area.

As soon as these officials from both my department and DFO can ascertain the extent of that sample, if it requires further remediation and bringing up further sedimentation, that is exactly what we will do. I have certainly given clear instructions that if that is an option we will do that before the winter comes upon us.

* * *

SOMALIA INQUIRY

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the defence minister talks about ministerial responsibility and gives the House a big speech on that.

Oral Questions

Ministerial responsibility is void without ministerial accountability. General Boyle wrote the terms of reference for the Somalia inquiry. Will the minister accept the accountability of his own department and offer his resignation now?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am relieved. I have been waiting for two days to be asked to resign by the hon. member and it has come at last.

What we have to look at is what the members of the Reform Party are trying to do with this independent judicial process. They are trying to politicize it.

I have tried not to be partisan this week in dealing with an issue which is tough, tough for the government and tough for everybody. However, we see over there desperation politics. Their leader is under assault. Their spokesman from Calgary West or Calgary Centre has not been in the House. They have three or four members who will not even support the leader of the Reform Party. This is an absolute and total attempt to politicize what should be an impartial process.

We are seeing the Reform Party undertake tactics that are not worthy of this Chamber.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party is asking the questions that are on the minds of Canadians. That is our job. Why does the minister not do his job and accept ministerial accountability?

If we were to find out that another person who was a witness in front of the inquiry wrote the terms of reference, the government lawyers would be screaming blue murder. Today we find that General Boyle has written the terms of reference for the Somalia inquiry at the same time that he is a witness before that very inquiry.

This is a conflict of interest. The minister has said he is accepting ministerial responsibility. Accept ministerial accountability and do the proper thing for Canada, resign today.

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what is on the minds of Canadians at a time when the unity of the country is threatened, when we are facing the challenges of globalization, is why a group of members in the House of Commons comes in here every day to try to politicize a process that is supposed to be devoid of politics.

• (1155)

That is what is on the minds of Canadians.

I have answered the question with respect to the role of ministers in responsible government, the role of public servants. I would

invite the hon. member to analyse his own question because there is illogic in the actual question the way it was posed.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week the Minister of Justice introduced measures to protect Canadians against violent long term offenders. It is an initiative that I applaud.

However, Canadians who are concerned about rising violent crime among young people want to know why the minister is not applying these new tough measures to young offenders.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-55, which was tabled this week, is an important step toward safety of Canadians in their communities. It targets adult offenders, those at highest risk to reoffend, sexual offenders. It empowers the court to impose a period as long as 10 years after the end of the prison term of supervision to ensure that those at highest risk to reoffend are under some degree of control in the communities.

This regime would apply to a young offender transferred to and sentenced in the adult court. It does not apply in youth court. As the hon. member knows, the chair of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs is now completing a comprehensive review of the Young Offenders Act.

One of the matters under consideration is how better to deal with violent young offenders. I am certain the committee will look carefully at the question, whether these principles have application in the youth justice system.

* * *

[Translation]

AIDS

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

Last Tuesday, the Canadian AIDS Society and the Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network tabled a study showing that the number of HIV-positive inmates in Canadian prisons had risen by 46 per cent between 1994 and 1996.

Does the Minister of Health intend to make vigorous representations to his colleague, the solicitor general, to convince him to take urgent measures to stop the spread of AIDS in Canadian prisons?

[English]

Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raises a question that has a number of recommendations for the Ministry of Health.

Oral Questions

We hope to be working more co-operatively with the solicitor general and move on the recommendations that have been announced both in terms of research and in terms of surveillance.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since it has already been two years since a committee of experts submitted to the government specific recommendations on the kinds of measures needed in prisons, can the Minister of Health explain to us why his government has done nothing in the past two years?

[*English*]

Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have to say I disagree with the premise of the hon. member's question.

In point of fact, there has been a lot of work by both respective departments. The Department of Health as well as the solicitor general have moved on a number of issues.

However, the recommendations which have been contained in the report that has been released emphasize that there has to be more focused work as it relates to research. We intend to do that.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the justice minister but I would like to advise the defence minister that we will be back on Monday.

The worst thing our justice system can do is imprison someone for a crime they did not commit. Two and a half years ago, I asked the justice minister to examine the lengthy delays experienced with the processing of 690 applications which are based on evidence of wrongful imprisonment.

The justice minister said at that time: "We will be announcing in the next few months changes in the system to ensure that all such applications are dealt with fairly and as quickly as possible".

I have not heard any announcements in the last two years. Has the new system been put in place?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, following the question put to me on that occasion by the hon. member, the Department of Justice organized and then published a set of procedures governing section 690 applications, making it clear to applicants what was required of them and also making clear the steps that would be followed inside justice in processing such applications. We have followed that procedure since and I think there has been a real improvement in the way they have been dealt with.

• (1200)

I am very much aware that these applications have to be dealt with as quickly as possible. We are talking about people who are in prison, for the most part. At the same time, it is a personal responsibility of mine to read the file, to review the submissions and to come to my own independent judgment not only about what is to be done but the reasons for doing it because of the value of precedent these cases set.

We do the best we can with the resources available. I will provide the hon. member with a copy of the guidelines or the procedure we published, and I know he will have a continuing interest in these matters.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Wilfrid Beaulieu has been waiting for word on his 690 application from the justice minister for over two years. Richard McArthur has been waiting longer than that.

It is unbelievable that Clifford Olson, a serial child killer, is guaranteed a review of his parole ineligibility by this government while the Beaulieus and the McArthurs wait almost indefinitely at the pleasure of the justice minister in the face of evidence that a miscarriage of justice may have occurred.

When can Mr. Beaulieu and Mr. McArthur expect a decision on their 690 applications?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is true to say that the application in the case of Wilfrid Beaulieu was made about two years ago. However, that does not mean that much time has elapsed since we had all the material on which to base the decision.

It was only earlier this year that I received the full report after the evidence was put in the hands of Mr. Beaulieu's lawyer for comment. It was only earlier this year that I received a draft from the counsel involved with recommendations. In the interim, I have reviewed that in detail. I have looked into further aspects of the matter about which I had questions, and I intend to deal with that matter in the weeks to come.

I have taken on the practice when I release reasons in these cases to append a chronology so the public will know about the period since the original application was taken up. Often it is requesting additional information that we need, often it is awaiting responses from counsel for the applicant. All the time that has elapsed is not necessarily on the account of the Department of Justice.

That having been said, they have to be dealt with quickly.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the acting Prime Minister.

Routine Proceedings

Late last night after the late night news, I received a phone call from a constituent of Kamloops, a longstanding Liberal who said that he felt that he had been bitten by his own dog.

He reminded me that on page 89 of the red book it says that a Liberal government will be committed to stable multi-year financing for national cultural institutions such as the CBC.

Was he metaphorically bitten by his own dog?

Mr. Guy H. Arseneault (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for his question because it gives me a chance to underline that there are some positive things there.

Although the CBC is undergoing some streamlining and reductions, other departments are doing likewise. I should point out that although we have had some reductions, there is still \$800 million to be allotted to the CBC in our budget. There is a production fund of \$200 million that it will be able to tap and it is going to a completely 100 per cent Canadian programming.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Ms. Colleen Beaumier (Brampton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

The government keeps boasting that it has created 208,000 jobs to date in 1996 yet there are many Canadians who are still hurting. Is the government so complacent because of its high rating in the polls that it is prepared to ignore the plight of over a million Canadians who are unemployed?

Does the government have any new plans for job creation?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a person whose total knowledge of the Canadian political scene was in watching question period today would find it passing strange, given that the prime preoccupation of Canadians is economic growth and an increasing quality of life, it is only a member of the Liberal Party who has asked a question about what Canadians are truly concerned about.

• (1205)

The hon. member is right. The number one priority of the government is giving Canadians jobs and a better standard of living. It is for that reason that interest rates are now down by over 4.5 percentage points and since we took office we have created over 750,000 jobs.

It is for that reason that we have an open skies policy which has brought in tourism and has created a multitude of jobs in imports. It is for that reason that we have lowered tariffs which have made the Canadian productive centre much more competitive. It is for that

reason that our trade missions have been so successful. We have invested in technology.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to four petitions.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS**

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 26th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding associate memberships of various committees. If the House gives its consent, I intend to move concurrence of the 26th report later this day.

* * *

CROWN LIABILITY AND PROCEEDINGS ACT

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-325, an act to amend the Crown Liability and Proceedings Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill would amend the Crown Liability and Proceedings Act to ensure that inmates serving penitentiary sentences will not be able to sue the federal government or its employees.

Specifically this legislation would prohibit lawsuits to be filed by inmates against the federal government for matters arising as a result of or during their penitentiary sentence.

There is an urgent need for this type of legislation in Canada today. This legislation, if adopted, would put a stop to the outrageous practice of prisoners engaging in frivolous legal actions against Canadian taxpayers. I would encourage all members of the House to carefully consider this legislation.

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

* * *

[Translation]

MOTION M-240

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, having checked with government and Reform members I think you would find unanimous consent to amend Motion M-240 in my name to read as follows:

That, in the opinion of the House, the government should give RCMP officers the right to unionize and to bargain collectively under the Canada Labour Code.

It was an error.

The Deputy Speaker: Since the hon. member has consulted with members of all the other parties, is there unanimous consent for this correction?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the House gives its consent, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, that the 26th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, presented to the House earlier this day, be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

* * *

• (1210)

[English]

PETITIONS

ABORTION

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the petitioners request that Parliament support a binding national referendum to be held at the time of the next election to ask Canadians whether or not they are in favour of federal government funding for abortions on demand.

PROFITS FROM CRIME

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present three petitions. The first asks Parliament to enact Bill C-205, introduced by the hon. member for Scarborough West at the earliest opportunity, to provide in Canadian law that no criminal profits from committing a crime.

This petition is signed by 43 of my constituents.

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second and third petitions ask Parliament to pass Bill C-201 which would ensure that the sentence given to anyone convicted of driving while impaired or causing injury or death while impaired reflects both the severity of the crime and zero tolerance by Canada toward this crime.

These petitions are signed by 375 of my constituents.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present to Parliament a petition signed by 360 people in my riding of Red Deer.

Government Orders

The citizens pray and request that Parliament proceed immediately with amendments to the Criminal Code to ensure that the sentence given to anyone convicted of driving while impaired or causing injury or death while impaired reflects both the severity of the crime and zero tolerance by Canada toward this crime.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table two petitions that raise the question of human rights and violence and terrorism.

[Translation]

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of petitions to table today.

[English]

The first petition signed by residents of the riding of Hull—Aylmer is opposed to the inclusion of the phrase of sexual orientation in the human rights act.

PROFITS FROM CRIME

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): The second petition, Mr. Speaker, is from a number of people in the riding of Glengarry—Prescott—Russell supporting an initiative by the hon. member for Scarborough West, namely Bill C-205.

INDIVISIBILITY OF CANADA

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the third petition comes from the constituents of Hull—Aylmer. It has to do with the indivisibility of Canada.

SEXUAL ORIENTATION

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the fourth petition is from the people of Hull—Aylmer again and it is against the inclusion of the sexual orientation phrase in the Criminal Code.

PROFITS FROM CRIME

Mr. Herb Grubel (Capilano—Howe Sound, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the petition calls for Parliament to support Bill C-205. This bill amends the Criminal Code and Copyright Act with the objective of preventing criminals from profiting from their crimes through the sale of books, video tapes and other such means related to their crime.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

FOREIGN EXTRATERRITORIAL MEASURES ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-54, an act to amend the Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Government Orders

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, before we were interrupted for question period I was speaking about the aspects of Bill C-54 which do not guarantee the rights of Canadians and therefore the need to have a NAFTA dispute panel settle this issue once and for all.

One important aspect was that Bill C-54 does not have any provisions against the Helms-Burton bill for barring entry of senior officials of selected companies doing business in the United States.

Bill C-54 does not cover a number of questions and these are questions that need to be settled at a NAFTA panel. Does the United States have the right to seize assets of Canadian companies in the United States? Clearly not. Article 1110 states that no party may expropriate an investment of an investor of another party in its territory or take a measure tantamount to the expropriation of such an investment.

• (1215)

Here is another NAFTA article to take to the dispute panel. Article 1105 states that each party shall accord to investments of investors of other parties treatment in accordance with international law, including fair and equitable treatment and full protection and security. No one can tell me that Helms-Burton is not in contravention of that provision of the NAFTA.

I know that the officials of the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade have been looking at whether the Cuban legislation, the Helms-Burton legislation, is in violation of U.S. international trade obligations as they relate to the World Trade Organization. A senior American State Department official said last year that the bill essentially meant that the United States was asserting its jurisdiction over transfer between two non-U.S. parties of land or assets situated outside the United States. The official argued that went well beyond the accepted international practice and would be difficult to defend under U.S. law. I make the point that it would be more difficult to defend under the World Trade Organization.

I am sure foreign affairs lawyers have advised the minister as to which dispute resolution forum is best. Let us go with it. Let us stop pussyfooting around on this issue and putting tit for tat legislation in place. Nowadays when a bully bullies us we do not have to put our tail between our legs and run. We do not have to get bloodied in the fight either. We can take that bully to international court. Let us take the Americans to court to see if we can get the Helms-Burton bill overturned.

The United States is a very important trading partner of Canada. It is not only our trading partner, it is our friend. We have about \$1 billion in two-way trade per day crossing the 49th parallel.

However, that does not mean the Americans can take their dispute with Cuba beyond their international borders. I make the point that the United States has every right to challenge Cuba and to put trade sanctions of a binational nature in place. However, it is simply not within the international parameters of good citizenship or international trade to take that outside its borders and apply it to countries such as Canada.

I would like to talk a bit about our trade and investment relations with Cuba. Canada maintained full relations with CUBA after the 1959 revolution which brought Castro to power. Even though the country has largely a state owned economy and cutting through paperwork is tiresome and frustrating we continue to do business there. Last year Canadian exports to Cuba amounted to \$108 million. This was mostly food products, chemicals, industrial machinery and transport equipment. Our exports were up more than 130 per cent last year. Imports from Cuba amounted to \$194 million. This is largely made up of sugar, raw nickel products and fertilizer.

In all, 37 Canadian companies have offices in Cuba and Canadian businessmen are involved in as many as 30 joint venture projects with Cuban partners in areas ranging from minerals, petroleum, processed food and others.

Canadian companies have arranged to build over 4,000 hotel rooms at 11 different sites in the next ten years. These are valued at over \$500 million and will feature golf courses, riding stables and yacht berths. Of course, Cuba is a very important and favoured winter vacation location for about 120,000 Canadians who travel there each winter.

There are continued prospects for Canadian companies to hunt for gold, drill for fertilizer and mine for nickel. A particularly interesting development is that Canadian firms are involved in biotechnology ventures with Cuban institutes.

At the same time we are trading with Cuba, I believe it is incumbent on the Liberal government to work to help that country bring about democratic reform. It is interesting to note that although we have been trading with Cuba for over 30 years the Minister of Foreign Affairs said today that we need to encourage democratic reform. Where has been that effort in the past?

The Minister for International Trade said that we should not have an isolationist policy like the United States does with Cuba; that we need to engage it. I concur completely.

It seems strange that it takes a bill like the U.S. Helms-Burton bill to cause interest in Canada helping to bring about democratic reform in Cuba. We should be making every effort to work with Cubans very closely through our trade relationships to encourage them to work toward a more democratic country.

• (1220)

Trading with Cuba is good business for Canada and good business for Cuba. I also believe that keeping trade alive is the best way to promote democracy and human rights in Cuba. The trade policy we are following with Cuba is the same one the United States is pursuing with China. Keep trade channels flowing and eventually the political situation will open as well. I believe we should be doing more to encourage that. In any event, we insist on our right to make our own decisions regarding trade and investments with Cuba and any other country. The United States has every right to take action against Cuba but its fight must be maintained with Cuba and not with us.

The Reform party supports Bill C-54 as a first step to repelling the Helms-Burton legislation but it is only a stop-gap measure. Let us take this to a dispute resolution under NAFTA. If we do not insist on our rights we will only encourage the Americans to keep pushing us around. It is time for Canada to test the United States' resolve. Will it be part of these international trade agreements and the rules that govern them or not?

I also believe it is time to test this Liberal government's resolve. The U.S. is testing Canada at the World Trade Organization on our policy on split run magazines. It has tested us at NAFTA. What is this government afraid of? It is time to test this government's resolve. Does it believe in the trade agreements it has signed, NAFTA and the World Trade Organization? Is it prepared to see them through? It seems to me we have worked very hard. Canada has been a leader in setting international trade agreements in place and rules to settle these disputes. It is ridiculous that we do not use them to settle matters of this nature.

[*Translation*]

Mr. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso): Mr. Speaker, I have agreed to switch spots with my colleague, the hon. member for Terrebonne, so that he could speak now. I will speak after.

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne, BQ): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I must say it was very kind of the parliamentary secretary to accept to switch spots with me. He agreed to do so for personal reasons and I am most grateful.

Before commenting on Bill C-54, I would like to take a moment to commend the chamber of commerce of Bois-des-Filion, in my riding, for holding a conference breakfast that the leader of the Bloc Québécois and myself attended this morning. As you can see we do get around quite a bit. A great deal of energy and professionalism went into organizing this event. I want to congratulate the president, Alain Éthier, and everyone involved in the operation of the chamber of commerce, for so successfully delivering the merchandise.

Government Orders

Moving to the heart of the subject, that is to say Bill C-54, as presented by the Minister of International Trade and the Minister of Foreign Affairs. As you probably noticed from the previous speech made by a member of the Bloc Québécois, we have no intention of stopping this bill from passing second reading.

The reason for this is quite simple: the Bloc Québécois is against this American initiative to limit Canadian and foreign companies' freedom of trade. It is illegal and it has prompted the Bloc Québécois to ask over and over these past few months that the federal government take more vigorous steps than public criticism in the press in reaction to such an attempt by the U.S. to extend to Canada its embargo against Cuba.

It is clear in our minds that it is essential to do everything in our power to protect Quebec and Canadian businesses trading abroad. This is why we will support Bill C-54. However, even if we do not oppose this measure, we have some reservations and we are somewhat puzzled about the efforts made so far by the government regarding the Helms-Burton issue.

It is clear to everyone that the measures taken by the U.S. are totally reprehensible. The Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act, better known as the Helms-Burton law, is unanimously condemned as unacceptable, both in Canada and in countries such as those of the European Union, the West Indies, the Caribbean and others from Latin America and South America.

• (1225)

One would have expected the international community to react against this attempt by the U.S. government to subject the whole world to its foreign and trade policies.

One would have expected greater leadership on the part of Canada to fight the actions of the U.S. government, first because our country is a major economic partner for Cuba, but also because of the strong economic ties between Canada and the United States. Instead, the Canadian government opted for the soft approach—time will take care of things—preferring to publicly condemn these measures, rather than take concrete and effective action.

The action, or lack of, deemed to be the most effective by this government is an incomplete and, more importantly, tardy bill. Whereas under NAFTA, the government could have called a special panel hearing since July 29. In fact, I wonder if the government could even have used the NAFTA procedure from the very beginning, in March or April. But instead of using this option, the government preferred to wait and start reacting once the damage was done.

Since the beginning, the Bloc Québécois has strongly condemned this American legislative measure with its extraterritorial effects, and it has urged the Liberal government to take strong, quick and decisive action. However, the government has not met our expectations or answered our questions, far from it. It has been

Government Orders

slow in taking action and the solutions proposed today are far from being complete.

Let me briefly remind the House of the history and the basis of the Helms-Burton law. Following Fidel Castro's takeover in Cuba in 1959, the United States decided, in 1963, to impose an economic embargo against that country. From then on, it became illegal for American companies to do business with Cuba. Over the years, American economic sanctions against Cuba multiplied, until recently the American government passed a law preventing foreign companies from trading freely with Cuba, thus flouting international law and the sovereignty of states.

In 1995, the American senate tabled a bill to strengthen the embargo's sanctions. However, in 1995, the presidential campaign had not begun, and agreement on the bill was far from unanimous. At that time, even the American president opposed it because, in his view, certain measures went too far, such as the ban on entering American territory, and the right to prosecute.

The situation changed when two civilian aircraft belonging to Cuban exiles were shot down over the Straits of Florida. Following this unfortunate incident, the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act was passed by the American congress and signed by President Clinton on March 12, 1996. The act strengthened the embargo and imposed reprisals against all companies that do not respect the American embargo against Cuba, and that are using expropriated American property or interests, and this is after Fidel Castro's victory over thirty years ago, should anyone have forgotten.

There are two titles worthy of note. First, title III entitled *Protection of property rights of United States nationals*. This title allows an American company to prosecute foreign companies profiting from investments expropriated by the Castro regime. The act permits the assets of such companies on American soil to be seized. Although this title was suspended by the American president on August 1 for a period of six months, before it could take effect, the fact remains that if the suspension is not renewed, this title could take effect in February 1997.

It is important to remember that there is also title IV, which has been in effect since August 1. This title is entitled *Exclusion of certain aliens*, and makes it possible to bar the entry into the United States of company directors who have bought or invested in expropriated American properties and their families.

Until now, directors of the Canadian company Sherritt International Corporation and members of their families have been barred from entering the United States. It should be noted that the President of the United States has the power to suspend titles III and IV, but has used his discretionary power only for the most controversial measure, which is title III concerning the right to prosecute.

• (1230)

The Bloc Québécois has always believed that a strong reaction to the Helms-Burton law was called for, in order to send a clear and unambiguous message to the U.S. government that its behaviour is unacceptable and that we will not give in to its imperialism.

Now, a few words about the extraterritorial legislation on Iran and Libya. Unfortunately, the Liberal government was not very vociferous in its opposition to the U.S. government's repeating the same offence by passing another piece of legislation with extraterritorial impact, this time blocking trade with Iran and Libya. On July 23, 1996, the United States Congress unanimously passed the 1996 legislation on sanctions against Iran and Libya. Its purpose is to discourage companies from making major oil and gas investments in Iran and Libya. The Canadian government ought to be opposed to this in principle, not its technical agreements but the principle.

The Helms-Burton and 1996 laws on sanctions against Iran and Libya have a direct impact on the spirit of international trade agreements. These acts violate the principle of the sovereignty of states and their territories, recognized by international law.

Although I am taking care not to oppose the federal government's attempt to counteract the effects of the Helms-Burton legislation, I feel that Bill C-54 can be summarized succinctly: too little, too late. Too late, because the Helms-Burton law has been in effect since March, and the government has waited until now to respond to the U.S. threat.

Too little, also, because its effect is incomplete. First of all, it addresses only title III, with respect to legal proceedings. C-54 does nothing about title IV, which means that at the present time the Canadian government is doing nothing about the only provision in the legislation which affects Canadian citizens, namely blocking their entry into the U.S. While it has had the possibility since July 29, 1996, of calling a special committee under NAFTA, it has refused, for obscure reasons. Perhaps the parliamentary secretary will let us in on those reasons shortly.

Bill C-54, which we have before us today, modifies an existing act, the Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act. Let us touch briefly on that act. It came into effect 11 years ago, in 1985. It was enacted by the Mulroney government to respond to possible legal actions by foreign governments or tribunals in order to interfere in Canadian jurisdictions.

It was amended twice: in 1990 and in 1992. In 1992, the act was amended in response to the US Torricelli law, which was extraterritorial in nature dealing with trade with Cuba.

Government Orders

This act contains two parts, one dealing with legal actions and execution of judgments, the other one requiring compliance with Canadian laws over harmful foreign legislation and setting fines.

It is very important to note that so far the current legislation has never been applied. And yet, since 1992, it has required Canadian corporations, including subsidiaries of US companies, to comply with Canadian laws and, therefore, ignore the US embargo on Cuba. On June 18, 1996, during Question Period, I put a question to the Minister for International Trade regarding American Express. I asked him then why he had not fined this corporation, since the legislation on foreign extraterritorial measures gave him the authority to prosecute Canadian companies and subsidiaries of foreign companies which comply with foreign legislation in contravention of Canadian law.

American Express, in the United States, had given unequivocal instructions to its foreign offices, including in Canada, to honour the American embargo on Cuba. Even though officials at the Department of International Trade have been aware of the situation for two years, the international trade minister told us in June he knew nothing about it. And, as of last June, the government had taken no action against American Express.

• (1235)

And what has happened since? The minister had three months to take action under the former act and he did nothing. Therefore, one wonders if the amendments proposed in Bill C-54 will serve any purpose. Is this yet another smoke screen?

Since the act has never been used, we have every reason to believe that the legislation amended by Bill C-54 will also remain unused. The minister himself said this morning that the government hopes this legislation will remain unused. Moreover, given that the Helms-Burton law could become a dead letter after the American election, in November, Bill C-54 is definitely a case of too little, too late.

In reply to my question on June 18, the Minister for International Trade said that the intent of the amendments he wanted to make to the Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act was to neutralize the effects of the Helms-Burton law, adding that this was a last resort measure.

The minister also said, like he did this morning, that he hoped Canada would never have to resort to this measure. The Canadian government gave itself time to see what it would do, before showing the true colours of its bill.

The federal government repeatedly claimed that Canada strongly and vehemently opposed the Helms-Burton law, but it did not take any concrete measure. The Liberal government strongly condemned the illegal actions of the United States, but when the time

came to counteract the American government's measures, it never rose to the occasion. The government was just buying time.

We will support Bill C-54 even though we have reservations about its usefulness. We will do so only because we want to protect Quebec and Canadian businesses. However, we want to put it on the record that we are not pleased by the Canadian government's lack of effective action.

By not refusing to use the process provided under NAFTA to have the American law invalidated, this government is shamelessly hurting dozens of Quebec and Canadian companies doing business with Cuba. Canadians and Quebecers expect more strength on the part of their government.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you and the hon. members for listening to my comments.

Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. members of the official opposition and the hon. member of the Reform Party who spoke in support of Bill C-54 today. This bill to amend the Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act is part of the continuity of Canada's firm, active and measured campaign worldwide and in the U.S. to convince the American administration and the American Congress to withdraw the Helms-Burton law and to change the course of action they have taken with this legislation.

Canada has lead this campaign in every international forum on this issue, at the World Trade Organization, the European Union, the Organization of American States and many other multinational organizations, where we have taken the lead in opposing this law.

The bill we are introducing today is a further element in our campaign to convince the U.S. to reconsider and withdraw their law, which affects their trade relations with many other countries.

• (1240)

[*English*]

It is indeed regrettable that these amendments are necessary. Our trade and political relations with the United States on the whole are very strong, but we cannot ignore the U.S. Helms-Burton act. It clearly interferes with business between Canadian companies and Cuba.

Basic principles of international law are at stake here. In effect the U.S. is unilaterally extending its reach into business between other countries. We cannot accept that quietly. We have to respond. We must give Canadian companies the means to protect themselves. That of course is what we are doing in this legislation.

I want to underline that this is responsive legislation. We are responding to a U.S. initiative that affects Canadians. We did not choose to start this quarrel.

Government Orders

Someone might say that a clash was inevitable because Canada and other countries have followed a different path than the United States in dealing with Cuba. My answer is that disagreement with our Cuba policy does not justify Helms-Burton. There are other ways under international law for the U.S. to resolve its dispute with Cuba.

Helms-Burton is indeed a disturbing development in U.S. foreign policy. I am aware that the U.S. administration had strong reservations about Helms-Burton before the shooting down of a U.S. civilian aircraft by Cuban planes in February.

I am also aware that in July President Clinton did suspend the right of U.S. companies to sue foreign firms under the claims provision of Helms-Burton for six months. I note that the President's special envoy, Stuart Eizenstat, said in Ottawa that the U.S. is in no way telling Canadians to stop trade and investment with Cuba.

But Helms-Burton remains a threat to Canadian businesses dealing with Cuba. The legislation is on the books. It does give President Clinton or his successors the power to permit filing of claims by U.S. companies against Canadian or other foreign firms. The U.S. has already informed some Canadians that they will be denied entry to the U.S. because of this law.

It is also unfortunate that Helms-Burton is not an isolated case. The President has signed into law the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act which again thrusts the United States into the trading relationships of other countries. The details of the two laws are different but the principle is the same.

Are these signs of a change in direction in U.S. foreign policy? Do they mean that the U.S. is ready to put aside the normal rules of international trade to achieve its own ends? I would like to answer no. I would like to say that the long U.S. tradition in support of open trade and internationally accepted rules is as strong as ever but I am not so sure.

There are some good signs. President Clinton has publicly endorsed the World Trade Organization and the U.S. is using the WTO dispute settlement mechanism to resolve some trade disputes. It has participated actively in a number of international negotiations in such areas as telecommunications and financial services, and it continues to press for more open trade around the world.

On the other hand, the U.S. has had a tendency to throw down the gauntlet in recent international trade negotiations. In some cases it has left the impression that it will not settle for less than the whole ball of wax. As well, the momentum of the free trade clause seems to have slowed, at least in the U.S. Congress. An example is last year's decision to refuse fast track authority to the president to negotiate admission of Chile to the North American Free Trade Agreement.

I do not want to overstate this. The U.S. is one of the most open and generous countries in the world. More than 95 per cent of Canada-U.S. trade flows freely without any impediment. The U.S. continues to show in the G-7 and other international meetings that it wants to work jointly with its partners on economic and political issues. I am convinced that remains the wellspring of U.S. policy.

But we cannot allow measures such as Helms-Burton to pass by without resisting. It is only by being firm and by working co-operatively with other countries that we can ensure Helms-Burton does not become a pattern. That has been a key element of our policy throughout the Helms-Burton debate.

• (1245)

On the domestic side, we are introducing these FEMA amendments as our response to what is clearly an infringement of Canadian sovereignty. The main purpose of these amendments of course is to give Canadian companies the tools to defend themselves if U.S. courts rule in favour of American claimants who sue them under the Helms-Burton act.

Under the FEMA changes, Canadian firms can attempt to recoup these damages by suing the American companies in Canadian courts. There are other changes which give the attorney general the authority to block application of unreasonable U.S. laws in Canadian courts. I hope these changes will help deter American firms from acting against Canadian companies under Helms-Burton. At least it will give them something to think about.

We are not limiting our action to the domestic front. Canada has played a leadership role in developing a co-ordinated international response since the President signed the Helms-Burton act into law. The Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister for International Trade and the Secretary of State for Latin America have raised the issue with colleagues in other countries and in international organizations. It has been discussed with visiting leaders from other countries. This co-ordinated international action is having some effect.

Mexico is introducing similar legislation to ours. The European Union is considering action through the World Trade Organization. The Organization for American States has asked the Inter-American Juridical Committee to investigate whether Helms-Burton is consistent with international law. These actions taken together may contain the damage of Helms-Burton. Beyond this my hope is that this experience will have an impact on legislators in Washington and that this will discourage such extraterritorial measures in the future.

We cannot however rely on hopes. We must take concrete steps to protect our interests. That is the purpose of these FEMA amendments and that is why I support them.

Government Orders

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I speak to Bill C-54 which expands the FEMA legislation to give Canada the capacity to counter the Helms-Burton bill. I think we would all agree that the Helms-Burton bill is heavy handed, unilateral, coercive and indiscriminate. Helms-Burton breaks international law and it contravenes NAFTA.

As the Reform Party foreign affairs critic I can state without reservation that our party's quarrel is not with the United States which is our friend, trading partner and ally, but it is only with the Helms-Burton bill itself. In fact, given Canada's tremendous relationship with the United States, it was surprising to all of us that Canada should be targeted as it was.

I would encourage Canadians however to consider this more of a nuisance caused by the coming presidential election than any true reflection on Canada-U.S. relations. I think all of us and previous speakers have reviewed the history behind this: the killing of civilians, certainly the number of voters of Cuban descent that exist in Florida, and of course the Helms-Burton lobby that has gone on for a number of years in the U.S. It is also hopeful that after the election in the U.S. this annoyance will disappear.

Nonetheless, as parliamentarians we cannot ignore the fact that Helms-Burton exists and remains a threat to Canadian sovereignty and trade. That is why we must take action. In the opinion of the Reform Party, the government should have already filed the grievances with the NAFTA dispute panel. Therefore I cannot say that we totally agree with the approach the government is using. However, we will be supporting Bill C-54 even though it seems to be a bit of a tit for tat and could even be questioned legally.

• (1250)

My colleague from Peace River, who is Reform's trade critic, has already covered most of the specific elements of Bill C-54 and their objectives. I agree with the analysis of my colleague and instead of repeating the same points I would like to talk briefly about promoting democracy in Cuba which I believe is part of this and probably, had this been approached more strongly, the U.S. politicians might not have gone along with the Helms-Burton bill.

One thing I would like to make clear is that Reform's support for Bill C-54 and our vocal opposition of Helms-Burton in no way signals approval of or support for Cuban dictator Fidel Castro. In fact, Reform shares the view that Cuba would be much better off as a democracy.

We have to remember that Cuba is the last country in our hemisphere to reject democracy. Therefore, we should really channel more of our foreign policy efforts toward promoting Cuban democracy. Not only would we be helping the people of Cuba, but such a constructive approach would show our neighbours south of the border that our goals are the same even if our methods are different from the ones they choose to use.

I think again, as the foreign affairs department has indicated, that being involved is the best approach to having influence. Whether it be China or Cuba, I believe that to be true.

I think as well however, when we hear people talking about Cuba, that we must remember the number of human rights abuses and the number of problems that do exist in Cuba. We cannot be selective about what we say about one country as opposed to another, which often is the case.

If Canada becomes a leader in the fight for democracy in Cuba, I am very confident that Helms-Burton will cease to be a problem. I really believe that it is a rather extreme bill and it is put forward because of the extreme action that was taken by Cuba in the shooting down of the planes as was mentioned.

Toward this end, Canada should assert itself in meetings of the Organization of American States and make sure that promoting democracy, institutional reform and human rights reforms in Cuba is the priority for the OAS. Let us face it, once Cuba becomes a democratic country it could be a very positive force within the Caribbean. I feel that Cuba has a great deal of potential, but in order to achieve this potential and direct it toward positive goals, the people of Cuba have to become their own political masters. Political change in Cuba will only spur economic revitalization.

While Canadian-Cuban trade has continued despite the American embargo, I think the business opportunities in a free Cuba would far outstrip those which exist today. For example, the lifting of the U.S. embargo alone would allow for a rapid economic expansion in Cuba. As a country emerging from communist rule, Cuba will not only need Canadian consumer products and technology but our service sector will also prosper. The Canadian advantage in areas like banking, insurance, wireless communication and high technology will stand us in good stead if Cuba can modernize its economy.

We need a vision of this sort of thing and I believe that this government does not have that vision going into the 21st century. I believe that causes all of us a great deal of concern with the status quo type of positions we seem to take. We basically feel we can solve our job problems simply by infrastructure programs. We do not really look to the tremendous number of jobs that would exist if we were promoting democracy and ourselves around the world.

We should note as well that Cuba is beside Haiti, the other country in our hemisphere with the greatest social, political and economic problems. I cannot help but think that a prosperous, stable and democratic Cuba would help Haiti's long term development. Proximity makes Haiti and Cuba ideal trading partners. I would hope that a democratic Cuba would also be able to shoulder some of the load that Canada has been forced to bear with respect to assisting Haiti these last several years.

Government Orders

• (1255)

All of these possibilities however require a political change in Cuba. Without democracy, Cuba will remain an international outcast and it will continue to earn the wrath of the Americans. We must always remember that Cuba is only 90 miles away from the U.S. border. Because of that proximity, the threat is obvious to all Americans.

In conclusion, I do recognize the need for Bill C-54 and we will be voting for it. I do hope members of this House will agree with me that Canada should do more than just fight against the Helms-Burton bill. We should also fight against dictatorship and fight for building a democratic future for the people of Cuba.

Hon. Roger Simmons (Burin—St. George's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was about to make an aside that my friends in the Reform Party are in good form as usual. It is always good to have their support for something like this, the Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act, which I am pleased to support. I congratulate both the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister for International Trade on this particular initiative. It is an important one and one I can gladly give my support to.

I think all of us were—chagrined is the nice word—disgusted by the Helms-Burton initiative of some months ago. Apart from the fact that it flies in the face of everything we understand about the rule of law, about the territorial integrity of sovereign nations, it also says volumes about the arrogance of the people who would advance that kind of legislation.

I had the occasion fairly recently to be outside the country in Asia. There they cannot often tell the difference between an American and a Canadian, until they are told. They are anxious to know the difference. It is amazing and heart warming the reception one gets once they learn one is a Canadian and not an American.

I am not on an American bashing initiative today. I just wanted to make that observation because I could make a long speech on how much I admire the aspects of the American system. I did my graduate work at Boston University many years ago and I have many good friends in the United States.

At the same time I think all of us who have travelled internationally first of all are amused but second are puzzled that certain Americans so readily cultivate or lend credence to this aura of arrogance and that they know best. There are two sets of rules, one for the Americans and one for everybody else.

• (1300)

The bill before us is intended to strengthen the act to allow Canada to respond to attempts by the United States to infringe on our sovereignty. It is an objective which I believe will find support on all sides of the House. The amended bill will allow Canadian

companies to oppose the financial claims aspect of Helms-Burton. It will allow Canadians to recover in Canadian courts any amounts awarded in Helms-Burton actions in United States courts plus any costs associated with both the Canadian and U.S. court actions.

As my friend the Minister for International Trade was saying earlier today in his speech in this Chamber, we as Canadians share the objectives of the American government in so far as Cuba is concerned. Yes, we want to see democracy there. Yes, we want to see more respect for human rights there. So do the Americans. What we disagree on is the way to get there. The Americans have been trying the old isolation policy for at least 170 years, going back to the early 1820s, without much of a track record. It has not worked very well. It certainly has not worked in Cuba. One only has to look at the parade of American leaders who have come and gone since this policy was implemented. Mr. Castro still remains.

One only has to look at the hypocrisy of the Americans in dealing with Cuba versus how they deal with other countries. Surely the Americans have a few axes to grind with other countries in the world. The U.S. has certainly made it known that it has a very big human rights axe to grind with China. However, we do not see the Helms-Burton initiative being taken, being advanced or being suggested in relation to that country.

I have often felt that the American stance toward Cuba was more motivated by spite and by pride than by common sense. If it had been motivated by common sense I submit the policy would have been different. It would have been more effective in its results than it has been to date. The results show no promise of change. There is no indication that the American approach to Cuba is going to bring any more results than it has over the last 30 years.

Even that comment is beside the point. It is not our role as Canadian parliamentarians, as Canadian citizens or as the Canadian government to tell the Americans what to do. We have not spent much time doing that. My comment a minute ago was not intended in that direction. I have no illusions they would listen anyway, but the fact is we should not be telling them what to do. That is the point. While we do not attempt to tell them, they think it is quite all right for them to tell us. They think it is all right for them to implement legislation which would seek to have impact beyond their borders. They can make whatever laws they see fit to regulate activities in their country and their citizens. That is what government is all about, what a good part of it is all about.

• (1305)

The moment they step over the line, the moment they say "Canada, we respect your sovereignty only as long as you do things we like", that is the day we have to stand up and be counted. I applaud the ministers responsible and the administration for this amendment to the act which would give some teeth to our efforts to

Government Orders

respond to the Helms-Burton initiative and other initiatives should they come along.

Let us have a quick look at what the minister and especially the attorney general will be able to do once this amendment becomes law, as I certainly hope it will. The attorney general will be able to issue so-called blocking orders declaring that judgments handed down under certain foreign laws will not be enforced or recognized in Canada if the attorney general believes the legislation violates international law.

Second, once the amendment to the act is implemented, the attorney general will be able to allow Canadians to recover in Canadian courts amounts awarded under these foreign rulings, plus any costs associated with these court cases in Canada and the foreign country; a so-called clawback.

Third, the attorney general will be able to issue and amend in the future with the agreement of the Minister of Foreign Affairs a schedule listing items of objectionable foreign legislation that in the opinion of the attorney general violate international law.

It is a good piece of legislation and I am delighted to support it.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois supports the principle of Bill C-54, which is meant to offset the extraterritorial effects of the Helms-Burton legislation on Canada and Quebec. In fact, we support the action by the Canadian government to protect businesses and corporations in Canada and Quebec, against retaliatory measures taken by foreign countries.

Unfortunately, we see that our neighbours the United States resort more and more often to threats of retaliation against businesses in third countries, even against friends like Canada, in order to isolate countries they have differences with.

The present case involves a political dispute between Cuba and the United States, which is deteriorating into a trade war with extraterritorial consequences. Furthermore, the Helms-Burton legislation could jeopardize the efforts of many countries, including the United States, to further free trade. Finally, we cannot tolerate any country dictating the foreign policy of another.

Bill C-54 is certainly the first step in a reply to the American legislation, but the Minister of International Trade and the Liberal government still have a lot to do in this matter.

Let us see what factors brought about Bill C-54 so that we really understand its scope, utility and shortcomings. The President of the

United States signed the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act, commonly called the Helms-Burton legislation, into law in March 1996.

● (1310)

This law is aimed at stopping foreign businesses that own or use American nationals' properties or interests that were expropriated by Cuba from doing business in that country, on pain of retaliation by the United States. Canada, as well as Quebec, and many countries and organizations such as the OECD, the European Union and the Organization of American States, have already positively opposed to this law, which imposes American jurisdiction outside U.S. territory on non-American businesses and people.

The Helms-Burton law contravenes the principles of international law and the sovereignty of countries on their own territory. The Bloc Québécois believes the American government would vehemently oppose any form of external interference in the conduct of its affairs. The same applies to Canada. It is therefore important to counter the Helms-Burton law so that the principles established by trade practice relating to disputes between states be respected.

Through Bill C-54, the Liberal government proposes to amend the Canadian Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act of 1985 to counter the effects the Helms-Burton law would have in Canada and in Quebec. But we must ask ourselves if this response will be sufficient. Will Canadians and Quebecers doing business with Cuba be able to find in it the means to protect themselves against potential American legal action?

To answer this question, let me comment on the titles of the American law that are prejudicial to businesses in Canada and in Quebec, and the measures proposed in Bill C-54 to counter them.

There are two titles in particular in the Helms-Burton law which affect Canadian and Quebec interests: titles III and IV. Title III allows American citizens whose property was expropriated during the Cuban revolution to bring legal action against anyone, American or not, who has invested in the properties they used to own in Cuba. This title was to come into effect on November 1, but the U.S. president has decided to suspend its application until February 1997. Nearly 6,000 lawsuits in this connection are already pending, a good number of them, no doubt, involving Canadian or Quebec companies.

As for Title IV, which came into effect this past August 1, it blocks entry into the U.S. of any person who has invested in expropriated American properties in Cuba. In Canada, the directors of a Toronto firm, as well as their family members, have already been refused entry into the U.S. under this section.

Government Orders

We feel that the problem lies in the fact that the amendments to the Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act proposed in Bill C-54 are not complete and are a bit late in coming.

I have just referred to the fact that two specific titles of the Helms-Burton law threatened Canadian and Quebec interests: titles III and IV. Although Bill C-54 addresses the effects of title III, implementation of which is suspended until after the U.S. presidential elections, it proposes nothing to help the cause of Canadians and Quebecers affected by title IV, which is the one that has already caused problems to some Canadians.

The Bloc Québécois wonders why the Canadian government refrained from taking any action to deal with the ban on entry and residence in the United States, which, as you know, penalizes the executives and shareholders of these companies as well as their spouses and minor children. Why did the government fail to react to this section of the Helms-Burton law?

We all condemn the U.S. Helms-Burton law and deplore the unfortunate impact it may have on the good relations we have with our U.S. neighbours.

We must not forget, however, that this law was not passed yesterday, and that is the problem. It has been one year and seven months since the red flag went up, so the government knows what will happen if it does not act promptly.

• (1315)

In February and in the fall of 1995, the Helms-Burton bill was introduced in the Senate and the House of Representatives. In March 1996 the Prime Minister finally expressed his opposition to this legislation, and it took six more months for him to transform his verbal opposition into a bill.

We are familiar with the delay involved in the NAFTA process for dispute settlement. However, today it is clear there is no excuse for waiting any longer. That being said, the U.S. election should not prevent the government from taking action. That is why we urge the Minister for International Trade to ask for a special panel to be charged with settling this dispute under the auspices of NAFTA. If it refuses to take action to have the U.S. law invalidated under the auspices of NAFTA, the Liberal government will continue to expose Canadians and Quebecers to the adverse effects of the Helms-Burton law, especially title IV.

After expressing its opposition verbally during the past six months, it is perhaps time for the Liberal government to start some concrete action towards the invalidating the U.S. law.

Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the ten clauses making up Bill C-54 have been pretty thoroughly covered. I will therefore take the opportunity provided by this bill to reflect

on some of the important questions facing the international community.

Since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the dismantling of the Soviet Union, a wind of liberalization and globalization of trade has swept the planet. And I imagine that, for the world's greatest economic power, the United States, it must be extremely frustrating to see that Cuba, a tiny country in Latin America, is standing in the way of this free trade movement.

Cuba is to the United States as David was to Goliath. For over 30 years, the Americans have tried by all the means at their disposal to bring down the Castro regime, but success has so far eluded them.

They undoubtedly thought that the liberalization of trade sweeping the planet would also sweep away the dictatorship in Cuba. However, I think they are reading it the wrong way. Instead of applying an even tighter embargo against Cuba, if they had taken the opposite approach a number of years ago, the Cubans themselves would probably have taken steps to throw off this dictatorship.

But the reaction of the Cuban people now that they are feeling oppressed by the United States is to stand behind their leader, and this is why the regime continues on, despite everything. It could have been completely different, of course. The whole Cuba-U.S. matter could have been different.

I remember a television program reviewing some of the main failed appointments in the history of mankind. What happened between Cuba and the U.S. was one of these failed appointments. The host of the show pointed out that, months if not weeks before President Kennedy's assassination, a French reporter had been hired to act as an intermediary between Fidel Castro and President Kennedy in organizing what would no doubt have been a historical meeting, which would probably have led to the resolution of this huge conflict between the two countries.

• (1320)

However, we know what happened in November 1963. President Kennedy was killed and the program host reminded us that Fidel Castro was crushed by this news, because he hoped the confrontation with the United States was coming to an end.

Of course, there is a direct link between the Helms-Burton legislation and the election, we must not delude ourselves about that. Just as we can almost be sure that there is a link between the United States' recent intervention in Iraq and the upcoming American elections, and that is unfortunate.

Obviously, this legislation is, or at least was, to strengthen the embargo around Cuba, in order to attract the votes of Spanish Americans.

Government Orders

Helms-Burton is an anachronistic measure since it goes against the tendency toward freer trade that has emerged over the last few years. Think about the length of the negotiations known as the Uruguay Round which led, in 1993, to the creation of the WTO. They lasted seven years. They were supposed to give us freer trade. Think about the NAFTA negotiations under the leadership of, if I am not mistaken, the United States. And here we are today faced with a piece of legislation that goes completely against this strong tendency toward freer trade.

Helms-Burton is an example of the inability of the United States to accept the fact that smaller countries also have rights and privileges. After the free trade agreement was finalized, we had the case of Norsk Hydro, a Quebec company, when the United States tried in every way it could to counter the effects of free trade and was finally successful.

We are all familiar with the softwood lumber story. The agreement was signed to promote free trade between Mexico, Canada and the United States and subsequently, the United States tried in every possible way, either directly or indirectly, to revise the content of the agreement. Finally, Canada was obliged to sign a schedule that would limit exports of softwood lumber to the United States for five years.

I will finish with a fable by La Fontaine. If we look at the U.S. attitude to trade, it is just like the fable of the wolf and the lamb. A little lamb was drinking water in a river, and the wolf was drinking up river. The wolf accused the little lamb of making the water murky, and the lamb answered: How could I, since I am down river? The wolf answered: If you did not do it today, you did six months ago. The lamb answered: I had not been born six months ago. The wolf added: If you did not do it six months ago, it must have been your parents. The fable ends with the wolf eating the lamb. I think this is a little like the attitude of the Americans to measures they themselves created. They are just sabotaging the agreements they signed of their own free will.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understand that the hon. member Okanagan—Shuswap will be seeking the floor to make a speech.

• (1325)

I think you would find unanimous consent that the House not see the clock at 1.30 p.m. to permit the member to make his remarks, within the 20-minute rule that usually applies, and that after that the House proceed with the question prior to going to private members' hour.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to permit the member to speak for 20 minutes?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, relations between our southern neighbour and major trading partner, the United States and the small country 90 miles south of the United States, Cuba, have been a roller coaster for nearly 100 years. Ever since 1898 when U.S. forces invaded Cuba and forced out the Spanish, it has not been unheard of for Canada to have to ride that roller coaster.

The legislation before us, Bill C-54, is needed because that roller coaster ride continues today. To put the legislation into perspective, I believe it is useful for us to look back briefly over some of the highest hills and deepest dives which that roller coaster has followed.

For four years, from 1898 until early into this century the U.S. military occupied and ran Cuba. When the U.S. imposed the Platt amendment giving itself the right to dictate Cuba's foreign policy and to have the U.S. military intervene in Cuba's international affairs, that situation continued for more than a generation. Only in 1934 did American President Franklin Delano Roosevelt give up the powers which the U.S. had given itself in the Platt amendment.

Eventually both American corporations and U.S. organized crime had a strong base of operations in Cuba, until a bushy bearded revolutionary named Fidel Castro seized power in 1960.

It shows Canada's special relationship with Cuba when we note that when Castro expropriated Cuba's banks at the start of his reign, he exempted just two, the Bank of Nova Scotia and the Royal Bank, both Canadian. Apparently a copy of the document by which the Cuban government bought ScotiaBank's Cuban subsidiary now reposes in the vaults of the Bank of Nova Scotia in downtown Toronto.

In 1962 intelligence reports revealed that the U.S.S.R. was installing ballistic missiles in Cuba capable of hitting U.S. and Canadian targets. Then U.S. president John Kennedy announced an American naval blockade of the island.

The Canadian government was asked with barely 90 minutes advance notice to move Canadian Armed Forces to an alert status called DEFCON 3. Our defence minister at that time, Douglas Harkness, quietly did so. But the Diefenbaker cabinet was torn and debate sizzled for a couple of days.

However, Soviet ships approached the American imposed quarantine zone later in that week. Prime Minister Diefenbaker authorized the alert on October 24, and it was announced in the House on October 25, 1962.

Many of us recall the international sigh of relief a few days later when the Soviet premier, Nikita Khrushchev, agreed to dismantle and remove those threatening ballistic missiles from Cuba. Many people feared that the world was teetering on the brink of nuclear war over the Cuban situation in 1962.

Government Orders

In 1985, the Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act, FEMA, became law in Canada. It was designed to defend Canadian interests against attempts by foreign governments or courts to apply unreasonable laws to Canada. FEMA currently gives the Attorney General the authority to prevent compliance in Canada with extraterritorial laws or court rulings which infringe on Canadian sovereignty. However, its penalties are lower than penalties threatened by new legislation in the United States for people doing business with Cuba.

Since FEMA was passed, and especially over some 35 years since Fidel Castro tossed out a right wing dictator to take over the Government of Cuba, many thousands of Cubans have escaped Mr. Castro's communist dictatorship and have gone to live in the U.S. state of Florida. Some estimates place the total of Cuban exiles living in Florida as high as one million people.

On February 24 of this year four people among those Cuban exiles, part of a group called Brothers to the Rescue, who were American citizens, were shot down by Cuban MiGs in international airspace and they died.

• (1330)

About 50,000 Cuban exiles, many with pictures of the dead taped to their chests, filed into the Orange Bowl Stadium a few days later for a memorial service. There they heard an emotional speech from the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, Madeleine Albright, who warned Cuba that the U.S. would not tolerate further attacks against Brothers to the Rescue.

Among other things, Albright promised: "America will protect its citizens in international waters and in international skies. We will tighten sanctions against the Government of Cuba and we will deploy every diplomatic means to bring democracy to the people of Cuba".

Despite the protest from Canada and Mexico, and from many others around the world, the Helms-Burton bill was signed into law by U.S. President Clinton on March 12.

In protest, members of the European Parliament adopted a resolution that urged the European Commission "to investigate the effects of the extraterritorial provisions of the bill on European businesses".

The resolution also urged the EC to strongly consider challenging the bill as "a serious infringement of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, World Trade Organization rules and international law".

Not long ago, officials of some Canadian companies which invested in Cuba received an official notice from the U.S. government that they and their families would not be welcome in the United States.

In the months since the Helms-Burton law was passed, debate has raged in Canadian newspapers regarding what Canada's position should be concerning Cuba and the Castro Communist dictatorship.

Many people point to the fact that Canada imposed sanctions on South Africa and that our current foreign affairs minister, the member for Winnipeg South Centre, proposed that economic sanctions should be imposed against the Government of Nigeria.

Others have questioned why Canada has spent so much time, effort and money, including most recently sending in Canadian troops as peacekeepers in another Caribbean country, Haiti, to try to make and keep the peace upon the return of ousted President Jean Bertrand Aristide, and yet we are willing to do nothing to help defeat Fidel Castro.

Is American policy regarding Cuba so different from Canadian policy about Haiti? I believe the answer must be no. Nevertheless, I also believe it is extremely important that this House pass Bill C-54 to bring FEMA up to date after the passage of the Helms-Burton bill in the United States.

My reason is one of pure Canadian patriotism, I believe, although others would no doubt call it plain being ornery.

The fact is, as a proud, certified western Canadian or, as the Liberals like to call us, redneck, I do not appreciate another country's telling Canada how to run our foreign policies. I may not agree with Canadian foreign policy but that is for us, this House and the other place representing the Canadian people to decide. Canadian foreign policy toward Cuba or any other nation must not be dictated by another country and enforced by severe penalties by the legislators of another country. Therefore I urge my hon. colleagues to join me in voting for Bill C-54.

[*Translation*]

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 unanimously agreed to. Therefore, the bill is referred to the foreign affairs and international trade committee.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee.)

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

*Private Members' Business***PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

• (1335)

[English]

RESTORATION OF DEATH PENALTY ACT

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.) moved that Bill C-261, an act to require a referendum on the restoration of the death penalty and to amend the Referendum Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley.

Let us start on this bill by being very clear about Bill C-261 is about and what it is not about. It does not propose directly to reinstate capital punishment in Canada, nor does it propose that the death penalty be the only penalty for first degree murder. Let us be really clear about that.

It does propose that the Canadian public be asked for its opinion on the subject of capital punishment. Let us ask the public what it thinks. Canada is our country. It belongs to the people, not to a political elite who know better than ordinary people.

This bill simply says “refer this matter to the electorate”, ask the public what it wants. I hope that is not asking too much of our parliamentary system. Ask the public what it feels.

Bill C-261 says put the question to the public in a referendum. So that it is not too costly it proposes that this referendum question be put to the public at the time of the next federal election. In this way at the same time that a voter casts his ballot for a member of Parliament the voter can also express an opinion on the capital punishment question. What could be easier and what could be less costly? Referendums themselves can be costly but this way not so.

Let us look at the question that would be asked in such a referendum. It would ask simply: “Do you agree that if a person is found guilty of first degree murder the judge or jury should have the option of sentencing the person to life imprisonment or the death penalty?” It is important to understand that an option is available.

Obviously if there were any doubt whatsoever about guilt, even after a finding of guilty, the sentencing authority would err on the side of caution. On the other hand, in extreme cases and where there is no question whatsoever of guilt, for example in the Clifford Olson and Bernardo cases, the sentencing authority would have the death penalty option available.

Who should decide this question, our leaders, our elites or the people? The resistance out there to even asking the question tells me two things. First, our leaders and our elites in this country do not trust the judgment of ordinary people. Second, the elites think they know best. More than that, they are absolutely convinced they know best.

During the 1993 election I had many constituents in my riding of Nanaimo—Cowichan discuss this subject with me on their doorsteps. They were concerned that if elected I might go to Ottawa and vote my opinion on this, as other subjects, rather than representing them and their opinions. These constituents cited the case of Tommy Douglas, a distinguished parliamentarian and one of my predecessors as the member of Parliament for my riding.

• (1340)

Apparently a survey in Nanaimo—Cowichan and the islands found that over 80 per cent of the electorate favoured keeping the death penalty. Tommy Douglas, a respected man though he was, returned to Ottawa and voted for the bill which eliminated the death penalty because it went against his conscience. Understandable, perhaps, but it raises the question of an MP's first obligation.

That is why the Reform Party has a policy on matters of morality or personal conscience. Our policy is that when such questions of morality arise our MPs should do three things. First, whenever asked, advise constituents of his or her personal beliefs. Second, ascertain the will of the majority of the constituents on that issue. Third, vote to represent that majority.

It is because of this policy that I have taken concrete measures to find out what the majority of my constituents wanted in this case. Using a tele-vote system in this last year which allowed all constituents to register their opinion in a secret ballot, I found that the majority of my constituents, and I suspect this is reflected by the majority across Canada, favoured the return of capital punishment. That expression of opinion directly to me from my constituents is what has led to the preparation of today's private member's Bill C-261. That, ladies and gentlemen, is democracy in action. It takes us a step closer to some direct democracy.

There are some in the House and some in the country and some in my constituency who do not like the concept of direct democracy. Perhaps some of these do not like democracy, period. But I think the majority of people do.

Let us look at the educational benefits of having a question such as this decided in a referendum advertised well in advance. Unlike the United States we do not know the date of our election. That is another Reform matter that we should correct. Nevertheless, we do know there will be an election in Canada within the next two years. Passage of my bill in the House would mean that the public would

Private Members' Business

have an indeterminate, because of our system, but nevertheless substantial period of time in which to debate the merits and drawbacks of capital punishment.

I address this comment to the so-called elites. Passage of my bill would allow them ample time to put forth their point of view. There is no reason for them to fear the public. Get out and tell it your thoughts then listen to what it has to say. They might learn something and the public might learn something and I think all would profit. The more facts or even the more opinions we have, the better the quality of our decisions is likely to be. Education is a beneficial byproduct of all referenda and specifically a benefit of this bill.

● (1345)

The public should be heard. Let us hear the views of those totally opposed to capital punishment and the views of those who would use it too freely. The public is not stupid; it is possessed of much common sense. The public can hear extreme arguments and find a middle road position with which it is comfortable.

It is important that this matter get to a vote. I would like at this point to ask for the unanimous consent of the House to have this bill made votable.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to have this made a votable item?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: Obviously there is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Ringma: Mr. Speaker, the nays from the Liberal side of the House indicate the problem we have with democracy in Canada in 1996. It is a problem we have had for a number of years. The Liberals are afraid of allowing the public to express its opinion. They are afraid of members of Parliament expressing their own opinions rather than the opinion handed down by their elite, by their whip, by those who know best within the Liberal Party who say: "That is not party line. Do not vote that way". They are afraid of open votes.

I will conclude on that note. Let us leave it open. We still have a few more minutes for debate. I hope that those on the other side of the House are listening and that they open their minds a bit. It is an important bill for Canada and for Canadians. We know pretty much where the majority opinion is on this issue.

The Deputy Speaker: Colleagues, the hon. member for Nanaimo—Cowichan indicated at the outset of his remarks that he wished to share his time with the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley. I do not believe there is a provision in our rules for the proposer of a private member's bill to do that. Therefore, it will have to be done by unanimous consent.

Is there unanimous consent that the hon. member for Nanaimo—Cowichan be permitted to share his time with the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to this bill.

Prior to the election in 1993 when we were going through the exercise of getting to know everyone, there was one thing I made sure I did. There was a certain number of issues which could be considered moral issues or personal issues. I felt the obligation as a candidate to ensure there was no doubt where I stood on things.

One of the issues was the issue of capital punishment. I made it very clear to my constituents that I, as a candidate for the Reform Party, personally favoured the return of capital punishment. I told everyone who asked. I even made an effort to publicize it so there would be no confusion as to where I stood. I was elected. I was not elected on that issue, but on the excellent platform which was put forward by the Reform Party.

At the end of the day, it is not what the member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley believes in which should be the main determining factor of how I vote in Parliament or how I debate, it should be that of the people who elected me.

I have done poll after poll in my riding on various things. One of the polls asked the question: Would you favour a binding national referendum on the issue of capital punishment? In my riding 71 per cent said yes, 17 per cent said no and the balance was unsure. Seventy-one per cent said yes. It gave me a good indication that my constituents for the most part, a huge majority, agreed with my personal opinion on the subject.

● (1350)

It is interesting to note that just recently I gave an interview in my riding. We were talking about Clifford Olson and his being able to apply for early parole, something the Liberals have allowed to happen. Let that be clear to Canadians watching today. Clifford Olson, this mass murderer is eligible to have a hearing on early parole. He is able to do this because of the Liberal government and the Liberal governments that preceded this government, whose philosophies are supported by this government and the Minister of Justice, and the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce who was the Minister of Justice back in the government that allowed Olson to have this opportunity.

Let us never forget where this Liberal government and its predecessors stand on the issue of crime and punishment. No matter what the Minister of Justice is putting through in this House with bill after bill that tinkers with the justice system, the Canadian people will not be fooled as to the philosophy of this Liberal government.

Private Members' Business

Getting back to what I wanted to say, we were talking about Clifford Olson and the fact that he can apply for a hearing. I made the comment that if I had my way, Clifford Olson should possibly get a suspended sentence, like at the end of a rope. My assistant in my riding office said: "You can't say that". I said: "Why not? The vast majority in my riding thinks the same way I do". He asked how I knew that and I told him we would do a little test.

A person that I knew came in and I said: "I think you are capable of doing a straw poll for me this afternoon, would you do it? Just go out and ask people, and do it demographically—young people, middle aged people, older people, men, women—this question: If you had the opportunity to pull the lever on Clifford Olson would you do it? Ask it in as unbiased, non-influencing manner as you can". He asked 37 people just strolling up the street. Of those 37, 31 said yes without hesitation; four said they agreed he should be put to death but they did not think they could do it; and two said they were not too sure about that. That is consistent with the thinking not only in my riding but in ridings all across the country.

This Liberal government and the Liberal and Tory governments before it, despite the widespread call from Canadians to give us a vote on this subject, have refused to allow a referendum on it. How can a political party that forms a government, whether it be Liberals or Tories, sit in this House, meet in caucus knowing that Canadians want an opportunity to vote on this issue and arbitrarily and unilaterally make the decision not to allow the vote? That is not democracy. That is not what this House is all about.

I understood, and maybe the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice when he speaks will correct me on this, but I always thought that we came here to represent the people of Canada. I ask him if he will address the question: Do we come here as members of Parliament to represent the people of Canada? I hope he will answer that question. If that is true, if that is why we are here, then why do we not have a national binding referendum on the issue of capital punishment?

• (1355)

The Canadian people over the years have responded an average of 68 per cent. Polls consistently taken since the 1960s show that Canadians favour the death penalty. Sixty-eight per cent of the population on average since the 1960s have clearly indicated that they favour the return to capital punishment.

A much higher percentage of the Canadian people want at least the opportunity to vote on it. The Liberals will not give them that opportunity; they will speak against this. The Tories would not give them that opportunity. The Liberal government before them would not give them that opportunity.

We get back to the question of why they came here. Did they come here to support some Liberal philosophy that they have created on how to deal with first degree murderers who commit horrendous crimes? Are they here to support Liberal philosophy on

people who kill people, on premeditated, savage murderers? Is it Liberal philosophy that should determine how they should be punished? I do not think so. This government, as previous governments did, has an opportunity to support this bill and see what the Canadian people want to do.

In closing, I ask for unanimous consent that this bill be sent to the justice committee.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent that the proposed bill be sent to the justice committee?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent. The member's time has expired.

Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take part in the debate on Bill C-261 which is sponsored by the hon. member for Nanaimo—Cowichan.

As Canadians, we regard as abhorrent and feel the pain and suffering that the victims' families are forced to endure. While we are rightly revolted by murder, the case has not been made effectively to demonstrate that the public interest would be served by restoring capital punishment for murder.

The public policy reality is clear. Since the abolition of the death penalty for murder, the murder rate has gone down and not up. In 1975 before capital punishment for murder was abolished, the homicide rate was at a certain level. In the years following from 1975 until 1994, the homicide rate never rose above that base rate in 1975. In 1994 the homicide rate was two-thirds what it was in 1975.

The issue of capital punishment has been thoroughly explored at the national level. In many debates in this House after extensively debating the question of capital punishment between 1966 and 1976, the House of Commons on a free vote adopted a bill abolishing capital punishment for murder in 1976.

The most recent debate in this House took place in 1987 when the government of the day honoured an election commitment to debate the reinstatement of capital punishment. After debating the question at length in the House of Commons, it was decided on a free vote that capital punishment should not be restored.

The arguments for and against are really no different today than they were in 1987. Effective arguments can easily be mounted to oppose the death penalty. Such arguments have been made in this House over the years and I do not intend to repeat many of them here today.

Private Members' Business

Perhaps one of the most effective arguments however is the concern about the possibility of wrongful convictions. Anyone who would choose to deride this concern, to put it down, to put it to the side, need only be reminded of two relatively recent cases of significance, namely the wrongful convictions for murder of Donald Marshall, Jr. and Guy Paul Morin.

• (1400)

Our justice system is designed by human beings, operated by human beings and human beings, as we know, are prone to mistakes and mistakes happen. Innocent people could be convicted and sentenced to death.

We have these brave Reformers suggesting that we have the death penalty. Is one of them ready to be the first mistake? Are they ready to have one of their children or their spouse be the first mistake? I know I am not ready for that and if I am not ready for it I am not about to impose it on others. When you make a mistake, oops just does not cut it. I am sorry is not good enough.

The hon. member for Nanaimo—Cowichan indicated that if you have any doubt about whether somebody committed the murder then do not execute them. This just shows a profound ignorance of the criminal law because if you have doubt that the person committed the murder you would not convict him in the first place.

Mr. Ringma: Do you have any doubts about Bernardo?

Mr. Kirkby: This is typical of the Reform Party. Mistakes happen when you are dealing with criminal law and I do not believe that the Reform Party is taking that issue very seriously.

Reinstating capital punishment in the Criminal Code is offered as a panacea by the Reform Party but it is hardly that. To focus on capital punishment as an optional sentence for first degree murder and to hold a national referendum on this issue really avoids grappling with the larger fundamental issue of how to promote the protection of society.

I want to turn my attention to the referendum issue. The bill proposed that a referendum on the restoration of the death penalty for first degree murder be held concurrently with the general election that next follows the coming into force of these proposals.

Federal elections are extremely important opportunities for Canadians to choose and elect their representatives and their Prime Minister. Holding a referendum concurrently with the general election could detract from the importance of the federal election. It is therefore not a practice in Canada. As a matter of fact, there is no procedure in place in the Canadian electoral system for holding a referendum concurrently with a federal election.

The government was elected on a platform which did not include the introduction of referenda concurrently with general elections,

nor did it include a further consideration of the issue of capital punishment. While referenda are an important part of Reform policy, our platform focused on augmenting the role of MPs as decision makers on questions of public policy.

The question of participatory democracy, including referenda, was addressed by a Commons committee not long ago. The Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs was mandated by the House of Commons to study various procedural matters, including the examination of measures to achieve more direct participation by citizens including binding referenda.

However, according to Mr. Patrick Boyer, former MP and author of several books on referenda who appeared before the committee, the referendum process should not be considered for every issue that comes before Parliament. Although he argued that referenda should be expanded to allow referenda on non-constitutional issues, Mr. Boyer was of the view that some transcending national issue which is greater than Parliament's current mandate and has never been discussed in previous elections should be subject to referendum.

What is the real reason for the referendum? Reformers say that the polls tell them that Canadians want the death penalty. Therefore, why would they ask for a referendum if they are so convinced that Canadians want the death penalty? I will tell you what the reason is. They are not prepared to be accountable for the decisions taken, to stand up on their own and say I am in favour of the death penalty. The reason they are not prepared to do that is because when a mistake happens they want to sit back and blame the Canadian public, play Pontius Pilate, wash their hands and say you asked for Barabbas. They want to sit here and say: "You voted for it, Canadian public. The mistake, the innocent person who has just had his life shortened is not our responsibility". We on this side of the House are prepared to take our responsibilities seriously. I would suggest that they not hide behind this sham of a referendum they are putting forward. If they want to change in the Criminal Code to include the death penalty, let them have the guts to stand up here and do it in this House.

• (1405)

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I have a short point of order. I believe that the parliamentary secretary inadvertently used the unparliamentary term "guts" in referring to the Reformers and I would like him to retract that.

The Deputy Speaker: I do not believe the word "guts" is an unparliamentary word. I have not checked recently but I am quite certain that word is not on the list. If the hon. member for Elk Island, who is a fine scholar, could find the word "guts" as having been found unparliamentary before, I will be very pleased if he would. In the meantime we will carry on with the debate.

Private Members' Business

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, I do agree with the government on this point. The death penalty is indeed an issue, a decision one must ponder very seriously.

There are, however, many other very important issues. If we were to apply the principle developed by the Reform Party, should the government consult the public via a referendum on every important issue? For instance, abortion is a very important issue. Does the Reform Party favour a referendum on abortion? Does the Reform Party also want a referendum on how to reduce the deficit, on peacekeeping missions we are taking part in?

Speaking of democracy, I believe that the voice of democracy was heard in 1993, and will be heard again during the next federal election. During an election campaign, we are asked what we think of a given topic. I remember very well that constituents would question me on the death penalty, in 1993, asking me: "Are you for or against the death penalty, Mr. Bellehumeur?" My answer was: "No, I am not in favour of the death penalty". And I would then explain why I oppose this concept. And yet, constituents in my riding of Berthier—Montcalm voted for me. Therefore, today, I am in a position to rise and speak on behalf of my constituents on issues such as the death penalty.

We do not have to hold a referendum on every issue on which we believe that the public may have a different view or, as the Liberal member mentioned, simply to wash our hands of it. We have been given the mandate, each one of us in our respective riding, to represent our constituents and express the opinion which we believe to be the majority's.

The Reform's approach in several areas, including capital punishment, is, I believe, very simplistic. Once again, this past week, we saw Reform members choose the easiest way out. They do not like Bloc members, they find them too vocal, too intrusive, so they would like to take away their official opposition status.

This past week, we heard them talk about dangerous offenders. They want to leave them in prison as long as possible, to let them rot in there. No matter what the minister suggests to strengthen the law, it is never enough for Reform members, they always demand more.

Their attitude is the same in the case of young offenders. They do not know what to do with them, so they say: Let us change the Young Offenders Act so that the age limit will be nine or ten. That is the easy way out. The same goes for first degree murders. What would be the easiest thing to do? Restore the death penalty to get rid of first degree murderers as quickly as possible.

The purpose of Bill C-261 before us is not to determine whether we are for or against the death penalty.

● (1410)

All the Reform speeches I have heard show clearly that members of that party are for capital punishment. It is said very clearly, but they will not come right out and say so.

If we consider the whole issue of the death penalty closely, we have to admit that, in 1975-1976, when Parliament studied the question, it made the right decision and chose to abolish capital punishment as many other countries have done throughout the years. Several countries have abolished the death penalty and have come to some conclusions.

Earlier, the parliamentary secretary read out some statistics, and yes, the figures are very positive. I have here a very comprehensive study, conducted between 1985 and 1996, which shows that, in Canada, after the death penalty was abolished, homicide, murder, manslaughter and infanticide decreased by 20 per cent. Therefore, those who think that the restoration of the death penalty will reduce the number of murders and other similar horrible crimes are wrong. That is for Canada.

If we look at statistics for France, in the eighties, that country also abolished capital punishment and the figures there are similar. It is not because the death penalty can be imposed that crimes will automatically decrease and vice versa.

What I often hear from Reform members and all those who advocate a return to capital punishment is the famous theory of deterrence, but it does not hold with the numbers we have before us.

We also talked about the risks of convicting innocent people and involuntarily putting them in the electric chair or some other method of ending it all. This is one aspect must also consider. As regards the inequality of justice, we need only look at what is happening in the United States to realize that, when it comes to the electric chair, justice is not necessarily the same for the rich and the poor.

The rich can afford lawyers and a multitude of legal experts to avoid the electric chair, while the most powerless before the system are even more powerless and, quite often, cannot present a fair defence, a defence that a rich person could have presented.

One point that surprised me is the uncertainty a return to capital punishment would bring out in the justice system, and perhaps Reform members do not know that. Again, when capital punishment was abolished in 1960 and 1976, it was realized that its abolition had a direct effect on the conviction rate.

Again according to statistics from Statistics Canada and experts, I will read to you what one of them, a certain Mr. Mackenzie, has to say. He says that in Canada, between 1960 and 1974, when capital

Private Members' Business

punishment was in force, the conviction rate for a first degree murder was below 10 per cent and, after capital punishment was abolished, it increased to 20 per cent between 1976 and 1982, the study period.

Why? Because the jury that hears the case knows that, if it decides that Mr. X is guilty or that Mr. X has committed a murder, he faces hanging, the electric chair or whatever. The members of the jury want proof beyond a reasonable doubt and even more, so that they often have a slight doubt about the individual before them who could be sentenced to death.

• (1415)

If the accused faced only a minimum sentence of 25 years, they would say that he was guilty, but with capital punishment hanging over him, they have doubts. They then decide that a unanimous verdict is impossible and the accused is set free.

The numbers are there. Without capital punishment the conviction rate is 20 per cent, compared to 10 per cent with capital punishment. These figures must be considered. Obviously one does not launch a philosophical debate across Canada before a federal election without looking at these figures beforehand, without realizing—unless they are completely irresponsible, which I do not think is the case—that they did not consider these things before launching this debate, before asking the government to hold a referendum on this issue in the next federal election.

If not, I urge them to do so. At some point we get into a vicious circle. The more we complain about a bad situation, the worse it gets. The more we talk about the murder rate, the higher it seems. We are creating a kind of public panic for no good reason. Yes, murders and other horrible crimes are being committed, but I think that the people of Quebec and Canada do not lean to the right as much as the Reform Party does.

Reform members often claim to represent Mr. or Mrs. So-and-So who has gone through the terrible ordeal of losing his or her child and demands that the death penalty be reinstated.

In closing, I would like to talk about Isabelle Bolduc, who was in the news over the summer. She was murdered by a killer on parole. But her father, Mr. Bolduc, clearly came out against capital punishment. He is working to improve rehabilitation and social reintegration for inmates.

The problem may not be with capital punishment itself. The problem may be with the enforcement of the current regulations. That is what I want to say to the Reform Party today. I do not think most of the people listening to us in western Canada share the views of Reform members. I am convinced that only a minority think the way Reformers do on this issue.

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Elk Island has brought a citation from Beauchesne's to my attention that the expression "has not got the guts" was found in May, 1959 not to be parliamentary. That is almost 30 years ago. He would have an excellent point but for the fact that he was not in his seat when he made the point.

The good point would appear to be cancelled out by the fact that he was not in his seat. We will all, no doubt, take note of the fact that there is a citation, as only a teacher can remember, in Beauchesne's.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, from my understanding of the ruling, I cannot use the word "guts" in my speech. Is that true? Because it would fit nicely in my speech as I address some of the points we have heard from the other side.

I rise today in support of my colleague's bill, the member for Nanaimo—Cowichan, private member's Bill C-261. Bill C-261 is about giving Canadians an opportunity to voice their opinion on one of the most contentious issues in Canadian history, the use of the death penalty for first degree murder.

It is strange for me to hear my colleague from the Bloc who just addressed the House say he is in favour of the democratic process in their referendums, where the direction and the guidance and the operation of the country is done by the will of a majority when it comes to electing him to his seat in the House. But after he is elected to his seat in the House he is saying to 69 per cent of the people who are opting for a referendum or opting for a second look at the death penalty: "You do not know what is in your own best interests, so you are going to have to trust me". That is what the member from the Liberal side has been saying.

• (1420)

They are saying to the people of Canada: "You know what is in your best interest when you elect me to the House, but after that, on issues like capital punishment or other issues that impact on the individual from a moral point of view, you have to leave those decisions to me because I know what is best for you. You do not know what is best for you, your family, your community or your nation. That has to be left to the elites like us". That is what this member is saying and that is what the Bloc member has been saying.

I do not want to focus my comments on the point of capital punishment. I do not want to take up any more time of the House debating the pros and cons of capital punishment. I chose today to focus on the issue of democracy because this is the essence of my colleague's private member's Bill C-261.

Bill C-261 is an act to require a referendum on the restoration of the death penalty and to amend the Referendum Act. I support the use of national referendums to determine the will of the majority on issues of a moral or contentious nature. If the Liberal government believed in democracy, if it truly believed the majority rules in this country, it would support the use of national referendums and support this private member's bill.

Liberal members would put aside their Liberal philosophies and personal biases regarding the use of the death penalty and they would allow Canadians through this democratic means to decide the fate of first degree murderers.

The definition of democracy contained in the *Gage Canadian Dictionary* is not unlike those found in most other dictionaries:

1) a government that is periodically elected and thus controlled by the people who live under it. Under a democracy, the people rule either by direct vote at public meetings or indirectly through the election of certain representatives to govern them;

2) the ideals and principles of such a government, such as equality of rights and opportunities and the rule of the majority;

A democracy is formed by the will of the majority, not by minorities, special interest groups or lobby groups. The majority elects a government to establish laws and programs that protect the lives and property, the liberties and the freedoms of all its citizens.

The greatest guarantee to the individual of these fundamental rights and freedoms is found in the expressed will of a well educated and informed majority.

Historically, these characteristics have formed the strongest stabilizing force within society. A group of nations, supported by their majorities, freed the world of the Nazi regime which denied millions their liberties, their freedoms and their very rights to live and own property.

It was the will of a majority of Americans who demanded Afro-Americans have the freedom to vote over the objection of a minority. It was a host of nations, supported again by their majorities, that turned back the dictator Saddam Hussein.

Although history may provide exceptions, the greatest violations of fundamental human rights have occurred at the hands of minority groups and elite groups like those represented by the voice over here. It has been nations governed by majority rule that have established and maintained to the greatest degree the fundamental rights of the individual.

The leader of the federal Tories ignored the determination of his youth delegates on the question of capital punishment at their recent convention. The Reform Party believes this issue must be decided by the majority of Canadians in a free and open vote after all aspects have been fully debated.

Private Members' Business

Our method is democratic. The Tory leader's method is not. Neither is the method of the Liberal Party so far heard expressed today in this debate.

The top down, autocratic leadership displayed by the Tory leader and by this government is what gave rise to the Reform Party of Canada in the first place and is the type of leadership that leads to a violation of fundamental human rights.

The previous Tory-Liberal governments' undemocratic form of leadership has plunged our country into a \$600 billion debt hole. This debt has been created, at least in part, by the establishment of grants and programs aimed at special interest groups without the consent of the majority.

The greatest threat to our social and economic stability of our families, individuals and our nation is the unlimited power of government to tax away our property and our wealth without our consent.

● (1425)

The issue of Quebec sovereignty dominates in the provincial legislature to their economic detriment. The Bloc keep pressing the issue in the House despite the fact that the majority was heard, despite the fact that referendums on Quebec separation produced a no vote not once, but twice.

The reinstatement of capital punishment cannot be determined by the Liberal government alone. We know only too well whose side the Liberals are on in this contentious debate on capital punishment. We know whose side they are on in the debate on Bill C-45.

Unlike the Reform Party, the Liberal government and the leader of the Tory party are not on the side of the murder victims and their families. The Liberal government is on the side of the killers. This was evident in its opposition to the private member's bill repealing section 745 and in its support of Bill C-45 which continues to grant first degree murderers an avenue for early release.

This was never more obvious than it was yesterday when the parliamentary secretary accused us of exploiting the families of murder victims, which, as I said in the House yesterday, was beneath contempt. The hon. member for Prince Albert—Churchill River accused us of exploiting the families of murder victims for political purposes. He said: "The Reform are always interested in talking about the effects on the victims". Yes, we are always interested in talking about the devastating effects of murder on the families of murder victims. We have a duty and a responsibility in talking about the horrifying trauma of victims' families knowing their son's or daughter's killer may be released early as a result of section 745.

I will have the hon. member and his colleagues know that I have been contacted by families of murder victims. They have thanked

Private Members' Business

me and all colleagues in the House for telling their painful stories to Canadians and what section 745 means to them; for telling Canadians how section 745, the Liberal made glimmer of hope for the most sadistic people in our society, has made them relive their nightmares.

If the hon. member for Prince Albert—Churchill River and his Liberal colleagues do not want to talk about the victims, if they want to remain in their ivory towers, oblivious to the real pain and suffering which is occurring in the country, then so be it. We will remain in touch with the people, the people's feelings and their concerns.

In closing I say this: The reinstatement of capital punishment ought not to be determined by the House, a handful of politicians; it should only be determined by a majority of Canadians. This is the nature of democracy, a majority rule, which most citizens have no difficulty whatever in understanding.

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, first let me say that it gives me great pleasure to stand in support of private member's Bill C-261.

I listened to the parliamentary secretary say that we did not have enough intestinal fortitude to stand to say that we are in favour of capital punishment. I am in favour of capital punishment for certain crimes and I am proud to say that. What I am not proud of is a government which refuses to give the Canadian people a say on this. I am not proud of that. That is lack of intestinal fortitude on that side of the House, not on this side of the House.

When the parliamentary secretary stands up and says such things, I think of the hypocritical people who are involved. The hypocrisy has never been so great. Bill C-261 is not about my personal opinion; it is not about their personal opinions. It is an opportunity to give the Canadian people a say which will be binding on the government. It is a say for the Canadian people.

If I had my way I would say capital punishment right now. But not this good government. Not this caring, sharing government that only worries about self-preservation and its pension plan. No, not this government. The Canadian people can stay out there and be told nothing but what the government wants them to hear. It will twist the facts. It will twist the statistics. It will come up with numbers that mean absolutely nothing in the real world.

The worst of it is, there are many members on that side who think the very same as we on this side but they are being controlled from within. It is politics of the lowest degree in a country that is supposed to be democratically ruled. When we do not allow our populace to have a say in such matters, when we keep on shutting our eyes and letting our folks walk the streets in fear because we have a government that has no intestinal fortitude to give the people a say, it is a disgrace.

• (1430)

Members can sit there with smiles on their faces. Sooner or later the people of Canada will have their say. I hope it is sooner rather than later.

This is good legislation. It should have been deemed votable. Government members can sit there and smirk all they want and say: "No, not us. We won't give the people a say in this because we are here to rule. We are here to rule the people". That is their agenda. They have lost the common sense of what government is supposed to be about. I am sorry the government has lost that. Like the Conservatives before them and the Liberals before the Conservatives, they think they are here to rule with an iron fist and say: "You will do what we wish and not what you wish we would do to govern properly". I find that outrageous.

The Liberals stand here time after time and say: "We listen to the people". Hogwash. If they truly represented the people they would at least allow them a voice on this issue. It is not up to members of Parliament to force their morality on the people. It is up to the people to force their morality on us. Sooner or later Liberal members might learn that.

You are just a hired peon in this place. You are hired by the taxpayers. You are hired to represent their wishes and their demands. You can say you are elected. They pay your wages, do not ever forget that—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member, like all hon. members, will please address his remarks to the Chair, not to you on the opposite side or on his own side.

Mr. Stinson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, you are right.

Members in this Chamber are hired. They are no better than anybody else who walks the street out there. The taxpayers pay our wages to represent them, not our wishes. That is where this government and governments before have gone wrong. It is time the taxpayers of this country demanded that politicians listen to what their concerns are. We are sick and tired of it.

Mr. Ramsay: We have a \$600 billion debt.

Mr. Stinson: That is right. We have a \$600 billion debt. We look after the criminals far better than we do the victims. It is a real shame. I know in other countries what would happen to politicians who think that they are better than the people.

Private members' business is something where a lot of members go to a lot of work trying to bring a bill before this House which the government is not going to address. Our biggest mistake in private members' business is not allowing all bills drawn to be deemed votable. Let us get rid of the politics in private members' business.

Private Members' Business

Bill C-261 is living proof that when we came here one of our commitments was that we would give referendums to the people and we would abide by the people's decisions. That was a Reform commitment. Members of the government ask: "How can you do that?" They believe they are far smarter than the people and they are so wrong.

When we came here after we were elected we all had these ideals. Somehow it has been beaten out of them on the other side and beaten out badly. They should remember. They still have to look at themselves in the mirror when they shave in the morning. I sometimes wonder how they can do it when they allow the things to go on in this country that they have.

The right to give a referendum to the Canadian people always seems to be on the agenda. This is not the first time it has come

before this House, nor will it be the last, until finally they are given their wish and they are allowed to vote on this. I hope this government at least gives them that right in the coming federal election. Then they would be surprised at the people's voice.

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

It being approximately 2.33 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday at 11 a.m.

(The House adjourned at 2.35 p.m.)

APPENDIX

**ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS WITH THEIR
CONSTITUENCIES, PROVINCE OF CONSTITUENCY
AND POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS;
COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE,
THE MINISTRY AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES**

(Please note that the Appendix is now included in the Friday Hansard)

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. PIERRETTE RINGUETTE–MALTAIS

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. GILBERT PARENT (CHAIRMAN)

MR. DON BOUDRIA

MRS. MADELEINE DALPHOND–GUIRAL

MR. GILLES DUCEPPE

HON. ALFONSO GAGLIANO, P.C.

HON. HERB GRAY, P.C.

MR. LEN HOPKINS

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

MR. CHUCK STRAHL

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session – Thirty-fifth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay East	British Columbia	Ref.
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary North	Alberta	Ref.
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Ontario	Lib.
Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	Lib.
Allmand, Hon. Warren	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce	Quebec	Lib.
Althouse, Vic	Mackenzie	Saskatchewan	NDP
Anawak, Jack Iyerak	Nunatsiak	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Transport	Victoria	British Columbia	Lib.
Arseneault, Guy H., Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Restigouche — Chaleur	New Brunswick	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau — La Lièvre	Quebec	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Don Valley North	Ontario	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	Quebec	BQ
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon — Clark's Crossing	Saskatchewan	NDP
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Baker, George S.	Gander — Grand Falls	Newfoundland	Lib.
Bakopanos, Eleni	Saint-Denis	Quebec	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Ontario	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton	Ontario	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Cochrane — Superior	Ontario	Lib.
Bélangier, Mauril	Ottawa — Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bélisle, Richard	La Prairie	Quebec	BQ
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	Quebec	BQ
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton — Gloucester	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon E.	Vegreville	Alberta	Ref.
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Beauce	Quebec	Ind.
Bernier, Maurice	Mégantic — Compton — Stanstead	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Gaspé	Quebec	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Quebec	Lib.
Bethel, Judy	Edmonton East	Alberta	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	York North	Ontario	Lib.
Bhaduria, Jag	Markham — Whitchurch — Stouffville	Ontario	Ind. Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg Transcona	Manitoba	NDP
Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Training and Youth)	Western Arctic	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Bodnar, Morris, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification	Saskatoon — Dundurn	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Ontario	Lib.
Boudria, Don	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Ontario	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Alberta	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Bridgman, Margaret	Surrey North	British Columbia	Ref.
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	Quebec	BQ
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville — Milton	Ontario	Lib.
Brown, Jan	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	Ind.
Brushett, Dianne	Cumberland — Colchester	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Bryden, John	Hamilton — Wentworth	Ontario	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Newfoundland	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Wellington — Grey — Dufferin — Simcoe	Ontario	Lib.
Campbell, Barry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane	Quebec	BQ
Caron, André	Jonquière	Quebec	BQ
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West	Ontario	Lib.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec)	Outremont	Quebec	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Richmond	British Columbia	Lib.
Charest, Hon. Jean J.	Sherbrooke	Quebec	PC
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Alberta	Ref.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Quebec	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac	Quebec	BQ
Clancy, Mary	Halifax	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor — St. Clair	Ontario	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Don Valley East	Ontario	Lib.
Collins, Bernie	Souris — Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Nipigon	Ontario	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Ontario	Lib.
Cowling, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Dauphin — Swan River	Manitoba	Lib.
Crawford, Rex	Kent	Ontario	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière-du- Loup	Quebec	BQ
Culbert, Harold	Carleton — Charlotte	New Brunswick	Lib.
Cullen, Roy	Etobicoke North	Ontario	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta	British Columbia	Ref.
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	Quebec	BQ
Daviault, Michel	Ahuntsic	Quebec	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	Quebec	BQ
de Jong, Simon	Regina — Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	Quebec	BQ
Deshaies, Bernard	Abitibi	Quebec	BQ
DeVillers, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Simcoe North	Ontario	Lib.
Dhaliwal, Harbance Singh	Vancouver South	British Columbia	Lib.
Dingwall, Hon. David, Minister of Health	Cape Breton — East Richmond	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	Quebec	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Discepolo, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil	Quebec	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	Quebec	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	Quebec	BQ
Duhamel, Ronald J.	St. Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau	Quebec	BQ
Duncan, John	North Island — Powell River	British Columbia	Ref.
Dupuy, Hon. Michel	Laval West	Quebec	Lib.
Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister for International Trade	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
English, John	Kitchener	Ontario	Lib.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Alberta	Ref.
Fewchuk, Ron	Selkirk — Red River	Manitoba	Lib.
Fillion, Gilbert	Chicoutimi	Quebec	BQ
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Quebec	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Ontario	Lib.
Flis, Jesse	Parkdale — High Park	Ontario	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London East	Ontario	Lib.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Burnaby	British Columbia	Ref.
Frazer, Jack	Saanich — Gulf Islands	British Columbia	Ref.
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gaffney, Beryl	Nepean	Ontario	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Saint-Léonard	Quebec	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Quebec	BQ
Gagnon, Patrick	Bonaventure — Îles-de-la- Madeleine	Quebec	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Ontario	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel, Leader of the Opposition	Roberval	Quebec	BQ
Gerrard, Hon. Jon, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification)	Portage — Interlake	Manitoba	Lib.
Gilmour, Bill	Comox — Alberni	British Columbia	Ref.
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	Quebec	BQ
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Regina — Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay West — Revelstoke	British Columbia	Ref.
Graham, Bill	Rosedale	Ontario	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada	Windsor West	Ontario	Lib.
Grey, Deborah	Beaver River	Alberta	Ref.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Grubel, Herb	Capilano — Howe Sound	British Columbia	Ref.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Orléans	Quebec	BQ
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	Ref.
Hanrahan, Hugh	Edmonton — Strathcona	Alberta	Ref.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Harper, Ed	Simcoe Centre	Ontario	Ref.
Harper, Elijah	Churchill	Manitoba	Lib.
Harper, Stephen	Calgary West	Alberta	Ref.
Harris, Dick	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Similkameen — Merritt	British Columbia	Ref.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Winnipeg St. James	Manitoba	Lib.
Hayes, Sharon	Port Moody — Coquitlam	British Columbia	Ref.
Hermanson, Elwin	Kindersley — Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Hickey, Bonnie	St. John's East	Newfoundland	Lib.
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Alberta	Ref.
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	British Columbia	Ref.
Hoepfner, Jake E.	Lisgar — Marquette	Manitoba	Ref.
Hopkins, Leonard	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Ontario	Lib.
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	New Brunswick	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity — Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Iftody, David	Provencher	Manitoba	Lib.
Irwin, Hon. Ron, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Jacob, Jean-Marc	Charlesbourg	Quebec	BQ
Jennings, Daphne	Mission — Coquitlam	British Columbia	Ref.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	Ref.
Jordan, Jim	Leeds — Grenville	Ontario	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Kerpan, Allan	Moose Jaw — Lake Centre	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Stormont — Dundas	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, David, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Kirkby, Gordon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Prince Albert — Churchill River	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin — Norfolk	Ontario	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York — Simcoe	Ontario	Lib.
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	Quebec	BQ
Landry, Jean	Lotbinière	Quebec	BQ
Langlois, François	Bellechasse	Quebec	BQ
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Ontario	Lib.
Laurin, René	Joliette	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Laurent	Beauharnois — Salaberry	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Paul	Quebec	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Quebec	BQ
LeBlanc, Francis G., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Cape Breton Highlands — Canso	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Leblanc, Nic	Longueuil	Quebec	BQ
Lee, Derek	Scarborough — Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	Quebec	BQ
Leroux, Gaston	Richmond — Wolfe	Quebec	BQ
Leroux, Jean H.	Shefford	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lincoln, Clifford	Lachine — Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Loney, John	Edmonton North	Alberta	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	Quebec	BQ
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Secretary of State (Veterans)(Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
MacDonald, Ron, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	Lib.
MacLellan, Russell	Cape Breton — The Sydneys	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton	Ontario	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie	Ontario	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
Manning, Preston	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec-Est	Quebec	BQ
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister of the Environment	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	Ref.
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Quebec	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Hull — Aylmer	Quebec	Lib.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	British Columbia	Ref.
McClelland, Ian	Edmonton Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Ontario	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
McKinnon, Glen	Brandon — Souris	Manitoba	Lib.
McLaughlin, Hon. Audrey	Yukon	Yukon	NDP
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Natural Resources	Edmonton Northwest	Alberta	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Ontario	Ontario	Lib.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	Quebec	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Blainville — Deux- Montagnes	Quebec	BQ
Meredith, Val	Surrey — White Rock — South Langley	British Columbia	Ref.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Newfoundland	Lib.
Milliken, Peter	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	Ref.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Ontario	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches — Woodbine	Ontario	Lib.
Mitchell, Andy	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Ontario	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Swift Current — Maple Creek — Assiniboia	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Murphy, John	Annapolis Valley — Hants	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Ontario	Lib.
Nunez, Osvaldo	Bourassa	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Ontario	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence D.	Labrador	Newfoundland	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat	London — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Victoria — Haliburton	Ontario	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North	Manitoba	Lib.
Paradis, Denis	Brome — Missisquoi	Quebec	Lib.
Paré, Philippe	Louis-Hébert	Quebec	BQ
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Welland — St. Catharines — Thorold	Ontario	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga West	Ontario	Lib.
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Quebec	Lib.
Payne, Jean	St. John's West	Newfoundland	Lib.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Alberta	Ref.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Ontario	Lib.
Peters, Hon. Douglas, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
Peterson, Jim	Willowdale	Ontario	Lib.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Papineau — Saint-Michel	Quebec	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	Quebec	BQ
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Essex — Kent	Ontario	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Ontario	Lib.
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	Quebec	BQ
Pomerleau, Roger	Anjou — Rivière-des- Prairies	Quebec	BQ
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Hillsborough	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Alberta	Ref.
Reed, Julian	Halton — Peel	Ontario	Lib.
Regan, Geoff	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Perth — Wellington — Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Rideout, George S.	Moncton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops	British Columbia	NDP
Ringma, Bob	Nanaimo — Cowichan	British Columbia	Ref.
Ringuette-Maltais, Pierrette, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Madawaska — Victoria	New Brunswick	Lib.
Robichaud, Hon. Fernand, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food, Fisheries and Oceans)	Beauséjour	New Brunswick	Lib.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Saint-Henri — Westmount	Quebec	Lib.
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Kingsway	British Columbia	NDP
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	Quebec	BQ
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma	Ontario	Lib.
St-Laurent, Bernard	Manicouagan	Quebec	BQ
Sauvageau, Benoît	Terrebonne	Quebec	BQ
Schmidt, Werner	Okanagan Centre	British Columbia	Ref.
Scott, Andy	Fredericton — York — Sunbury	New Brunswick	Lib.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	British Columbia	Ref.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — French River	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Ontario	Lib.
Sheridan, Georgette	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Silye, Jim	Calgary Centre	Alberta	Ref.
Simmons, Hon. Roger	Burin — St. George's	Newfoundland	Lib.
Skoke, Roseanne	Central Nova	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Alberta	Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden	Saskatchewan	NDP
Speaker, Ray	Lethbridge	Alberta	Ref.
Speller, Bob	Haldimand — Norfolk	Ontario	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Northumberland	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of National Revenue	Brant	Ontario	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	British Columbia	Ref.
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley East	British Columbia	Ref.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Ontario	Lib.
Taylor, Len	The Battlefords — Meadow Lake	Saskatchewan	NDP
Telegdi, Andrew	Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Terrana, Anna	Vancouver East	British Columbia	Lib.
Thalheimer, Peter	Timmins — Chapleau	Ontario	Lib.
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	Ref.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Tremblay, Benoît	Rosemont	Quebec	BQ
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Témiscouata	Quebec	BQ
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Lincoln	Ontario	Lib.
Vanclief, Lyle	Prince Edward — Hastings	Ontario	Lib.
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Hubert	Quebec	BQ
Verran, Harry	South West Nova	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Eglinton — Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.
Walker, David	Winnipeg North Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough West	Ontario	Lib.
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	New Brunswick	PC
Wells, Derek	South Shore	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex — Windsor	Ontario	Lib.
White, Randy	Fraser Valley West	British Columbia	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	British Columbia	Ref.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Alberta	Ref.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Ontario	Lib.
Young, Hon. Douglas, Minister of Human Resources Development	Acadie — Bathurst	New Brunswick	Lib.
Zed, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Fundy — Royal	New Brunswick	Lib.

N.B.: Under Political Affiliation: Lib.—Liberal; BQ—Bloc Québécois; Ref.—Reform Party of Canada; NDP—New Democratic Party; PC—Progressive Conservative; Ind.—Independent.

Anyone wishing to communicate with House of Commons members is invited to communicate with either the Member's constituency or Parliament Hill offices.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session — Thirty—fifth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALBERTA (26)		
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary North	Ref.
Benoit, Leon E.	Vegreville	Ref.
Bethel, Judy	Edmonton East	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Ref.
Brown, Jan	Calgary Southeast	Ind.
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Ref.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Ref.
Grey, Deborah	Beaver River	Ref.
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Ref.
Hanrahan, Hugh	Edmonton—Strathcona	Ref.
Harper, Stephen	Calgary West	Ref.
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Ref.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Ref.
Kilgour, David, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southeast	Lib.
Loney, John	Edmonton North	Lib.
Manning, Preston	Calgary Southwest	Ref.
McClelland, Ian	Edmonton Southwest	Ref.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Natural Resources	Edmonton Northwest	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Ref.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Ref.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Ref.
Silye, Jim	Calgary Centre	Ref.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Ref.
Speaker, Ray	Lethbridge	Ref.
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Ref.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Ref.
BRITISH COLUMBIA (32)		
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay East	Ref.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Transport	Victoria	Lib.
Bridgman, Margaret	Surrey North	Ref.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia—Pacific)	Richmond	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta	Ref.
Dhaliwal, Harbance Singh	Vancouver South	Lib.
Duncan, John	North Island—Powell River	Ref.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster—Burnaby	Ref.
Frazer, Jack	Saanich—Gulf Islands	Ref.
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	Lib.
Gilmour, Bill	Comox—Alberni	Ref.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay West—Revelstoke	Ref.
Grubel, Herb	Capilano—Howe Sound	Ref.
Harris, Dick	Prince George—Bulkley Valley	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt	Ref.
Hayes, Sharon	Port Moody—Coquitlam	Ref.
Hill, Jay	Prince George—Peace River	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Jennings, Daphne	Mission—Coquitlam	Ref.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	Ref.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo—Chilcotin	Ref.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Meredith, Val	Surrey—White Rock—South Langley	Ref.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops	NDP
Ringma, Bob	Nanaimo—Cowichan	Ref.
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby—Kingsway	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Okanagan Centre	Ref.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	Ref.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan—Shuswap	Ref.
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley East	Ref.
Terrana, Anna	Vancouver East	Lib.
White, Randy	Fraser Valley West	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	Ref.

MANITOBA (14)

Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg Transcona	NDP
Cowling, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Dauphin—Swan River	Lib.
Duhamel, Ronald J.	St. Boniface	Lib.
Fewchuk, Ron	Selkirk—Red River	Lib.
Gerrard, Hon. Jon, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification)	Portage—Interlake	Lib.
Harper, Elijah	Churchill	Lib.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Winnipeg St. James	Lib.
Hoepfner, Jake E.	Lisgar—Marquette	Ref.
Iftody, David	Provencher	Lib.
McKinnon, Glen	Brandon—Souris	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North	Lib.
Walker, David	Winnipeg North Centre	Lib.

NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

Arseneault, Guy H., Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Restigouche—Chaleur	Lib.
Culbert, Harold	Carleton—Charlotte	Lib.
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	Lib.
Rideout, George S.	Moncton	Lib.
Ringuette—Maltais, Pierrette, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Madawaska—Victoria	Lib.
Robichaud, Hon. Fernand, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri—Food, Fisheries and Oceans)	Beauséjour	Lib.
Scott, Andy	Fredericton—York—Sunbury	Lib.
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	PC
Young, Hon. Douglas, Minister of Human Resources Development	Acadie—Bathurst	Lib.
Zed, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Fundy—Royal	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
NEWFOUNDLAND (7)		
Baker, George S.	Gander—Grand Falls	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Hickey, Bonnie	St. John's East	Lib.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonavista—Trinity—Conception	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence D.	Labrador	Lib.
Payne, Jean	St. John's West	Lib.
Simmons, Hon. Roger	Burin—St. George's	Lib.
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (2)		
Anawak, Jack Iyerak	Nunatsiak	Lib.
Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Training and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brushett, Dianne	Cumberland—Colchester	Lib.
Clancy, Mary	Halifax	Lib.
Dingwall, Hon. David, Minister of Health	Cape Breton—East Richmond	Lib.
LeBlanc, Francis G., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Cape Breton Highlands—Canso	Lib.
MacDonald, Ron, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Dartmouth	Lib.
MacLellan, Russell	Cape Breton—The Sydneys	Lib.
Murphy, John	Annapolis Valley—Hants	Lib.
Regan, Geoff	Halifax West	Lib.
Skoke, Roseanne	Central Nova	Lib.
Verran, Harry	South West Nova	Lib.
Wells, Derek	South Shore	Lib.
ONTARIO (99)		
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Don Valley North	Lib.
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Cochrane—Superior	Lib.
Bélanger, Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton—Gloucester	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	York North	Lib.
Bhaduria, Jag	Markham—Whitchurch—Stouffville	Ind. Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Boudria, Don	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville—Milton	Lib.
Bryden, John	Hamilton—Wentworth	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Wellington—Grey—Dufferin—Simcoe	Lib.
Campbell, Barry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	St. Paul's	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph—Wellington	Lib.
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor—St. Clair	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Don Valley East	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay—Nipigon	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Lib.
Crawford, Rex	Kent	Lib.
Cullen, Roy	Etobicoke North	Lib.
DeVillers, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Simcoe North	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister for International Trade	York Centre	Lib.
English, John	Kitchener	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Lib.
Flis, Jesse	Parkdale—High Park	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London East	Lib.
Gaffney, Beryl	Nepean	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia—Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Bill	Rosedale	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada	Windsor West	Lib.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Lib.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Harper, Ed	Simcoe Centre	Ref.
Hopkins, Leonard	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity—Spadina	Lib.
Irwin, Hon. Ron, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Sault Ste. Marie	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce—Grey	Lib.
Jordan, Jim	Leeds—Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Stormont—Dundas	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin—Norfolk	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York—Simcoe	Lib.
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister of the Environment	York West	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Sudbury	Lib.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Ontario	Lib.
Milliken, Peter	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview—Greenwood	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches—Woodbine	Lib.
Mitchell, Andy	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark—Carleton	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora—Rainy River	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South—Weston	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat	London—Middlesex	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
O'Reilly, John	Victoria—Haliburton	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Welland—St. Catharines—Thorold	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga West	Lib.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Lib.
Peters, Hon. Douglas, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Scarborough East	Lib.
Peterson, Jim	Willowdale	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Lib.
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Essex—Kent	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Lib.
Reed, Julian	Halton—Peel	Lib.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Perth—Wellington—Waterloo	Lib.
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming—French River	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Lib.
Speller, Bob	Haldimand—Norfolk	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron—Bruce	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Northumberland	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of National Revenue	Brant	Lib.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew	Waterloo	Lib.
Thalheimer, Peter	Timmins—Chapleau	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Lib.
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton—Middlesex	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Lincoln	Lib.
Vanclief, Lyle	Prince Edward—Hastings	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Eglinton—Lawrence	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough West	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex—Windsor	Lib.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Lib.
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)		
Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Secretary of State (Veterans)(Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Lib.
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Hillsborough	Lib.
QUEBEC (75)		
Allmand, Hon. Warren	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau—La Lièvre	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni	Saint-Denis	Lib.
Bélisle, Richard	La Prairie	BQ
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier—Montcalm	BQ
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Beauce	Ind.
Bernier, Maurice	Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Gaspé	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle	Lib.
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	BQ
Canuel, René	Matapédia—Matane	BQ
Caron, André	Jonquière	BQ
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development – Quebec)	Outremont	Lib.
Charest, Hon. Jean J.	Sherbrooke	PC
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac	BQ
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup	BQ
Dalphonf—Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
Daviault, Michel	Ahuntsic	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	BQ
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	BQ
Deshaies, Bernard	Abitibi	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Discepola, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil—Papineau	BQ
Dupuy, Hon. Michel	Laval West	Lib.
Fillion, Gilbert	Chicoutimi	BQ
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Saint-Léonard	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gagnon, Patrick	Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel, Leader of the Opposition	Roberval	BQ
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans	BQ
Jacob, Jean-Marc	Charlesbourg	BQ
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Landry, Jean	Lotbinière	BQ
Langlois, François	Bellechasse	BQ
Laurin, René	Joliette	BQ
Lavigne, Laurent	Beauharnois—Salaberry	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun—Saint-Paul	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Leblanc, Nic	Longueuil	BQ
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	BQ
Leroux, Gaston	Richmond—Wolfe	BQ
Leroux, Jean H.	Shefford	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lachine—Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec-Est	BQ
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle—Émard	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Hull—Aylmer	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga—Maisonnette	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Blainville—Deux-Montagnes	BQ
Nunez, Osvaldo	Bourassa	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Paradis, Denis	Brome—Missisquoi	Lib.
Paré, Philippe	Louis-Hébert	BQ
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Lib.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Papineau—Saint-Michel	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	BQ
Pomerleau, Roger	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies	BQ
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Saint-Henri—Westmount	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
St-Laurent, Bernard	Manicouagan	BQ
Sauvageau, Benoît	Terrebonne	BQ
Tremblay, Benoît	Rosemont	BQ
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski—Témiscouata	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Hubert	BQ
SASKATCHEWAN (14)		
Althouse, Vic	Mackenzie	NDP
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing	NDP
Bodnar, Morris, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification	Saskatoon—Dundurn	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	Ref.
Collins, Bernie	Souris—Moose Mountain	Lib.
de Jong, Simon	Regina—Qu'Appelle	NDP
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Regina—Wascana	Lib.
Hermanson, Elwin	Kindersley—Lloydminster	Ref.
Kerpan, Allan	Moose Jaw—Lake Centre	Ref.
Kirkby, Gordon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Prince Albert—Churchill River	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia	Ref.
Sheridan, Georgette	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Lib.
Solomon, John	Regina—Lumsden	NDP
Taylor, Len	The Battlefords—Meadow Lake	NDP
YUKON (1)		
McLaughlin, Hon. Audrey	Yukon	NDP

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of September 20th, 1996 — 2nd Session, 35th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: Raymond Bonin

Vice-Chairmen: Claude Bachand
John Finlay

Jack Iyerak Anawak Robert Bertrand	Margaret Bridgman Maurice Dumas	John Duncan Elijah Harper	John Murphy Bernard Patry	(11)
---------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	------

Associate Members

John Bryden Marlene Cowling	Paul DeVillers Hedy Fry	Dick Harris Audrey McLaughlin	Len Taylor
--------------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------	------------

SUB-COMMITTEE ON ABORIGINAL EDUCATION

Chairman: Robert Bertrand

Claude Bachand	Raymond Bonin	Margaret Bridgman	John Murphy	(5)
----------------	---------------	-------------------	-------------	-----

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chairman: Lyle Vanelief

Vice-Chairmen: Jean-Guy Chrétien
Glen McKinnon

Mark Assad Cliff Breitreuz Murray Calder	Bernie Collins Wayne Easter Elwin Hermanson	Jake E. Hoepfner Jean Landry Réjean Lefebvre	Jerry Pickard Julian Reed Rose-Marie Ur	(15)
--	---	--	---	------

Associate Members

Peter Adams Vic Althouse Leon E. Benoit Morris Bodnar	David Chatters Harold Culbert John Cummins Allan Kerpan	Laurent Lavigne John Maloney Denis Paradis	John Solomon Paul Steckle Len Taylor
--	--	--	--

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chairman: Clifford Lincoln

Vice-Chairmen: Gaston Leroux
Pat O'Brien

Jim Abbott Jack Iyerak Anawak	Guy H. Arseneault Mauril Bélanger	Hugh Hanrahan Jean-Paul Marchand	Janko Perić Beth Phinney	(11)
----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------	------

Associate Members

Robert Bertrand Jan Brown John Bryden	Simon de Jong Pierre de Savoye Stan Dromisky	John English Rey D. Pagtakhan Louis Plamondon	Georgette Sheridan Monte Solberg
---	--	---	-------------------------------------

**SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE REVIEW OF THE SPECIAL
IMPORT MEASURES ACT (SIMA)**

Chairman: Ronald J. Duhamel

Herb Grubel Yvan Loubier Brent St. Denis Susan Whelan (5)

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chairman: Joe McGuire

**Vice-Chairmen: Yvan Bernier
Derek Wells**

Gerry Byrne Harold Culbert Ted McWhinney Mike Scott (11)
René Canuel John Cummins Lawrence D. O'Brien Harry Verran

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy Ron Fewchuk Jean Payne Paul Steckle
Vic Althouse Fred Mifflin Roger Simmons Elsie Wayne

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chairman: Bill Graham

**Vice-Chairmen: Stéphane Bergeron
John English**

Sarkis Assadourian Jesse Flis Bob Mills Charlie Penson (15)
Colleen Beaumier David Iftody Lee Morrison Benoît Sauvageau
Michel Dupuy Francis G. LeBlanc Philippe Paré Bob Speller

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy Maud Debien Jean H. Leroux Ted McWhinney
Leon E. Benoit Jack Frazer John Loney Val Meredith
Jag Bhaduria Beryl Gaffney Ron MacDonald Rey D. Pagtakhan
Bill Blaikie John Godfrey Gurbax Singh Malhi Janko Perić
David Chatters Herb Grubel Keith Martin Paddy Torsney

**SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL
FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS**

Chairman: Bill Graham

David Iftody Bob Mills Philippe Paré Paddy Torsney (5)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON SUSTAINABLE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: John English

Colleen Beaumier Maud Debien John Godfrey Keith Martin (5)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON TRADE DISPUTES

Chairman: Michel Dupuy

Sarkis Assadourian Ron MacDonald Charlie Penson Benoît Sauvageau (5)

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chair: **Albina Guarnieri**

Vice-Chairmen: **Eugène Bellemare
Gilbert Fillion**

John Bryden
Paul Crête

Bill Gilmour
Dick Harris

John Harvard
Ovid L. Jackson

Gurbax Singh Malhi
Dan McTeague

(11)

Associate Members

Mauril Bélanger
Ghislain Lebel
Ian McClelland

Carolyn Parrish
Janko Perić
George Proud

John Solomon
Randy White

Ted White
John Williams

HEALTH

Chairman: **Roger Simmons**

Vice-Chairs: **Beryl Gaffney
Pauline Picard**

Antoine Dubé
Sharon Hayes

Grant Hill
John Murphy

Andy Scott
Georgette Sheridan

Paul Szabo
Joseph Volpe

(11)

Associate Members

Margaret Bridgman
Jan Brown
Maurice Dumas
Laurent Lavigne

Keith Martin
Audrey McLaughlin
Réal Ménard

Pat O'Brien
John O'Reilly
Bernard Patry

Svend J. Robinson
Roseanne Skoke
Rose-Marie Ur

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HIV/AIDS

Chairman: **John O'Reilly**

Sharon Hayes
Réal Ménard

Pat O'Brien
Bernard Patry

Svend J. Robinson
Paul Szabo

Rose-Marie Ur
Joseph Volpe

(9)

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: **Maurizio Bevilacqua**

Vice-Chairs: **Jean Augustine
Francine Lalonde**

Warren Allmand
Christiane Gagnon
Daphne Jennings

Dale Johnston
Ian McClelland
Larry McCormick

Robert D. Nault
Pat O'Brien
George Proud

Geoff Regan
Anna Terrana
Stéphan Tremblay

(15)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Chris Axworthy
Leon E. Benoit
Bonnie Brown

Jan Brown
Gerry Byrne
John Cannis
Marlene Cowling

Paul DeVillers
Wayne Easter
Jim Gouk
Herb Grubel

Réal Ménard
Maria Minna
Svend J. Robinson
Andy Scott

LIAISON**Chairman: Bill Graham****Vice-Chair:****Albina Guarnieri**

Reg Alcock
Eleni Bakopanos
Maurizio Bevilacqua
Raymond Bonin
Charles Caccia

Mary Clancy
Shaughnessy Cohen
Sheila Finestone
Patrick Gagnon
Michel Guimond

Ghislain Lebel
Clifford Lincoln
Joe McGuire
Andy Mitchell
Jim Peterson

Roger Simmons
Lyle Vanclief
David Walker
Paul Zed

(21)

Associate Member

Jack Frazer

SUB-COMMITTEE ON BUDGET**Chairman: Jim Peterson****Vice-Chairman:****Paul Zed**

Sheila Finestone
Jack Frazer

Bill Graham

Michel Guimond

Andy Mitchell

(7)

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS**Chair: Mary Clancy****Vice-Chairmen:****Robert Bertrand
Jean H. Leroux**

George S. Baker
John Cannis

Jack Frazer
Jim Hart

Jean-Marc Jacob
John O'Reilly

John Richardson
Bob Wood

(11)

Associate Members

Stéphane Bergeron
Bill Blaikie
Pierre de Savoye

Jesse Flis
Gar Knutson
John Maloney

Réal Ménard
Val Meredith
Pat O'Brien

Bob Ringma
Svend J. Robinson
Elsie Wayne

NATURAL RESOURCES**Chairman: Andy Mitchell****Vice-Chairmen:****René Canuel
Peter Thalheimer**

Réginald Bélair
Marlene Cowling
Bernard Deshaies

Monique Guay
Bonnie Hickey
Jay Hill

David Iftody
Julian Reed
Benoît Serré

Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Bob Wood

(15)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Leon E. Benoit

Roy Cullen
John Finlay

Roger Gallaway
John Solomon

Brent St. Denis
Derek Wells

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS**Chairman: Paul Zed****Vice-Chairs:****Marlene Catterall
François Langlois**

Don Boudria
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Jack Frazer

Mac Harb
René Laurin
John Loney

Peter Milliken
Rey D. Pagtakhan
Carolyn Parrish

Ray Speaker
Chuck Strahl

(14)

Associate Members

Robert Bertrand
Dianne Brushett
John Cummins
Ken Epp
Ron Fewchuk

Deborah Grey
Michel Guimond
Hugh Hanrahan
Stephen Harper
Dick Harris

Jim Hart
Jim Jordan
John Solomon
Darrel Stinson

Suzanne Tremblay
Elsie Wayne
Ted White
John Williams

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joint Chairmen: Sen. Jean-Louis Roux
Patrick Gagnon

Vice-Chairmen: Jean-Paul Marchand
Benoît Serré

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons

Gerald A. Beaudoin
Marie-P. Poulin

Jean-Claude Rivest
Louis J. Robichaud

Warren Allmand
Eugène Bellemare

Cliff Breitzkreuz
John Godfrey

(12)

Associate Members

Gaston Leroux

Bob Ringma

Jim Silye

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairmen: Sen. P. Derek Lewis
Ghislain Label

Vice-Chairman: Derek Lee

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Doris M. Anderson
Michel Cogger
Normand Grimard
William M. Kelly

Shirley Maheu
Pietro Rizzuto
Nicholas W. Taylor

Gilbert Fillion
Mac Harb
Gar Knutson

Dan McTeague
Tom Wappel
Ted White

(16)

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

A CODE OF CONDUCT

Joint Chairmen: Sen. Donald H. Oliver
Peter Milliken

Vice-Chairs: Sen. Jean-Robert Gauthier
Suzanne Tremblay

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

W. David Angus
Peter Bosa
Consiglio Di Nino
Mira Spivak
Peter Stollery

Don Boudria
Marlene Catterall
Ken Epp
Mac Harb
François Langlois
René Laurin

John Loney
Rey D. Pagtakhon
Carolyn Parrish
Bob Ringma
Ray Speaker
Paul Zed

(21)

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

Panels of Chairmen of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. PIERRETTE RINGUETTE-MALTAIS

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
The Hon. Herb Gray	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada
The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. David M. Collenette	Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs
The Hon. David Anderson	Minister of Transport
The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
The Hon. David Dingwall	Minister of Health
The Hon. Ron Irwin	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
The Hon. Joyce Fairbairn	Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister with special responsibility for Literacy
The Hon. Sheila Copps	Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. Sergio Marchi	Minister of the Environment
The Hon. John Manley	Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development – Quebec
The Hon. Diane Marleau	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
The Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
The Hon. Douglas Young	Minister of Human Resources Development
The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton	Minister for International Trade
The Hon. Marcel Massé	President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure
The Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Natural Resources
The Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
The Hon. Alfonso Gagliano	Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. Lucienne Robillard	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
The Hon. Fred Mifflin	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of National Revenue
The Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
The Hon. Pierre Pettigrew	Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie
The Hon. Fernand Robichaud	Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food, Fisheries and Oceans)
The Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Training and Youth)
The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay	Secretary of State (Veterans) (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
The Hon. Christine Stewart	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)
The Hon. Raymond Chan	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
The Hon. Jon Gerrard	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) (Western Economic Diversification)
The Hon. Douglas Peters	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
The Hon. Martin Cauchon	Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development – Quebec)
The Hon. Hedy Fry	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Rey D. Pagtakhan	to Prime Minister
Paul Zed	to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Nick Discepola	to Solicitor General of Canada
Francis G. LeBlanc	to Minister of Foreign Affairs
John Richardson	to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs
Stan Keyes	to Minister of Transport
Jerry Pickard	to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Joseph Volpe	to Minister of Health
Bernard Patry	to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Guy H. Arseneault	to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage
Karen Kraft Sloan	Minister of the Environment
Morris Bodnar	to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification
John Harvard	to Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Barry Campbell	to Minister of Finance
Robert D. Nault	to Minister of Human Resources Development
Ron MacDonald	to Minister for International Trade
Ovid L. Jackson	to President of the Treasury Board
Marlene Cowling	to Minister of Natural Resources
Gordon Kirkby	to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
George Proud	to Minister of Labour
Maria Minna	to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Ted McWhinney	to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Sue Barnes	to Minister of National Revenue
Paul DeVillers	to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
John Godfrey	to Minister for International Cooperation

CONTENTS

Friday, September 20, 1996

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act

Bill C-54. Motion for second reading	4485
Mr. Rock	4485
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	4485
Mr. Eggleton	4487
Mr. Bergeron	4489
Mr. Penson	4492

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

The Death of Rose Ouellette

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral	4494
----------------------------	------

Government

Mr. Silye	4494
-----------------	------

Children

Mr. Finlay	4494
------------------	------

New Brunswick Round Table Meetings

Mr. Culbert	4494
-------------------	------

Formal Systems Inc.

Mr. Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	4495
--	------

High Risk Offenders

Mr. Harper (Churchill)	4495
------------------------------	------

The Canada—Israel Free Trade Agreement

Mr. Bergeron	4495
--------------------	------

Immigration

Ms. Meredith	4495
--------------------	------

Breast Cancer

Mr. Richardson	4496
----------------------	------

Commercial Signs

Mr. DeVillers	4496
---------------------	------

Bloc Quebecois Leader

Mrs. Bakopanos	4496
----------------------	------

Parliament

Mrs. Debien	4496
-------------------	------

Canadian Wheat Board

Mr. Kerpan	4496
------------------	------

St. Lawrence River

Mr. Patry	4497
-----------------	------

Olympic Athletes

Ms. Brown (Oakville—Milton)	4497
-----------------------------------	------

Goods and Services Tax

Mrs. Jennings	4497
---------------------	------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Auditor General

Mr. Duceppe	4497
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	4497
Mr. Duceppe	4498
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	4498

Mr. Duceppe	4498
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	4498
Mr. Loubier	4498
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	4498
Mr. Loubier	4499

Somalia Inquiry

Mr. Hart	4499
Mr. Collenette	4499
Mr. Hart	4499
Mr. Collenette	4499
Mr. Hart	4499
Mr. Collenette	4500

The Judiciary

Mr. Bellehumeur	4500
Mr. Rock	4500
Mr. Bellehumeur	4500
Mr. Rock	4500

National Defence

Mr. Strahl	4500
Mr. Collenette	4500
Mr. Strahl	4500
Mr. Collenette	4500

Bertrand Litigation

Mr. Laurin	4501
Mr. Rock	4501
Mr. Laurin	4501
Mr. Rock	4501

Department of National Defence

Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge)	4501
Mr. Collenette	4501
Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge)	4501
Mr. Collenette	4501

The Canadian Armed Forces

Mr. de Savoye	4502
Mr. Collenette	4502
Mr. de Savoye	4502
Mr. Collenette	4502

Bosnia

Ms. Catterall	4502
Mr. Collenette	4502

Somalia Inquiry

Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	4502
Mr. Collenette	4503
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	4503
Mr. Collenette	4503

Irving Whale

Mrs. Guay	4503
Mr. Marchi	4503
Mrs. Guay	4503
Mr. Marchi	4503

Somalia Inquiry

Mr. Hart	4503
Mr. Collenette	4504
Mr. Hart	4504

Mr. Collenette	4504
Justice	
Mr. Mitchell	4504
Mr. Rock	4504
AIDS	
Mr. Ménard	4504
Mr. Dingwall	4504
Mr. Ménard	4505
Mr. Dingwall	4505
Justice	
Mr. Ramsay	4505
Mr. Rock	4505
Mr. Ramsay	4505
Mr. Rock	4505
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	
Mr. Riis	4505
Mr. Arseneault	4506
Employment	
Ms. Beaumier	4506
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	4506

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Jackson	4506
Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Ms. Catterall	4506
Crown Liability and Proceedings Act	
Bill C-325. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	4506
Mr. Hanger	4506
Motion M-240	
Mr. Ménard	4506
Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Motion to concur in 26th report	4507
Ms. Catterall	4507
(Motion agreed to.)	4507
Petitions	
Abortion	
Mr. Hanger	4507

Profits from Crime	
Mr. Finlay	4507
Impaired Driving	
Mr. Finlay	4507
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	4507
Human Rights	
Mr. Harb	4507
Human Rights	
Mr. Boudria	4507
Profits from Crime	
Mr. Boudria	4507
Indivisibility of Canada	
Mr. Boudria	4507
Sexual Orientation	
Mr. Boudria	4507
Profits from Crime	
Mr. Grubel	4507

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act	
Bill C-54. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading	4507
Mr. Penson	4508
Mr. Sauvageau	4509
Mr. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)	4511
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	4513
Mr. Simmons	4514
Mrs. Debien	4515
Mr. Paré	4516
Mr. Stinson	4517
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee.)	4518

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Restoration of Death Penalty Act	
Bill C-261. Motion for second reading	4519
Mr. Ringma	4519
Mr. Harris	4520
Mr. Kirkby	4521
Mr. Bellehumeur	4523
Mr. Ramsay	4524
Mr. Stinson	4526
Appendix	

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://wwwparl.gc.ca>**

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from the Canada Communication Group — Publishing, Public Works and Government Services Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, at \$1.75 per copy or \$286 per year.

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant au Groupe Communication Canada — Édition, Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada,
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, à 1.75 \$ l'exemplaire ou 286 \$ par année.**