



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 134 • NUMBER 076 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, September 27, 1996

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

CORRIGENDUM

The following changes are to be made to the September 23, 1996 issue of Hansard:

At the page 4536, immediately after division list No. 124, insert the following passage:

The Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 2. As is the practice, the mover of the motion will vote first and then everyone in the first row who are in favour of the motion will rise.

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division list No. 125: Yeas, 83; Nays, 66)

At the page 4537, replace division list No. 125 with division list No. 126: Yeas, 83; Nays, 68

At page 4538, delete division list No. 126 so that the passage reads:

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

[During the taking of the vote:]

NOTE: The full text of division lists are available in the electronic versions of 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 27, 1996

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

CANADA MARINE ACT

On the Order:

September 27, 1996—The Minister of Transport—Second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Transport of Bill C-44, an act for making the system of Canadian ports competitive, efficient and commercially oriented, providing for the establishing of port authorities and the divesting of certain harbours and ports, for the commercialization of the St. Lawrence Seaway and ferry services and other matters related to maritime trade and transport and amending the Pilotage Act and amending and repealing other Acts as a consequence.

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I move:

That Bill C-44, an act for making the system of Canadian ports competitive, efficient and commercially oriented, providing for the establishing of port authorities and the divesting of certain harbours and ports, for the commercialization of the St. Lawrence Seaway and ferry services and other matters related to maritime trade and transport and amending the Pilotage Act and amending and repealing other Acts as a consequence, be referred now to the Standing Committee on Transport.

[*English*]

Mr. Stan Keyes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as always, I consider it a great privilege to rise in the House. Today I am speaking in support of the proposed Canada marine act which was introduced on June 10, 1996.

The new Canada marine act will enable ports to respond more effectively to the needs of their customers and will eliminate needless bureaucratic interference in the marine sector. Modernization of the marine sector has a direct link to jobs and growth. A stronger and more efficient marine transportation system will improve Canada's international trade performance. That means jobs right here in Canada.

The legislation will make it easier for ports to operate according to business principles. It will enable the Government of Canada to commercialize the operations of the seaway and to improve the way pilotage authorities and ferry services operate in Canada. It will serve to enhance the competitiveness of our marine sector, preparing it for the 21st century.

At this point I wish to acknowledge the contribution already made to this bill by the Standing Committee on Transport, which undertook a comprehensive study of the national marine sector early in May of 1995. The SCOT report contained a number of recommendations to improve the marine system, many of which have been addressed in the legislation.

I would like to address the main elements of Bill C-44. I want to begin with ports. The major ports in Canada will be managed by Canada port authorities. These CPAs will operate under the following guiding principles. Any port can apply to become a CPA, and there is a process in place to evaluate criteria proposed in this legislation. I expect anywhere from 10 to 15 ports will meet the criteria and be eligible for CPA status in the very near future.

• (1010)

Port authorities will be established by letters patent as non-share capital corporations and will pay an annual amount to the crown based on gross revenues.

The board of directors will consist of a federal, provincial and municipal appointment and then a majority of directors nominated by the port users. Boards of directors will have a defined code of conduct and conflict of interest provisions as set out in their letters patent and regulations.

For the port users, local communities and financial community there is a new public accountability regime with new disclosure requirements that will ensure access to more detailed information. This accountability is achieved by an unprecedented transparency of operations and through rigorous disclosure requirements.

The following documents and procedures will be made public on a mandatory basis. There will be an annual report. There will be an annual audit, a public land use plan requiring public input in the development process and amendment process. There will be annual meetings throughout, open to the public. Directors' and officers' compensation and benefits will be reported in the annual report.

Government Orders

There are further aspects of the accountability regime which will be put in place by the proposed Canada marine act.

The port authority will be required by law to have financial audits conducted annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing practices. Furthermore, a special examination of the management, operations and financial performance will be conducted no less than every five years and the results reported to the Minister of Transport.

Perhaps the most important accountability mechanism stems from the fact that ports will have to raise their financing in the private sector.

Financing will depend on what the market sees as the realistic future cash flows of the ports. Their development aspirations will be subjected to ordinary measures of commercial risk. The government will no longer be responsible for their debt. In fact, this means they have to be more efficient than they are today. The government will not be on the hook for their liabilities.

The end result is a system where port authorities will be accountable to their customers, their local communities, their financial community, federal, provincial and municipal governments.

We are moving the decision making and accountability out of Ottawa and into the boards of directors of the new port authorities. We are ensuring financial responsibility by having the financial community decide on new port investment.

We are keeping title to the federal lands that are entrusted to the new boards and we remain accountable for important framework issues such as safety. We think these are reforms that will energize our ports and contribute to Canada's growth of jobs and prosperity.

For regional and local ports, the changes to the port system offer an opportunity for local interests in all provinces to manage ports in a manner more responsive to local needs with lower costs and better service.

This act enables these ports to be transferred as operating ports to local interests and, in some cases, other federal departments.

I am pleased to report that since January Transport Canada has already 47 port sites in the Arctic that were transferred to the coast guard April 1, 1996. Twelve fishing recreational port sites were transferred to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans April 1, 1996.

Order in council approval for 199 harbours was proclaimed in June 1996. Fifty-four letters of intent have been already signed as of this month. Five port sites will be transferred to local interests by the end of this month.

I move on to the challenges facing the seaway. Quite frankly, they are formidable. We have a \$7 billion asset supported by a declining traffic base and \$70 million in revenue.

If we do not take steps now to put the seaway on a stronger footing, we will have a big problem on our hands in a few years. The key to the future viability of the seaway lies in achieving efficiencies, reducing costs and making the system more competitive. Part III of the Canada Marine Act enables the Minister of Transport to enter into agreements with a non-profit corporation or any other private sector interests to operate and maintain all or part of the seaway.

• (1015)

We now have an agreement in principle for a new operator to be put in place, perhaps as early as January and the existing seaway authority would be dissolved at an appropriate date.

Another section of the bill deals with marine pilotage. Maintaining an effective pilotage regime to ensure safety and environmental protection is the primary concern of the government, users, the pilotage authorities and pilots alike.

The Canada Marine Act includes amendments to the Pilotage Act which will allow for faster setting of tariffs to prohibit appropriations from the government and to provide for a ministerial review in consultation with the authorities and users in 1998.

These changes will serve the users better and ensure that the authorities operate in a more cost efficient and cost effective manner. Safety and environmental protection will continue to be the government's highest priority when making decisions with respect to marine pilotage. The changes in the delivery of pilotage services will ensure that the safety of marine transportation is maintained.

Finally, with respect to ferry services, the Canada Marine Act will permit the Minister of Transport to enter into agreements with the private sector or other levels of government to provide the constitutional or other services that are currently provided by Marine Atlantic. These provisions are included in the act to facilitate the increased commercialization of ferry operations as outlined in the national marine policy.

Again, the government will maintain its regulatory role for safety and it will continue to support constitutionally required services.

This has just been a quick overview of the proposed Canada Marine Act. The goals of the marine policy are reflected in this legislation. We want our marine sector to be more competitive, more commercially driven, free from Ottawa bureaucracy and more responsive to the users.

We believe this legislation will help us to achieve these goals and prepare the marine sector and transportation system for the competitive demands of the 21st century.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Just so everyone understands the rules of debate on this motion, members are entitled to 10-minute interventions without questions or comments. The

Government Orders

maximum, of course, is three hours of debate on this motion before it is referred to the committee.

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments with regard to the Canada Marine Act.

The parliamentary secretary has outlined the objectives of the act. The objectives are very noble and I certainly congratulate the parliamentary secretary for setting them out in legislation. It is time that our ports were more self-sufficient, self-determining in their goals and objectives and in financial accountability. I want to place on the record my support for the parliamentary secretary's outline of the objectives of the bill.

I have received representation with regard to this issue a number of times since I arrived in Ottawa. As a person who represents a rural constituency in Lethbridge, Alberta, we usually do not talk about the seaway too much, or oceans, travel or marine life at all because we always are worried about having enough rain for the crops, never mind worrying about oceans, lakes and seaways.

Pilotage on the Great Lakes has been brought to my attention. There are certain shipping lines that travel the lakes day after day, week after week, month after month. The captains of those boats are very aware of the travel patterns. They know how to be safe on the lakes and they know how to move from one port to another and avoid any kind of disaster or cause any difficulty in making their way and taking their cargoes of grain, coal or other materials from one port to another.

● (1020)

As I understand it, in the past it was compulsory that they take on pilots at some of the ports. These pilots, either one or two or three, board the boat, find themselves a comfortable seat but the captain is still in charge. He knows where the boat is going. The pilots really do not contribute at all to that passage.

The concern is the major cost that is incurred by that pilot entering the boat, taking a nice comfortable chair, riding from one port to another and supposedly fulfilling his or her commitment in determining what is a safe route and the best way to go.

I can see that this may be necessary when foreign boats come into the seaway, perhaps from the European continent or some other country. When they enter the seaway it is new territory or it is territory they may only travel a few times each year. Under those circumstances the regulations should require that those vessels should take on pilots as it ensures safety on the Great Lakes. It ensures that the correct route is taken and that the necessary requirements are met. I do not understand all of those requirements.

I do see the case for a shipping company—the hon. minister and the parliamentary secretary certainly know the companies to which

I am referring—that is consistently on the lakes and has been for years. They have experienced captains. Perhaps that is another requirement. Perhaps the captains have to travel the lakes so many years. After they have been travelling the lakes and navigating the ship on the seaway for some many years, they have the right to be their own pilot. Maybe some regulations could be put in place to deal with that issue.

Why should the shipping company incur the extra cost of pilots when they are not needed on the boat at that time? It is a major cost to the industry. Certainly it employs somebody and creates a job. I understand that some of these pilot jobs are passed on from one family member to another. There are three or four families in their third or fourth generation of pilots so it is an industry for them.

Under the regulations the shippers on the Great Lakes have to use them. They have a guaranteed income, a wonderful thing, and I know they would not want to upset that. In practical terms it just does not seem right.

I recommend to the parliamentary secretary, the minister and the government that they look at this and maybe set up categories of where the requirements of a pilot are necessary and where they are not necessary. That makes some common sense as I see it.

I am making a judgment, maybe as a prairie gopher. I do not understand all of the things that happen in terms of navigation on the Great Lakes. But after standing back and looking at it in a common sense way, in terms of efficiency and the shipping companies not incurring costs that are not necessary, I think that would be very right.

As a farmer in western Canada, some of the grain I grow travels on the Great Lakes. It is moving on those boats. The Upper Lake Shipping Company, for example, moved some of my grain on the Great Lakes. I guess I am paying something extra because of the pilotage cost that is built into the system.

I certainly appreciate the new objectives that have been set out for the port authorities. It is good that is being done. They sound excellent. The accountability that is built into it is certainly supportable and of merit.

I ask the minister to have a second look at pilotage when regulations are designed to look at what is right and what is not right.

● (1025)

The third objective that the minister set out in his remarks is that the new act will be more responsive to the users. That is a good objective. It is the consumer, the user that really needs it, not the government. It should not be a bill for government. It should not be a bill to protect the bureaucrats of the system and enhance their jobs. It should not be a bill to protect the pilots. It should be a bill that enhances the opportunity of the users, that allows them to be

Government Orders

efficient, to keep the costs down and to have safety as their utmost responsibility. I believe that is built into the bill.

I would like to thank the House for the opportunity to speak to this bill. On that basis I am prepared to support it as an individual member from western Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Mercier (Blainville—Deux-Montagnes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, first I will give a brief description of the bill and then I will outline the Bloc's position.

Bill C-44 implements the federal government's new national marine policy. Three hundred and twenty-four Transport Canada ports are equipped for commercial traffic. Ninety per cent of marine traffic goes through 45 ports. This bill mainly affects three major marine issues, namely ports, pilotage and the seaway.

As far as ports are concerned, 324 of them come under the jurisdiction of Transport Canada, which shows the scope of this bill. The bill calls for the creation of Canada port authorities or CPAs, which will be private not for profit organizations operating in accordance with market discipline. The Canada Ports Corporation is being dismantled but the federal government still owns the federal lands on which CPAs are located.

As for the seaway, the government intends to continue to commercialize operations, as the bill allows the federal government to reach an agreement on management and operations with the private sector.

Finally, pilotage authorities will no longer have access to public funds.

Here is our party's position on these provisions. First of all, we must emphasize that we have always supported the port divestment and commercialization policy, as we pointed out in our May 1995 report on Canada's marine strategy. Therefore we support the bill in principle; however, we have four reservations about it.

First, some neglected ports must be rehabilitated. The new managers and owners should not be penalized by the federal government's failure to properly maintain many federally-owned harbours and ports in recent years. They must have access to facilities that are in reasonable shape. In this regard, officials tried to reassure us by saying that \$125 million has been set aside for this purpose, but this amount seems woefully inadequate.

Second, during the divestment process, the federal government will have to take into account the differences between the various port facilities. Some profitable ports will sell easily, but other will need more assistance from public officials and the local community. We, in the Bloc Quebecois, want to emphasize this important

point and we will be watching the federal government to ensure it takes regional disparities into account.

Third, even though the federal government wants to withdraw financially from the area of shipping, paradoxically, it wants to impose government representation on the boards of directors. This is just one more of many areas in which the federal government has tried to retain full power while withdrawing financially since the Liberals have been back in power. The government is decentralizing its deficit but trying to maintain control over shipping.

● (1030)

Our fourth and last reservation is with the federal government wanting to divest itself within six years of ports that do not meet the requirements to become part of the ports system: traffic diversity, connections with other transport modes, and financial autonomy. At the end of these six years, it will decide what should happen to those ports that did not sell. This deadline may well cause insecurity in many communities, in Canada and Quebec.

The Bloc Quebecois is for the commercialization of the St. Lawrence Seaway. We are also for government support for the building of ships suited for seaway navigation, which we feel is essential to the continued operation of the seaway and to shipyards in Quebec and Canada. Because of the reservations I have just listed, however, the Bloc cannot support Bill C-44 as it stands. Following the consultations scheduled to start on Monday, my party will propose amendments and, depending on how well these amendments are received, will vote accordingly.

To conclude, Bill C-44 clearly shows how miserably the federal marine policy has failed these past twenty years. The federal government just realized, although a bit late, that its involvement over the years has resulted in costly and cumbersome bureaucratization as well as ineffective management. The St. Lawrence Seaway is a good example of this.

More than \$7 billion, in 1996 dollars, has been spent by the federal government on the seaway. But the seaway only generates \$70 million per year in revenue, a 1 per cent return on the investment. Add to this the fact that shipping has declined by half since 1970. These figures show how effective federal policies are in shipping as in many other areas.

[*English*]

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by saying that this intercession is being delivered on behalf of my colleague, the Reform transportation critic, the member for Kootenay West—Revelstoke. Reform supports the intent of Bill C-44. However, there are several areas with which we have concerns and I would like to expose those in the next few minutes.

Government Orders

The motion before us is to refer the bill to committee before second reading. We will support that motion but I believe it is in order to state the reasons for that support and the reservations we have.

The first time this procedure was used on a transport bill was the legislation dealing with the privatization of CN Rail. We supported the Liberal argument that this process would allow the bill to be dealt with better in committee and that it would make it more amenable to amendments. Those assurances were false.

The bill was debated at length and our transport critic brought forward several amendments designed to improve the bill that we had already generally agreed with. Although several Liberal members of the committee expressed words of agreement with some of those amendments, when it came time for the vote every amendment was defeated by the same Liberal Party that asked for our support for the new streamlined procedure.

Interestingly, after the bill was passed in the House and implemented it became very clear that the Liberals would have been wise to have accepted some of those Reform amendments.

The next transport bill to come before the House with a motion to send it to committee before second reading was the Canada Transport Act. This time, based on the false promises issued by the Liberals on the previous transport bill, the Reform Party did not support the motion. When the bill ended up in committee our critic once again went to work exposing numerous flaws with a bill that we generally supported. Once again he brought forward numerous motions designed to improve a bill that we did want to support.

Unlike with the previous bill, the Liberals listened and then supported the majority of those amendments. Although there were a couple of rejected amendments which we felt were deal killers, we do acknowledge the Liberals' improved attitude in dealing with our amendments. Because of this improved attitude we are willing to give them another chance to act as they promised when they first introduced this procedure.

• (1035)

Having given our reasons for supporting the motion to refer the bill to committee before second reading so as to make it more amenable to amendments, I will now place the government on notice as to some of the aspects of the bill we have difficulty with.

However, before I do that there is one other item that needs to be brought out. This bill was introduced in the House last spring. The intent of doing so was supposedly to allow the appropriate people to have the summer to study the bill in order to be prepared to study it again upon the reconvening of Parliament in September.

One of the instruments utilized by members of Parliament is a briefing book on the bill supplied by the appropriate department, in this case transport. Our transport critic, the member for Kooten-

ay West—Revelstoke, did not receive the briefing book until the afternoon of September 25. That is not acceptable. I hope this disregard for proper and timely action is not an indication of how this bill will be dealt with.

During summer our transportation critic studied this bill and made notes of his concerns. He then went on the road to discuss the bill with various port operators and users. He began his meetings by asking for their reaction to Bill C-44. He found in virtually every case that many of the concerns of those he visited were identical to his own concerns.

Those areas of common concern include the size and the make-up of the board of directors. Section 6(2)(f) stipulates that the number of directors be between nine and eleven. Most port operators do not need nor do they want that large a board. Of those operators our critic visited, the desired number indicated ranged from three to five. One operator who did support five stated that he could live with seven but would prefer the lower number.

The Reform Party had previously expressed its opinion of board of director make-up in its minority report in the marine study completed by the Standing Committee on Transport last year. We believe in government participation but not government control.

Section 6(2)(f)(v)) of the bill states that one director is to be appointed by concerned municipalities and one by the province, two specifically in the case of the Port of Vancouver, and all other directors are to be appointed by the Minister of Transport. In the case of some of those appointments, the minister is to consult with the users. But no obligation is placed on the minister to appoint those who are chosen by the users.

The government may argue it is its intention to appoint directors selected by the users but if it does not say that, it is not likely to happen. If the minister does indeed plan to appoint those elected by the users, why not just let the users appoint their own directors, but not in the numbers stipulated in the bill? No one group, be it the government, the municipalities or the users, should have in itself a majority on the board.

Section 9 and others within the bill set out a provision that cancels any right that current office holders might have to compensation, damages or indemnity.

Section 11(2) goes further by clearing stating that neither the port authority nor Her Majesty in Right in Canada is bound by any severance agreement entered into between a predecessor of the port authority and any of its officers after December 1, 1995. Given that transport is the same department that gave us the Pearson cancellation bill, we should not be surprised that it would do something like this.

Section 24 restricts the right of a port authority to operate any form of business which may provide needed cash flow revenues for the port. For example, Fraser port does partial assembly of vehicles upon their arrival. That is good business and aids in the

Government Orders

financial viability of the port. The government should not be restricting this activity, it should be encouraging it. Fraser Port is an example of how we should set up the new port authorities. I am glad to see the nod across the way from the parliamentary secretary to go in that direction.

• (1040)

Section 27(3) states that a port authority may not mortgage any property that it holds in any manner. Does this restriction apply only to the crown land turned over to the port to operate or does it include other properties which have or may in the future be bought by the port authority? This we think is overly restrictive and creates serious financial problems for the ports.

Another problem section is 36(5). This either stops a port authority from acquiring a new property or at a minimum requires an amendment to the letters patent each time there is a purchase. The idea of the bill is to get rid of bureaucratic red tape, as stated by the parliamentary secretary, not create more.

Section 45 states that the Official Languages Act applies to a port authority as if it were a federal institution. That is absolutely without merit. Why would the Port of Prince Rupert on B.C.'s north coast need to be bilingual? Why would small ports at other west coast locations need to have this unnecessary expense and hiring restriction placed on them? It is not a matter of not wanting to provide a bilingual service, it is simply that no one would ever use it. Let us be practical.

Section 56 sets it up for the minister to gouge money for little or no service out of certain ports like Kitimat. Considering that the Minister of Transport is also supposed to be the Liberal cabinet representative for B.C., he should be ashamed of allowing such an unfair provision to remain in the bill.

Section 63 is little better and is also likely to cause undue hardship on Kitimat.

While there are some other areas of concern, these are the most contentious. We are giving the government fair notice as to where our concerns lie. I hope it will remain open minded and work with us to make Bill C-44 one which all parties can support and one which will benefit all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this debate because, when we deal with the marine sector, the MIL Davie workers, in my riding of Lévis, immediately come to mind. My goal is to see if this bill includes measures that will be beneficial for these workers.

Why do I think in these terms? Because Bill C-44 is pompously called the Canada Marine Act. However, there is nothing in it about

marine construction or the merchant navy. Yet, I saw Liberals, including the Prime Minister, come to meet MIL Davie workers and tell them that a summit would be held and a policy would be developed.

In the end, this bill deals primarily with ports. What is it all about? The member for Blainville—Deux-Montagnes, who spoke before me, stated the Bloc's position. In principle, we cannot oppose this bill, because it theoretically seeks to take politics out of port authorities. However, we are not so sure that this will actually be the case.

For example, in most cases, the federal government will continue to appoint the directors of a port authority. As mentioned in clause 12(1), there will be an official representing the federal government, but, with the exception of those individuals appointed by the municipalities and the provinces, the others, including those representing the users, will be appointed by the federal government.

I happen to come from the region of Lévis, across from Quebec City, which has a major port.

• (1045)

Over the years, I watched what was going on in the port of Quebec, because there are port facilities on both sides of the river. What happened is that, over the ten previous years, the port of Quebec had accumulated profits of \$36 million. This prompted the federal Conservative government, and then the Liberals, to grab \$33 million out of the \$36 million.

Under the circumstances, you will understand why the port authorities had no real incentive to make profits. The member for Blainville—Deux-Montagnes talked about siphoning off profits and he is absolutely right. This best describes what took place. The federal government was siphoning off the profits and, then it says, in the bill, that the previous policy has failed. This is indeed the case, because, wherever it was cost-effective, the federal government moved in and took amounts for its own administration.

The Bloc Québécois has certain concerns, one being that, although the port of Quebec City was cost-effective, smaller ports, and there are many of them, are not in the same situation. We are still worried about them. Often, ports are in pitiful shape. The federal government has neglected the maintenance of several small ports and now it would like to turn these small ports over to local entrepreneurs, rely on the spirit of economic development and initiative that local people may have.

It is not much of a gift in some cases, unless the necessary money is invested. We will see, during the consultation, because there will be hearings at which the various stakeholders throughout Canada who are interested in the matter may express their views.

The members of the Bloc Québécois, the official opposition, will be present at each of these hearings to listen to people's concerns.

At first sight, \$125 million to refurbish all the ports concerned seems insufficient to us. Sometimes, what is needed is an analogy with what is happening in other areas. This morning, I read in the newspaper about a group of five small regional airports in Quebec that have decided to make representations to the federal government. The representatives say that they would be interested in taking over management of these airports, but that they are in unsatisfactory shape at the moment. For a year, or 18 months now, I believe, we have been seeing, if we look at specific cases, that people are realizing that if an adjustment is not made, it is not as interesting for local authorities to take over the administration of what the federal government leaves behind.

I will give another small example. I personally wonder. Take the Toronto airport, You will tell me it is not the same thing, but it still has a bearing on the ports. The Conservative government had decided to privatize Pearson, but the Liberal government wanted to prevent privatization. Why? Because there was more in it for them that way. It makes me wonder. When something brings in money, the government wants to hang on to it to fill its own coffers, but when it is a losing proposition, and when the government itself has contributed to the deterioration of the infrastructures, it wants to hand it over to the local authorities.

At first sight, this strikes me as a real contradiction. So during these hearings on the ports, people will have a chance to express their concerns. I think that these hearings will provide an opportunity for them to do so.

• (1050)

The only thing I see is that the time limit seems very short. In the human resources development committee I have seen that people have not had enough time to prepare a brief because of the time limits. The democratic process, though generally very good, is not always followed as it should be, because people have not been given the necessary time to prepare. At any rate, we shall see what happens.

This the reason for the Bloc Québécois' serious reservations, despite our support of the principle.

There is also the matter of pilotage. I have had a lot of representations from people about the St. Lawrence, where I understand it will be implemented in 1998. The St. Lawrence pilots have expressed their concerns to me. They are not sure it is a good thing to move the St. Lawrence pilot administration to Ottawa. In this instance, centralization does not seem attractive at first glance.

Finally, as for privatization and increased commercialization of the St. Lawrence Seaway, I would be in agreement with that. Yet I would point out that, as the member for Lévis, I would certainly like to see this new legislation take into consideration the fact that

Government Orders

vessels plying the St. Lawrence Seaway in future will have to be built with a narrower seaway in mind. We are well aware that it is not all that easy to navigate through all kinds of submerged barriers. As well, environmental protection regulations would be necessary.

If all of this were done, the situation of the workers at MIL Davie, whom I represent here, would also be improved.

Mr. Stéphan Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to speak to Bill C-44 which concerns shipping.

First of all, I would like to digress somewhat. Speaking of transport, two weeks ago in my riding we opened the Véloroute des bleuets, a bicycle path around the Lac-Saint-Jean that will give all visitors as well as residents a chance to tour this lovely region. It is probably one of the few bicycle paths that forms a loop, in other words, you never cover the same ground twice.

I say this just in passing. Now, from cycling to boating.

Shipping is probably one of the most important economic sectors in Quebec and Canada. Need I add that it helped create our two countries. That is why it is essential to consider every aspect of a bill that concerns this sector before taking action.

Mr. Pettigrew: Two countries?

Mr. Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean): Yes, two countries.

The proposed legislation implements the federal government's national marine policy announced in December 1995. This is new legislation that will regulate the entire shipping sector, both in Quebec and Canada.

The government dares to refer to this legislation as the Canada Marine Act. In fact, we are really talking about legislation to regulate shipping in Quebec and in Canada. So why is there no reference to shipbuilding, an important industry in Quebec? Why is there no reference to shipyards? Why is there no reference to the merchant navy? I intend to answer those questions.

First of all, because the federal government's marine policy has been a complete flop. A good example is the St. Lawrence Seaway. In 20 years, the federal government has invested \$7 billion—quite a bundle—while annual revenues amount to about \$70 million annually. The situation is pretty clear.

The government is definitely in the red, and furthermore, today's shipping is half what it was in the seventies, in the good old days. This is why the government wants to get rid of the embarrassing economic situation of its ports, while maintaining a final say on the membership of the boards of directors that will have the responsibility for managing the ports.

S. O. 31

• (1055)

In this regard, clauses 12(1)(a) and (e) of the bill provide that the federal government will have a representative on each of these boards in addition to appointing the other members in consultation with the users. But the bill does not specify whether or not the minister is required to respect the users' choice. I think that this, in a way, shows the irony of this bill. The government should not try to sell us a bill of goods: it cannot get rid of the infrastructure, and still have a say in this.

The government may well consult with users and then appoint whoever they want, as this seems to be a hallmark of the party across the way. Again, the government talks about decentralization but the facts show a totally different situation. In government language, it simply means getting rid of the federal deficit at the expense of the other levels of government while maintaining control through a federally-appointed board of directors and especially saving the work for its own officials. This is reminiscent of what is happening here in Ottawa, where everyone is working to keep his or her job. Effectiveness does not matter.

Given the state of Canada's deficit, the government should perhaps sell off the whole country, keeping only the Parliament buildings. That would be one way to get rid of its debts.

An hon. member: First they must find a buyer.

Mr. Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean): Right, the problem is finding a buyer. That would be one way for the government to get rid of its debts without losing its decision making power, which is very important.

In the end, I seriously wonder about two problems that might arise from this bill. First, I am very concerned by the wide variation in the commercial viability of the various ports. The government should take into account the differences between the various port facilities. As we know, some ports are more profitable than others and will sell off quickly, while others will need more help from both the public and the private sectors and from local communities. Making them commercially viable will increase our already heavy financial burden.

The second problem that bothers me is this. In what kind of shape will the ports the federal government will hand over to the private sector be? Finally, as my colleague for Lévis said essentially, earlier, when something is profitable, you retain control over it and pocket the profits, otherwise, you divest ourselves of it. It is a well known fact that several harbours and ports were left to look after their own maintenance and modernization. Officials did try to reassure us by saying that \$125 millions will be earmarked for repairs to ports that have not been properly maintained. Given the condition of certain ports, it seems clear to me that \$125 million is very definitely not enough. Again, this goes to show that the

government's sole aim is to get out of debt by shifting the costs of repair onto other levels of government and the private sector.

The Bloc Québécois is very much in favour of the commercialization of the St. Lawrence Seaway. At the same time, we are for government support for the building of ships suited for seaway navigation. We will be looking at the bill with a view to making suggestions on how to improve it, so that it better meets the expectations of all Quebecers and Canadians.

As I said and I repeat, shipping, particularly on the St. Lawrence Seaway, represents an important industry, an economy, which must not be taken lightly. The government must consider the merits of my line of argument.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Rather than give the floor to a member for one minute, we will proceed to members' statements and then we will resume this debate after question period.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1100)

[English]

JOHN CHILD

Mr. John Cannis (Scarborough Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations and praise to a constituent of my riding of Scarborough Centre for his outstanding performance in the 1996 Summer Olympic Games.

My constituent John Child competed in one of the new medal sports introduced this year, beach volleyball. Mr. Child along with his partner Mark Heese competed against the best players in the world and went on to win a bronze medal in the finals, proving once again that Canada is indeed a force to be reckoned with in this new and increasingly popular sport.

To follow up on their bronze medal, Mr. Child and Mr. Heese went on to win the Canadian National Beach Volleyball Championships which were held right here in Ottawa over the Labour Day weekend.

It is with great pride that I again congratulate John Child on his pursuit of excellence in his chosen sport. Well done, John.

S. O. 31

[Translation]

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SÉMINAIRE DE JOLIETTE

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 29, Joliette's oldest educational institution will celebrate its 150th anniversary.

In 1846, Barthélemy Joliette, the founder of the city, established the Collège Joliette, which later became the Séminaire de Joliette, then the Académie Antoine-Manseau, and now the Cégep Joliette-de-Lanaudière. Headed by the Clercs de Saint-Viateur, with the support of secular priests and lay persons, this institution has always offered top quality education and training, and boasts among its former students the current Prime Minister of Canada and member for Shawinigan, and the deputy premier of Quebec, Jean-Bernard Landry.

Today, I have the great privilege of paying tribute to my former alma mater. The dedication, perseverance and generosity of its builders contributed significantly to the enrichment of our country and to the development of Quebecers.

* * *

[English]

PRIME MINISTERIAL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has done it yet again with the appointment of Wilfred Moore to the Senate yesterday. He has extended his unbroken streak of blatantly and cynically putting his Liberal Party interests ahead of democracy in Canada.

I do not need to talk about Mr. Moore's impeccable Liberal pedigree because the Prime Minister wants only people who would do his bidding.

Canadians should realize how the Prime Minister is perverting the Canadian democratic process. For example, Canadians assume because their elected representatives overcame strong lobbying by the heritage minister and her department that there be a ban on cable company negative option billing that the ban would come into effect but this is not so. Even as we speak the Liberal senators are being told how to vote on behalf of the heritage department, on behalf of the cable companies and against consumers. This Prime Minister wants to have his own way.

Perverting the Canadian democratic process with endless Senate appointments works against Canadians who are demanding accountability instead of Liberal manipulation.

DRAYTON FESTIVAL

Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Wellington—Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Drayton Festival. Located in my riding, the Drayton Festival will conclude its sixth season on Sunday, October 6.

A true success story, the festival has quickly grown from 16,000 tickets sold in 1991 to 60,000 this year. Running from May to October, the 21-week season is the third longest running summer theatre in Ontario.

This season the most popular show was a Canadian musical play about the second world war as seen through the eyes of six Canadian soldiers. Extremely popular with all audiences and heavily supported by the Royal Canadian Legion, the show was 98 per cent sold out.

The theatre, which receives no government money, recently launched a \$1.5 million capital campaign to renovate its historic building. To date over \$500,000 has been raised.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, the success of the theatre is phenomenal, especially when you consider it is located in a village with a population of 1,300.

* * *

ARTHRITIS MONTH

Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that September has been designated Arthritis Month by the Arthritis Society.

Arthritis is a significant health issue that has disabled 600,000 Canadians and has become the most common cause of long term disability in Canada. It costs our economy more than \$5 billion annually.

There is still no cure. Arthritis research is a critical component of the strategy to address this disorder.

During Arthritis Month this year, a new Internet site is being launched by the Arthritis Society in conjunction with the society's corporate partner and the Canadian Rheumatology Association.

The web site is being developed, maintained and supported on a voluntary basis by a dynamic team of Canadian rheumatologists, orthopedic surgeons, physical and occupational therapists and family physicians.

I congratulate the Arthritis Society and its 100,000 dedicated volunteers whose efforts continue to bring hope to many Canadians suffering from arthritis.

* * *

● (1105)

VAUGHAN INTERACT CLUB

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (York North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this summer I was invited to speak at the founding of the Vaughan

S. O. 31

Interact Club. At a time in our country's history when youth unemployment is a challenge, organizations such as the Interact Club are essential.

Sponsored by our local Rotary Club and the Vaughan Chamber of Commerce, Interact gives area youths the opportunity to learn valuable leadership and teamwork skills while gaining experience that will serve them well down the road. By focusing on community service and understanding, Interact prepares our youth for the challenges they face entering the world of work.

To the youths who have taken the initiative to join Interact and the business leaders who will volunteer their time, I say to them, congratulations. They have made a wise decision and one which will benefit themselves and the community in which they live.

This type of effective partnership between youth, community associations and area businesses is exactly the kind of alliance that is needed to help our youth take on their future and realize their full potential.

* * *

[Translation]

ANNE HÉBERT

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on August 29, novelist and poet Anne Hébert gave to the University of Sherbrooke several manuscripts and audio material representing the greater part of her literary work in Quebec before 1960.

These documents are an invaluable part of our heritage. When the agreement was signed between Ms Hébert and the University of Sherbrooke, university Rector Pierre Reid said to the author: "Ms Hébert, the gift you are making today to the University of Sherbrooke will form the basis of research for generations of students."

In order to promote research, the University of Sherbrooke pledged to create a centre, scheduled to open in May of 1997. Michel Gosselin, a professor of literature at the Collège de Sherbrooke, a writer and a friend of the author, will chair the steering committee of this research centre.

My colleagues and I wish to extend our warm appreciation to Ms Hébert for this gift to the Province of Quebec, and particularly to the Eastern Townships.

* * *

[English]

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, years of half measures dealing with youth crime have left Cana-

dians with laws that allow criminals to go unpunished because they are between the ages of 12 and 17.

Victims rights groups and Canadians in general have been shut out of the process to reform the Young Offenders Act. However, in my riding of Nanaimo—Cowichan, constituents are being heard on this issue.

Using the direct democracy initiative of televoting, residents are voting on the following questions:

1. Do you feel that youths charged with violent crimes should automatically be dealt with in adult court?

2. Should the names of youths convicted of a serious crime be released to the public?

3. Should the Young Offenders Act be amended to lower the age at which a youth can be charged from 12 years to 10?

To date, 698 people have responded and in time their views will be reflected in legislation which I will bring before this House.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, although the Liberals promised to keep marketing boards, the Crow benefit and branch lines, they have already gotten rid of two of those three pillars of their policy. When confronted with their duplicity they say that the international agreements made them do it. However, during the election they said they would not sign those agreements.

Now the Liberal government has offered up marketing boards on the sacrificial altar of free trade for the 1999 round. Canadian officials did not have to call them state trading entities but they did. The government did not have to sign onto the agenda but it did.

Unfortunately for Canadian farmers who want to keep single desk selling, our officials have willingly taken the poison to kill the boards and now we find there is no antidote. What is worse, no one inside the government seems to be looking for one.

* * *

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the House's attention to the problem of impaired driving, a serious social problem which unfortunately still manifests itself in our society with all the negative consequences it entails.

[Translation]

Many have proposed solutions to this serious problem, without giving proper thought to their degree of success. Impaired driving is a complex issue that cannot be resolved by adopting ill-considered half-measures.

[English]

The problem of impaired driving requires comprehensive, not piecemeal solutions. Dealing with impaired drivers requires efforts in the social as well as the legislative arenas. Only then will we succeed in our goal to eradicate this criminal and socially unacceptable behaviour.

* * *

• (1110)

CANADIAN UNITY

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend a constituent of mine from Greely in Osgoode township who has found a novel way to promote Canadian unity.

Mr. Kent Hamilton has created a train whistle out of Canadian pine and cedar which provides a sound reminiscent of early steam engines that brought our country together from the Atlantic to the Pacific in 1885.

[Translation]

Mr. Hamilton calls his instrument in both official languages: l'Unisifflet and The Great Canadian Whistle. I am proud to join him, and many others, to show our national pride by blowing in the Great Canadian Whistle.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH CARE

Ms. Judy Bethel (Edmonton East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the premier of Alberta visited financiers on Wall Street in New York City this week extolling the virtues of the Alberta advantage. However people on the main streets in Edmonton East know the premier is ignoring one essential element of the Alberta advantage, one that is of paramount importance to Albertans: quality health care services and an accessible health care system.

The premier believes that responsible health care restructuring simply means taking dollars out of the system without any consideration for the impact on people, on services or on budgets.

The results of cutting too deep too fast with no planning were illustrated this week when Alberta's regional health authorities reported a combined deficit of \$100.6 million for the 1995-96 fiscal year.

Albertans clearly see health care in that province as an Alberta disadvantage. Their confidence rests with our Prime Minister who understands their overwhelming desire for an effective, efficient

S. O. 31

health care system and who is committed to upholding the principles of the Canada Health Act.

* * *

[Translation]

THE MINISTER OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister of National Defence to explain to this House what he means when he says that the generals in the Canadian Armed Forces carry no more weight than a plumber.

To my knowledge, when something is wrong with the plumbing, you call a good plumber. And when a government has problems with its armed forces, it makes just as much sense for it to attach a minimum of importance to the opinions of its generals.

When the defence minister says that his generals carry no more weight than a plumber in the decisions concerning the armed forces, what use then are these generals?

In my opinion, the minister is no longer seeing straight in this affair. His lack of judgment and inappropriate remarks point to one thing: he is no longer able to hold such a position.

The Prime Minister has no choice but to call for the resignation of the defence minister.

* * *

[English]

THE LATE BERT HARGRAVE

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform the House of the passing of a former member of Parliament from Medicine Hat constituency, Mr. Bert Hargrave.

Mr. Hargrave devoted his lifetime to the promotion of agriculture and public service, and often the twain did meet.

A graduate of the University of Saskatchewan, he served as a tank engineer in World War II. A strong supporter of agriculture, he took over the family farm at Walsh, Alberta in 1945. In 1972 he took office as a Conservative member until retiring in 1984, serving for a time as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture. His tireless devotion to his life work was recognized when he was inducted into the Alberta Agriculture Hall of Fame.

Over the years I met him on several occasions. I was honoured when in his later years he became a member and supporter of my party.

Mr. Hargrave was a typical western gentleman: tough, straightforward and generous. He passed away Tuesday at age 79 and will be laid to rest on Monday beside his wife Amy.

Oral Questions

I know the House will join me in extending sympathies to his family. He will be sorely missed. May he rest in peace.

[English]

* * *

[Translation]

REFERENCE TO THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Bloc Québécois showed us once again that its talents lie more in the politics of showmanship than in dialogue. The reference of the question of a unilateral declaration of independence to the Supreme Court surely does not merit such a frenzied spectacle from the Bloc Québécois.

The sole purpose of our government's decision is to demystify the concept put forward by the separatists that Quebec has the right to unilaterally declare its independence.

We are in no way denying the right of the government of Quebec to organize a consultative referendum on the future of Quebec. We merely wish to avoid having any future unilateral declaration of independence by the government of Quebec take place in confusion and chaos.

We believe that the interest of the people of Quebec must come before the separatists' partisan interests. We urge the Bloc Québécois to co-operate in this important process of clarification.

* * *

• (1115)

REFERENCE TO THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government of Quebec will not comment on the reference to the Supreme Court by the Minister of Justice.

Yet, last May 29, in connection with the Bertrand case, Lucien Bouchard took quite a different position from that just adopted by his government, and I quote: "I obviously cannot just allow the court to go ahead without saying anything. The lawyers are attacking Quebec's rights".

As for the leader of the Bloc Québécois, he said on June 5, and I am again quoting: "I have always told Mr. Bouchard, and I told him again recently, that the policy of the empty chair is not appropriate at this time".

Quebecers are entitled to know the separatists' arguments concerning the unilateral declaration of independence. To refuse to take part in the deliberations of the Supreme Court is to deny them this right.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last April 5 a terrible tragedy occurred in my riding of Okanagan—Shuswap which resulted in the shooting deaths of nine people. My deep sympathy goes out to all their family and friends who have suffered again through the coroner's inquest which has revealed a lot of heartbreaking information.

The police will now routinely contact the spouse when a person applies for a restricted weapon. This sounds good in theory, but in practice the RCMP already have their hands too full dealing with a 20-year crime wave and laws which impose so much red tape that it can take longer for the officer to complete the paperwork than a judge imposes as the sentence.

Nevertheless, our present government continues to cut funding for the administration of justice. My office has received complaints that the public does not believe there are enough police to protect law-abiding citizens and their property.

The investigation into the so-called Vernon massacre clearly indicates the continuing lack of justice in our criminal justice system.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise again to encourage the government in its efforts to develop sustainable domestic and international fish stocks management policies. We need to put our own house in order in the inland and marine fisheries so that we can ratify the United Nations convention on the law of the sea in the near future.

In the meantime, we should surpass the standards set by the FAO code of conduct for responsible fisheries.

We should also use all our influence to gain full international recognition for the agreement on straddling stocks and highly migratory fish.

The policies and achievements of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans last year gave us a position of moral leadership in global fish stocks management. We should work to retain that position.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[Translation]

CONSTITUTION

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Minister of Justice referred to conditions mutually acceptable to Canadians and Quebecers based on the

Oral Questions

Canadian Constitution. Need I remind everyone that this Constitution has been judged unacceptable by all of the governments of Quebec? The present federal Minister of Immigration, who is present in the House, moreover, held that opinion when she was a member of the Quebec National Assembly. I do not know whether she has changed her mind since then.

The Minister of Justice also stated yesterday, and I quote: "We shall take whatever steps are necessary in the months ahead to comply with the commitment we gave in the speech from the throne".

Does the Minister of Justice confirm that referral to the Supreme Court is only the first step of plan B, and that the federal government is preparing to impose impossible conditions on Quebec, by setting the rules for the referendum itself?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): No, Mr. Speaker, and might I add a note of reality to this?

It was Mr. Bouchard himself who sent his Minister of Justice into a Montreal court room, a few months ago, in the spring of this year, in order to convince it to close the Bertrand case because, under the Constitution, the courts have nothing to do with sovereignty. He was not successful. We responded to that in court and were successful in convincing the judge to continue because the court does indeed have a role to play by deciding these matters of law.

After that, the Quebec Minister of Justice left the case, yet the basic questions remain, those raised by Mr. Bouchard and his Minister of Justice themselves.

• (1120)

We have raised those fundamental questions in the highest court of the land, and Mr. Bouchard and the Government of Quebec have refused to participate. In my opinion, the only conclusion we can reach is that Mr. Bouchard and the Government of Quebec are well aware that what we maintain is true: unilateral action is illegal.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the unilateral action by the Government of Quebec is illegal, yet the unilateral action by the federal government is legal. That is this boils down to. That is what they mean by democracy.

Their "democracy" is a game with loaded dice. Their "democracy" denies the existence of the people of Quebec.

Will the Minister of Justice admit that any desire for change expressed by the people of Quebec is subject to a veto by any one of the provinces, from Newfoundland to Prince Edward Island, since unanimity is required under the Constitution, a constitution no Quebec government, whether Liberal or PQ, has accepted or signed?

[English]

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it suits the purpose of the hon. member to confuse one issue with another. What he fails to address is that the one rule that binds us all in this country is the rule of law.

What is at issue here is whether that rule of law is to govern all that we do, including resolving the great national question of separation.

We made clear yesterday that we must respect a decisive majority on a clear question on that issue as expressed by the population of Quebec. The question will be separation or not, nothing in between, not partnership or any such thing. Separation or not is the clear and honest question that must be asked.

We have every confidence that when that question is asked, the population of Quebec will vote, as it has done on two earlier occasions, for a united Canada.

The issue we confront in the case that we have now referred to the Supreme Court of Canada is this. My hon. friend and the government of the province of Quebec pretend that if they get the result they want the very next day they can walk away unilaterally from the nation that is Canada. That is not so.

They would have to follow negotiations to resolve the tough issues involved in separation, not partnership. Those negotiations have to be in accordance with an orderly process consistent with the rule of law.

That is our point in taking his questions to the Supreme Court of Canada.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we are getting closer and closer to the real bottom line. What this minister is telling us is that Quebecers and their government lack the maturity and democracy to be capable of making a decision on their own concerning their development, their future. That we need the other provinces, the anglophone majority in Canada, to tell us how to go about it. That is the bottom line.

With the exception of his better approach, this minister is acting exactly like his Prime Minister, who has always found a way to stick it to Quebec—

An hon. member: What is the question?

Mr. Duceppe: What is the question? Hold on, it is coming up. As I was saying, like the Prime Minister, who has always fiddled with principles in order to stick it to Quebec.

To quote the Minister of Justice again, because it is noteworthy: "Mr. Speaker, I very much hope that our federalist allies in Quebec will see the value of clearly determining these questions that have now been put at issue". You see, the Quebec federalists are not in agreement with the federal government. They can smell a trap that

Oral Questions

reeks of Meech Lake, but the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration does not seem to be unable to do so.

Some hon. members: Question. Question.

Mr. Duceppe: My question is on the way, if only the wolves will stop their howling.

• (1125)

Is the Minister of Justice aware that this government is in the process of cutting all ties with Quebec, even with its federalist allies like the Quebec Liberal Party?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have addressed the question, we have made a speech.

But the speech mentioned the word “democracy”, a pertinent word here, because of course we must respect the decision of the population of Quebec on the question of separation. Of course, if a decisive majority voices its opinion on a clear question after a legal process, and decides to leave Canada, to separate, that decision must be respected. That is true.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Rock: Yes, it is true. It is obvious that we do not intend to hold someone within Canada by force, against their will. We are, however, confident that decision will not be taken.

But the reason for our referral to the Supreme Court this week is that action after such a vote cannot be unilateral. We need answers to the difficult questions which arise under such circumstances. That is to say, all Canadians are involved in this process, a process which must respect the rule of law. That is the purpose of our action this week.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): If I may be allowed to comment, the first round of questions took us 10 minutes. I would therefore appreciate the co-operation of both sides of the House in making both questions and answers more concise.

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice said yesterday that he would recognize the will of Quebec if certain conditions were met.

Could the Minister of Justice tell us in no uncertain terms whether the federal government intends to determine the wording of the question and the percentage required to recognize a referendum?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we intend to act on the commitment we made in February in the speech from the throne, that if there was a third referendum in Quebec, there would be a clear question, full discussion of all the consequences, a fair and

equitable process and an opportunity for all Canadians to have some say on the future of their country.

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice also said that all Canadians would have their say. However, he would not tell us whether he was considering holding a pan-Canadian referendum to determine Quebec's future.

Could the Minister of Justice tell us today whether the government has dismissed the possibility of holding a pan-Canadian referendum on the future of Quebec? Yes or no?

[English]

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the Government of Quebec insists on a third referendum after twice the population of Quebec voted for a united Canada, the first issue will be to determine the will and wish of Quebecers. We have said time and again that we are confident they will choose a united Canada.

The hon. member pretends that in such an event the population of Quebec would choose a different course. We are saying that in any such unlikely eventuality, all Canadians have a stake in what would then happen, which is the settlement of the issues that would be outstanding on separation, not partnership. All Canadians must have a voice in determining those issues.

* * *

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister and the defence minister have demonstrated to Canadians their lack of leadership, and by their lack of leadership they have allowed morale in the Canadian Armed Forces to plummet.

Instead of restoring morale, they have been lining the pockets of their Liberal campaign workers. The defence department budget was meant to protect Canada's interests, not as a personal slush fund for friends of the Prime Minister and his cabinet.

• (1130)

To the acting Prime Minister, why is the Liberal government spending more money rewarding its friends than it is restoring morale in the Canadian Armed Forces?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are rules for these contracts which are clear. Each department has delegated authority to assign some contracts according to rules which are provided by the Treasury Board. These rules have been followed by the minister of defence.

I am assured that all the rules that were in place have been followed. In this case, the rules that apply are similar to the rules

that apply to the Leader of the Opposition and to the leader of the third party. These contracts have to meet certain criteria. I am informed they have all been met.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, again Canadians will not be happy with the fox writing his own rules when it comes to guarding the chicken house.

The Prime Minister and the defence minister clearly are putting their self-interests ahead of leading the Canadian military by failing to uphold ethical standards. By rewarding Joe Thornley and Stephanos Karabecos with lucrative contracts they have shown that they put their personal self-interests and financial betterment of friends above rank and file troops in our Canadian Armed Forces.

To demonstrate to members of the Canadian Armed Forces that their interests and their morale are paramount, will the government conduct an official review of the tendering process for the Thornley contract?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the allegations of the member opposite are simply incorrect.

Yesterday the Prime Minister indicated the number of contracts that have been allocated to people who were ex-candidates for the Reform Party. The criteria have to do with efficiency, ability to meet the requirements of the contract within the moneys allocated. This is what has been done.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the minister knows that he is clearly trying to confuse Canadians. He is comparing apples and oranges. We are talking about the executive branch of government issuing untendered contracts; leadership and responsibility with accountability, not interest at all costs.

While the defence minister was stuffing the pockets of his Liberal buddies, the family of Corporal Neil MacKinnon was trying in vain to find out exactly how its son was killed.

First, Mr. and Mrs. MacKinnon were lied to and then the lie was covered up for over a year. The command inspector will not be investigating this shameful incident. People have been charged in Corporal MacKinnon's death but no one is being held accountable for the lies his parents had to endure for over a year.

Why does the defence minister's leadership stop at the bank for his Liberal friends when it never made it to the home of Corporal Neil MacKinnon?

Mr. John Richardson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite has imputed a lot of motives. The facts do not flow directly or logically. He is trying to evolve a

web here that is so convoluted it is very difficult to answer his question.

Simply put, the accident that took place with Corporal McKinnon was a tragic accident. Upon its discovery, immediately the armed forces took forthwith a board of inquiry to get to the bottom of it. They have followed through to the very end with charges. People have been charged with negligence of duty. One cannot be more responsible than that.

* * *

[*Translation*]

JERUSALEM TUNNEL

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister.

The opening of the tunnel in Jerusalem sparked a wave of violence which so far has claimed nearly 100 casualties. In a situation where Jewish colonization has started again and negotiations on the definitive status of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip are threatened, the opening of this tunnel constitutes a genuine provocation that further compromises the peace process in the Middle East.

Could the Deputy Prime Minister indicate whether, as other governments have done, the Canadian government intends to ask Israel to close the tunnel in order to restore calm and thus contribute towards resumption of the peace process?

• (1135)

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister for International Co-operation and Minister responsible for Francophonie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada is very concerned about the surge of violence in the Gaza Strip and on the West Bank. I very much appreciate the concern shown by the hon. member of the opposition.

We are dismayed by the increasing number of casualties over the past few days. Canada is asking for an immediate ceasefire.

I can also inform you that today, the Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs is attending a special session of the UN Security Council on this important question. My colleague, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, will present Canada's position, which is to ask Israeli and Palestinian representatives to resume direct negotiations and take immediate steps to restore calm.

[*English*]

The minister also met with senior Israeli representatives yesterday in New York to press them to refrain from any pressures that may be unhelpful to the Middle East peace process. I can also inform the member that some senior officials from the Department of Foreign Affairs met yesterday in Ottawa and gave the same message.

*Oral Questions**[Translation]*

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister for International Co-operation just told us that the Canadian government, through the Minister of Foreign Affairs, intends to ask for a ceasefire. I asked a very specific question, namely whether he intends to ask for the tunnel to be closed.

Furthermore, does the minister also intend to support the request by Yasser Arafat for immediate intervention by the Security Council on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister for International Co-operation and Minister responsible for Francophonie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the presence of the Minister of Foreign Affairs before the UN Security Council today is very important, and at this time I would not wish to commit Canadian diplomacy as specifically as the hon. member for the opposition would have us do, since these discussions are now taking place in New York.

Consultations are proceeding at extremely important levels, and I believe we would not be acting very responsibly by making a commitment at the very moment the Security Council is discussing this question.

* * *

*[English]***QUEBEC**

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice is sending out some fairly confusing signals. Yesterday and today he suggested that Canadians would have a full voice on any developments surrounding the future of their country in the event of Quebec's secession. However, today he stopped short of saying that Canadians would be involved and have a voice in a referendum campaign in the event of Quebec's secession.

Is it the government's position that a full and meaningful voice would mean that they would have a vote in a referendum campaign?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have said time and again, even in the speech from the throne, that our commitment is quite clear. It is that if a third referendum is to be held in Quebec we will ensure that the choice is very clear: remaining in Canada or separating. There is no middle ground and no suggestion of partenariat or some association which is in someone's imagination. That is the first item.

Second, the consequences would be clear. Those voting in Quebec would know that they are choosing between Canada and something very different, which is separation.

Third, the process would be fair. Canadians would have a right to express themselves in seeking to persuade the population of Quebec to remain.

Fourth, no matter what the decision, Canadians everywhere would have a say in the future. This would mean that unilateral action, no matter what the result of the referendum, is illegal and unacceptable and following a referendum in Quebec when the population of Quebec expresses its view, all Canadians must then participate in determining where we go from there.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to get to is how would they have a say in where we go from there? I am going to push on to another question.

• (1140)

Reformers maintain that Quebecers have the right to decide whether to secede from Canada, but this does not imply the right of the Government of Quebec to unilaterally establish the terms and conditions of secession.

The only way to ensure that Canada's interests will be well represented in the event of secession is to pass contingency legislation laying out the terms and conditions of secession. Is the government willing to consider such legislation or is the Supreme Court reference the sum total of its plan B?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court reference is a response to issues raised by the Government of Quebec. It was Mr. Bouchard and his minister of justice who said that the courts have no role to play. When they raised that issue in the Bertrand litigation we went to that courtroom, persuaded the hon. Mr. Justice Pidgeon that, indeed, the courts do have a role to play. He said as much in his judgment of August 30. After that issue was determined, Mr. Bouchard and his minister of justice left the courtroom and abandoned the process.

We have now taken the very issues he has raised and put them before the Supreme Court of Canada. That is what this reference is about.

In a more direct response to the hon. member's question, the issue of contingency legislation was raised yesterday by his colleague, the hon. member for Calgary West. As I said then, a number of suggestions have been made in the public discussion about how we might approach this issue. They are all useful suggestions. That public discussion should continue. It is very valuable and we encourage it.

I am sure that through that discussion in which all Canadians are participating a number of valuable suggestions will arise and they shall all be considered.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

REVENUE CANADA

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

This government is collecting scandals the way some people collect stamps. After the family trust scandal, yesterday the auditor general condemned Revenue Canada for allowing several major corporations to avoid paying duties and excise taxes to the tune of some \$630 million a year.

Given that the time limit for a tax audit is four years, can the Deputy Prime Minister explain why Revenue Canada has conducted only one audit of all the major oil and tobacco companies, thus preventing the government from recovering several million of dollars with each audit?

Mrs. Sue Barnes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question.

[English]

I also want to thank the auditor general for bringing these issues to our attention.

I would first point out that in the year after the government took office, lost revenues due to smuggling decreased by two-thirds. That is a result of government initiatives. It is a big \$1 billion decrease.

During the time that the audit resources were reallocated into the anti-smuggling situation, all of the large industries were monitored. The department has recently completed several large oil company audits and the results confirm our risk assessments. The rate of compliance was excellent. It was in excess of 95 per cent.

[Translation]

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we have noticed that the government acts only when it has its back against the wall, as was the case with smuggling. Every day, the revenue minister is allowing hundreds of thousands of dollars or even millions in tax revenue to be lost. By not going after the \$630 million owed her department, the minister is making a royal gift to major corporations on the back of taxpayers.

What are the government and its minister waiting to take action?

[English]

Mrs. Sue Barnes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue these smuggling initiatives. In fact, it will be done department-wide. The assistant deputies are monitoring the situation and

working together. Not only that, it involves other jurisdictions. It involves the police forces and the RCMP.

• (1145)

We are doing very well. This is a criminal element in our society and we are going after that money. It is important work in our department and we will continue to do it well, so that instead of a \$1 billion decrease we look forward to getting rid of the extra \$500 million. We are working on that and we have the plan of action to complete.

* * *

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a document which appeared on a Liberal member's desk last Monday when the House was voting on the negative option bill. It appears to be on the letterhead of the Minister of Canadian Heritage. It says: "Government position on Bill C-216. Third reading. Government position: No".

It may be a forgery because the minister said outside the House that she had not tried in any way to influence the members of her caucus to vote the way that her department wanted to vote, which was against the consumer and in favour of the cable companies.

My question is very simple. Is this document a forgery or was her statement a forgery?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I answered that question yesterday, the day before and the day before.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, that is the problem. Her answers have been devoid of even the smallest particle of fact.

The issue is that on one side of the coin she is trying to imply to the Canadian people that the government is opposed to negative option billing; therefore, making the connection to this bill which is opposed to negative option billing as though she was supporting the bill, whereas, in fact, I have evidence that the government position was opposed to that bill. She is trying to have it both ways.

I ask her again, was her government in any way, shape or form trying to influence the members to vote against the negative option bill which was before the House, namely, Bill C-216?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me that for the last several days the member has raised the issue of negative option billing, implying that somehow the government supports it.

I have said from the beginning of this process, as was repeated in the House by every single member who spoke on the legislation, that the Government of Canada opposes negative option billing.

Oral Questions

We opposed negative option billing last year. We will oppose negative option billing next year. As long as we are the government there will be no negative option billing.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADA PENSION PLAN

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

The Canada Pension Plan legislation places considerable limits on the exchange of information between the various private and public benefit schemes for the disabled. The auditor general is of the opinion that increased circulation of information between private and public schemes would result in improved service to clients and reduced program costs.

Does the minister intend to amend the Canada Pension Plan in order to rectify the shortcomings in the present system and thus ensure that only those truly entitled to disability benefits actually receive them?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the auditor general's comments. I had an opportunity to meet with Mr. Desautels and to discuss his report.

Obviously, I and my departmental officials have a great deal of respect for the work that has been done on this issue. It is very complex. We undertook, in our response to the comments of the auditor general, to take the necessary action in order to try to be as effective as possible.

With all due respect to the auditor general, I wish to assure my hon. colleague that, when all is said and done, we are still very interested in ensuring that, where an error has been made, and errors are still made, we come down in favour of those applying for disability benefits, rather than taking a more stringent approach.

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the auditor general has noted that the government's reassessment activities are still falling short of the mark, despite the very firm recommendations he made in 1993.

When does the minister finally intend to take the necessary action so that only those who are eligible benefit from the public disability pension scheme?

• (1150)

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at the meeting of social services ministers in Victoria almost two weeks ago, we all agreed that one of the major problems facing the systems that manage the workers' compensation boards, the private insurance companies, as well as

the government of Canada, through the Canada Pension Plan, had to do with disability.

It is extremely difficult to define this whole question in absolute terms. There are many situations that are extremely complex from a medical point of view. But we undertook to try to work together, the private sector, the provincial governments—because they too have major problems with this—and the Government of Canada.

I hope that we will find solutions, but in the meantime we will continue to be effective and to protect the rights of the disabled.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Saint-Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board.

[English]

Yesterday the premier of Manitoba made some serious allegations concerning the federal government's response to the disastrous flooding of last spring.

Has there been a response to date and, if not, when will one be given?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all payments under the disaster financial assistance arrangements are made according to the same criteria and all the provinces are treated fairly and equitably.

The Manitoba government has already been paid advance payments of \$7 million for the 1993 floods. In July of this year we received a request from the Government of Manitoba telling us the amount of damages for the 1995 and 1996 floods but there was no request for an advance payment to be made and therefore no advance payment was made.

In this case, all the rules have been followed and Manitoba has been treated in a totally fair and equitable manner.

* * *

GUN REGISTRATION

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice on more than one occasion told members of the House he had consulted extensively with Canadians, including his provincial counterparts, regarding his gun registration bill, Bill C-68.

In view of the fact Ontario, Alberta, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and the Yukon have notified the minister they will be opting out of administering the new federal firearms' regulations and are launching a court challenge, does the minister still stand by those statements?

Oral Questions

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Of course I consulted, Mr. Speaker, closely and continuously. The fact that the attorneys general of some of those provinces did not like what was done does not mean they were not asked for their views and their views were listened to carefully.

The hon. member is factually wrong in saying that Ontario is opting out. As I understand its position, it is challenging the regime in court but it has not decided to opt out.

The fact is that there are some provincial governments who do not support gun control. That is the sad fact: some provincial governments do not support gun control. It is a good thing there is at least one level of government in this country that is prepared to represent the wishes of the vast majority of Canadians who stand up for gun control.

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is all provinces support crime control.

As a result of these court challenges the federal government will end up fighting these challenges using taxpayers' dollars, the same taxpayers' dollars which will be used by the provinces and the same taxpayers' dollars the federal government will need in its out of court settlements for the Pearson airport deal and the Airbus fiasco.

I ask the minister this. Have the court bills been tallied?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants to save us some money perhaps he can speak to his friends in the Alberta government and have them drop the lawsuit.

I read in this morning's newspaper that the attorney general of Alberta gives himself a 50:50 chance. It is for the courts to decide. We have to respect the role of the courts.

I will say this. I am very confident. From the federal perspective it looks a lot better than 50:50. Let me say that this is on the part of my hon. friend just another shot in the dark.

* * *

● (1155)

[Translation]

THE CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this morning, six Quebec associations of artists-composers-performers and record producers joined their Canadian colleagues to ask the Minister of Canadian Heritage to withdraw the licences granted by the CRTC to DMX Canada and Power Music Choice.

As the minister admitted herself that the terms of those licences did not comply with Canadian standards on Canadian and franco-phone content, will she have the courage to cancel these licences?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the member shows some interest in Canadian content because that issue concerns us all. The question he raises is now being studied by Cabinet, and therefore I cannot comment any further.

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): Mr. Speaker, you know quite well the Canadian content includes 25 per cent French channels. That is very important. In the case we are concerned with, Mrs. Barshefsky, the U.S. Secretary of State for Trade, has asked her Canadian counterpart to take steps so that DMX can operate in Canada under the conditions agreed to by the CRTC and thus to ensure, without saying it in so many words, that this issue does not become an irritant between the two governments.

Concerning the intervention from the U.S. Secretary of State for Trade, what weight does the minister intend to give this request?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ensure the House that the Government of Canada is very concerned with protecting Canadian culture. That is why we are making representations to the World Trade Organization to protect Canadian publications.

As for the issue raised by the hon. member, he knows very well the matter is before cabinet and the deadline for a decision is October 22.

* * *

[English]

CANADA COMMUNICATION GROUP

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Reform believes that government operations should not compete directly with the private sector and supports the privatization of services offered in the private sector at an equal and competitive rate.

We now understand that the new buyers of the Canada Communication Group will get special access to lucrative federal contracts that bypass the bidding process. Privatization should save money, not cost taxpayers more.

My question is for the minister of public works. How can the minister guarantee to Canadians that the government will get the best deal on printing contracts if contracts are not awarded through an open, competitive bidding process?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the minister, I can point out to the hon.

Oral Questions

member that there are times when the standard procedure of open competitive bidding, which is the general policy of the government, has to be varied by reason, for example, of some trade mark or copyright.

They require standardization of equipment that can only be obtained from one supplier. In addition, there may be other reasons of a similar nature. I can only assure him that our general policy is, of course, open and competitive bidding.

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we are talking about integrity of government. That is one of the lamest answers we have come across in quite a while.

I have been part of the government operations committee looking into the open bidding system. This has nothing to do with open bidding. This has to do with giving a lucrative contract to one special segment. The government has sold the corporation to the employees and are now giving the employees special access. This is not open government.

My question, again, is for the minister of public works. Will the minister guarantee that the private sector will not be put at an unfair disadvantage and allow all companies a fair chance to bid on all government contracts above \$30,000, as required by Treasury Board guidelines?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a little difficulty with the hon. member's supplementary. The first question was about open bidding. In the supplementary he is not talking about it.

What I would like to point out to him is that it is simply not possible in a complex system such as the federal government to make such totally sweeping guarantees.

• (1200)

For example, if we have computer software of a particular type, it is not possible to open it up to open bidding to companies that could not supply that product because of copyright infringement problems. There has to be some give and take.

In addition, there have to be some elements, which are successor contracts, where we already have developed a system in place. To throw out existing work and start completely afresh every time a new contract may come down on a program would simply be bad business management and exactly the opposite of what the private sector would want this government to do when it protects taxpayer dollars.

* * *

HONG KONG

Mr. John English (Kitchener, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for Asia-Pacific.

A large number of my constituents are of Hong Kong origin and are deeply concerned that they must return to Hong Kong before July 1, 1997 to maintain their permanent resident status. Many of them use that status to build trade links with Canada.

What is the Government of Canada doing to address this concern of these constituents about Hong Kong permanent resident status?

Hon. Raymond Chan (Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question.

There is a lot of concern among Canadians of Hong Kong origin that in order to maintain their permanent resident status in Hong Kong they were asked to return to Hong Kong by July 1. But their concern is with how long they have to stay after that and how long before they have to be in Hong Kong. Does it mean that all Hong Kong residents who have foreign visas or who have foreign citizenship status have to remain stagnant in Hong Kong after July 1, before they register?

I expressed that concern to the foreign affairs minister of China when he visited Canada last week. He agreed to look into the matter and give us a decision in the near future.

* * *

[Translation]

RETURNING OFFICERS

Mr. Stéphan Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

This summer in my riding, the government appointed Noël Girard, the defeated Liberal candidate in the 1993 general election, to the position of returning officer.

Does the Deputy Prime Minister not think that the time has come to modernize the rules for selecting returning officers and to put in place, as Quebec did, a system in which returning officers are chosen by competition based on their qualifications rather than their political affiliation?

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the hon. member that all appointments are made by the governor in council and that this has been the practice for years. All appointments are made based on qualifications and not on political affiliation.

Now if the hon. member wants to recommend certain people, he should submit his recommendations to the governor in council.

Routine Proceedings

[English]

BUSINESS CONTRACTS

Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Cooperation.

When Markham Electric bid on a Caribbean development contract in Belize it underbid its two main competitors by a very large amount. Markham has been arbitrarily excluded by this minister from bidding on a contract in Mali and guess what? Those two high priced competitors are on the minister's list.

Since the minister's policy is clearly to favour Quebec companies, my question is how much does his preferential treatment for his few hand picked buddy-buddy firms cost the Canadian taxpayer?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the persistence of this Reform member to always come back to one single issue.

He knows very well that I have toured Canada. I went from coast to coast last July. I organized seminars and did business with CIDA as it had never been done before in such a professional, clear way.

We want to provide the Canadian International Development Agency with the best expertise that exists in Canada. There are members in the west who are extremely pleased. If I could cite a small but important quote, the president of Agriteam Canada Consulting Ltd., Bob Francis, said: "As a western firm, we find CIDA is like any other client. If you do your homework, submit first rate proposals and have people on the ground to sell your product where the decisions are being made, you get fair consideration. We at Agriteam Canada are definitely westerners, yet we have won a number of CIDA contracts. We do not do it by crapping on Quebec. We do it by showing that we have more to offer than firms from Quebec or Ontario". That is the way it works.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

● (1205)

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 30th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

If the House gives its consent, later this day I will move concurrence in the report.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I also have the honour to present the 31st report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the membership of certain committees.

With the consent of the House, I will move concurrence in this report later today.

[English]

Mr. Speaker, I move that the 31st report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, presented to the House earlier this day, be concurred.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That notwithstanding any Standing Order the House shall not sit on Friday, October 25, 1996.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

PETITIONS

DEFICIT REDUCTION AND JOB CREATION

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (York North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present to the House two petitions signed by residents of York North.

The subject matter of the two petitions is closely related, as they deal with deficit reduction and job creation, the top two priorities of the government.

The first petition draws the attention of the House to the government's red book commitment to reduce the deficit to 3 per cent of the GDP and the fact that we have surpassed that goal.

The petitioners call on Parliament to continue to keep its commitment to Canadians and pursue its deficit action so that the government will reach its deficit target of 2 per cent of GDP by 1997-98.

● (1210)

Mr. Speaker, the second petition draws to the attention of the House that in the past year alone short term interest rates have declined three percentage points and that for the last two and a half years inflation has averaged less than 2 per cent and that by 1997-98 the federal deficit will have been reduced by \$25 billion.

The petitioners further draw to the attention of the House that since this Liberal government took office over 600,000 jobs have been created. The petitioners therefore call on Parliament to work diligently to create a healthy environment for jobs and economic growth.

Government Orders

TERMS OF UNION

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from a group of residents from Manitoba stating their disapproval of a constitutional amendment to term 17 of the Terms of Union between Newfoundland and Labrador and Canada.

These petitioners are concerned that this action might set a precedent for permitting any provincial government to suppress the rights of minorities.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Stan Keyes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

CANADA MARINE ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak on Bill C-44, the Canada Marine Act.

I will take a moment, of course, to state the purpose of Bill C-44 and discuss some concerns the Bloc Québécois has regarding this bill as well as amendments that will need to be made at a later stage, when the bill comes up for further consideration at committee.

Bill C-44 implements the national marine policy the federal government had announced back in December 1995. Naturally, it will apply to the whole marine industry in Canada and Quebec. The four main areas affected are ports operated by Transport Canada, law enforcement in Canadian ports, pilotage and, finally, the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway system.

Let us now look at each of these areas individually. As far as the ports are concerned, this bill provides for the establishment of the Canada Port Authority to replace the Canada Ports Corporation.

There are questions and concerns about law enforcement in Canadian ports, as we remain in the dark about the government's true intentions as to what is to happen to the police force which is

currently comprised of about 100 constables and 30 civilians. Maintaining this force cost approximately \$9.6 million in 1995. Further explanations are required concerning the future of law enforcement in these ports.

As for the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway, the government intends, of course, to pursue the commercialization of operations, and the bill provides the authority to do so.

The fourth element concerns the issue of pilotage. From now on, operations will be much more efficient, since public funding will no longer be available. The bill provides that Transport Canada will have to report to Parliament before December 31, 1998, regarding the review of the following issues: compulsory pilotage area designations, cost reduction measures, pilot certification process for masters and officers, and licensing requirements for pilots.

This is, in short, what is to be found in the bill. As for us, Bloc Québécois members, we feel that the title of the bill somewhat exceeds its content. The bill is called the Canada Marine Act, but it is silent on shipbuilding, shipyards, and the merchant navy. It is not as complete as it could be.

• (1215)

It would have been interesting to find out about the government's intentions regarding these issues and to see them included in the Canada Marine Act, so as to have a global picture. This is only wishful thinking, but who knows, perhaps the government will provide more details in the subsequent stages of the review of the bill.

We also have to conclude that the government failed, when we look at the shipping policy of the past 20 years. Over the years, some \$7 billion, in current dollars, were invested in the St. Lawrence Seaway, while annual revenues generated by the seaway are of the order of \$70 million. Since that was not a huge success, they are now dismantling the whole thing, privatizing it, etc.

This is due mainly to the financial situation of the government who now realizes that, these last few years, it did not play such an efficient role as a promoter in this field, as in, might I add, many other transportation areas. Just consider the trend in the Department of Transportation these last few years. It was the same thing with the deregulation of air transportation, the dismantling of the rail industry and now, it is the shipping industry.

It is somewhat amazing that a country—made out of two countries—such as Canada, which covers a huge territory has not been able to better define all of its transportation policies. It is also disappointing to see that a such a vast country, where there is road, rail, sea and air transportation, could not become a leader or a role model in efficiency.

I want to point out that the Bloc Québécois has always supported a disposition policy and the commercialization of harbours and ports. We did mention it in the minority report of the Bloc Québécois concerning the maritime strategy tabled in May 1995.

Government Orders

The commercialization of harbours and ports raised some concerns in every region, but maybe more so in areas like mine, where there are recreation harbours. The same question always comes back: "In what shape will they be handed over to the local authorities? In what shape are they now? In what condition will they be handed over?" We are told of a \$125 million fund, which should be used to refurbish the ports and, in some cases, the cost could be negotiated differently depending on the port's condition.

This is not a very clear policy. We know that when criteria are rather fuzzy funds are often allocated to the ones who press harder. Often decisions are political and not necessarily based on considerations of efficiency when there are no clear, definite and well understood criteria.

Thus, there are concerns because many sites have not been properly maintained throughout the years. All regional and local disparities must also be taken into account. We must show respect and make sure that we have a system of ports that is adequate as a whole. When the amounts will be affected or negotiated for the management transfer to local organizations or companies, we must ensure that the system remains adequate as a whole.

I find it rather disturbing that at the beginning this process will be somewhat haphazard as was the case for the commercialization of airports. There will be a problem because obviously things will not proceed as fast in one place as it will in another. This is not the model to apply to sea transportation. We have reasons to worry, since the same department is involved.

There is a factor which is surprising from the logical point of view but not from the political one. In the last few years, as everybody knows, the federal government has come to realize that it can no longer afford to provide the same level of service, but it nevertheless tries to keep the same level of control.

This is why paragraphs *a*) and *e*) of clause 12(1) provide that the federal government has one representative on each of the boards. Pursuant to this clause, the federal government can also appoint other individuals in consultation with the users.

• (1220)

But the government, in consulting, does not have to follow up on the recommendations of the stakeholders. Obviously, an exception is made for directors representing the municipalities or the provinces, but we can see that the federal government will have one direct representative and will appoint other representatives. As is usually the case, these people will certainly have views that are compatible with the government's. Thus, the government is keeping a high level of control.

It is always somewhat surprising and somewhat irritating to see a government investing less and less money but keeping the same level of control.

If the government wants to decentralize and to have local management because it is more efficient, etc., why does it impose, on a board of directors, people that are appointed through a political process? Often these people are local friends of the government who are there to ensure that the government's views will prevail on these boards of directors.

We have seen this in several other cases, and it is very disturbing and disappointing for the people in the regions who realize that this decentralization is sort of artificial. The government is decentralizing the financial problems but is keeping control over the decision-making process.

There is a last point I want to mention. The members of the Bloc Québécois have suggestions and recommendations to make with regard to the Pilotage Act. I cannot elaborate on that at this moment since my time is running out, but I am sure the members who represent us on the transport committee will do it adequately.

In general, this bill contains some interesting elements, but it needs a lot of improvements. We need to have complete and effective decentralization, which means, among other things, that situations as the one described in section 12 must be avoided.

Corrections will have to be made to this bill and, once this is done, we will be able to judge if it is a good or a bad piece of legislation.

[English]

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments regarding Bill C-44 as it pertains to Port Alberni, which is in my riding. It is one of the six recognized ports on the west coast.

I met with the harbour commission about a month ago. It had some major concerns regarding the legislation. The difficulty, it would appear, is that this legislation will treat Vancouver, which is a huge port, similar to a smaller port such as Port Alberni.

Alberni has an operating budget of \$3 million to \$4 million. It has operated with a very small profit for the last eight years. In other words, it is not a burden. It is on a user pay system. It is working. The Port Alberni Harbour Commission is working well. It serves the community. It does not cost the taxpayers any money. However, this legislation will change all that.

I have to return to the analogy of treating a huge port like Vancouver similarly to a smaller port such as Alberni. It is the panty hose solution, one size fits all. In this case it will not work.

It would appear that the problem goes back to when the legislation was drawn up. It was drawn up by bureaucrats before there was consultation. Yes, a committee will do a cross Canada tour, but the bureaucrats have now got themselves into a position where they are backed up against a wall, defending legislation

Government Orders

which will not fly. Why do we have to have this kind of situation where the bureaucrats draw up the legislation before there is nationwide consultation to get the information which is required to write good legislation?

I hope when the committee travels across Canada that the representations from the different ports and boards will be listened to.

That brings up another point. It is really odd in the Canadian system that a committee is not tied to a minister. A committee can come up with some wonderful recommendations, good legislation, which the minister can then totally ignore if he or she chooses to do so. That is wrong.

• (1225)

I hope that the committee listens well, makes good recommendations and furthermore that the minister and the bureaucracy also listen and come up with legislation that fits all the ports across this country and does the job that we require.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to Bill C-44, the short title of which is Canada Marine Act. This bill is crucially important for the future of shipping and the survival of ports and harbours in Canada and Quebec.

First, allow me to point out that in all matters concerning transportation in general, the way the government works is to harm regions, legislate in a piecemeal manner, without measuring the impact its legislations will have once in force.

During last spring's debate on Bill C-20, many members wondered about the impact of the privatization of air navigation services on remote regions. We were not against the principle of privatizing these services, but we thought that it should not be done in the sole perspective of deficit reduction and by dumping the problems and costs in the local stakeholders' backyard.

In the same vein, Coast Guard fees for services, such as ice breaking and dredging, are likely to hinder the competitiveness of Quebec's ports. Again, the federal government's main thrust is the fight against the deficit and this, at all cost, at the expense of the true interests of Canadians and Quebecers. That jobs could be jeopardized does not seem to carry much weight in this government's political choices.

The same can be said today about Bill C-44. First, in spite of its title, the bill does not propose any kind of shipbuilding or merchant marine development strategy. Instead of development, it seems that, once again, under the pretence of streamlining operations and

improving services, the government has only one thing in mind: to dump its deficit onto the provinces, municipalities and local stakeholders.

The bill's main objective is to commercialize port services by getting rid of the present Canada Ports Corporation and replacing it by Canadian port authorities.

The Bloc Québécois is not opposed to a policy to divest itself of ports and harbours by commercializing them. In fact, local stakeholders would probably be able to manage those facilities much more efficiently than the federal government did until now. Indeed if we look at the last 20 years of federal management of ports and harbours, we can only come to the conclusion that there have been an excessive bureaucratization which resulted in unreasonable costs and inefficient management of facilities.

The St. Lawrence Seaway, for example, received \$7 billion in investments over the years but generates only \$70 million in revenues annually for a traffic of only half that of 1970. There are 324 commercial ports and harbours in Canada.

Right now, 90 percent of the commercial maritime traffic transits through 45 of these ports. Obviously the federal government must withdraw from the management of that sector, but not any which way.

In the bill before us today, we see that the Canada Ports Corporation will be replaced by Canadian ports authorities or CPAs. These CPAs will manage the port facilities, but the federal government will keep ownership of the lands and facilities. That is to say that the government will withdraw from the fiscal aspect while keeping its control since it will have a representative on all CPA boards.

• (1230)

We can understand that this government is trying once more to avoid its financial responsibilities while keeping all its powers. When this government talks about decentralisation, we must understand that in reality it wants to decentralise its debt. When it talks about involving local stakeholders, we must understand that their main role will be to pay the bills while being forced to abide by federal standards.

Criteria are also being established for ports do be designated CPAs. Applications made by ports will thus be evaluated under the following criteria provided in clause 6: first, the port is, and is likely to remain, financially self-sufficient; second, the port is of strategic significance to Canada's trade; third, it is linked to major rail lines or a major highway infrastructure; and fourth, it has diversified traffic.

Only ports respecting those criteria will be designated as CPAs. As I said earlier, the federal government is withdrawing from the financial area but it wants to hang on to control of CPA administration.

Of greatest concern is the fate of ports which cannot become CPAs. The government is taking its time: it allows itself six years to dispose of those ports. This delay will therefore create some insecurity in Canada as well as in Quebec. Actually, the federal government has neglected the maintenance of the ports and most of them are in poor condition. They will need substantial repairs. Therefore, several ports probably will be left out of the running and will not have the status of port authorities, unless municipalities and provinces invest significant funds for their rehabilitation.

Again, under the cover of decentralization, the federal government is passing the bill on to other levels of government. It would be more honest on the part of the federal government to rehabilitate those port facilities before their transfer given the fact that their deterioration is the result of lack of maintenance by the government.

Although the Bloc Québécois is not against the principle of privatizing port facilities, we will vote against this bill just because the government is not proceeding in the right way. This bill needs major amendments in order to meet the different needs of port localities and regions.

To this government, decentralization of powers seems to mean only decentralization of the debt, a debt which results from a poor management on its part. The impact of this bill in its present form, combined with the new fee structure for Coast Guard services, will come down hard on a number of municipalities, in both Canada and Quebec, which rely on commercial shipping. The government does not seem to be taking this into consideration.

We will therefore try to see that the Liberal government assesses the real consequences of its policies—policies which may be costly to the people of Canada and of Quebec.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those opposed will please say nay.

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (1235)

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the division stands deferred until Monday, September 30, 1996 at the regular time of adjournment.

I have a problem, but it is my problem, not yours. It is true that the assistant whip of the government rose to request the floor. I understand that the representative of the official opposition was already at the table. I will respect the tradition of the House and give the floor to the hon. member who was already standing.

I hope this will not complicate matters, and maybe they were both seeking the same solution. The assistant whip of the Government has the floor.

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am going to solve your problem.

[English]

I think if you were to seek it you would find unanimous consent of the House to present a motion to further defer the vote until Tuesday at the end of Government Orders. If there is consent I will gladly defer to the whip of the opposition party to present the motion.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): How co-operative!

[English]

I think possibly this will resolve the matter.

[Translation]

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, here is proof that common sense will always lead to some agreement. Of course we would be delighted if the division were held on Tuesday, if the House agrees.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Does the House agree that the vote will be deferred until Tuesday?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

[Translation]

MANGANESE-BASED FUEL ADDITIVES ACT

The House resumed from Wednesday, September 25, 1996, consideration of the motion that Bill C-29, an Act to regulate interprovincial trade in and the importation for commercial pur-

Government Orders

poses of certain manganese-based substances, be read the third time and passed and of the amendment.

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I think today is my lucky day. I am very pleased to speak on third reading of Bill C-29, formerly Bill C-94, an Act to regulate interprovincial trade in and the importation for commercial purposes of certain manganese-based substances. The immediate purpose of Bill C-29 is to ban the addition of MMT to unleaded gasoline in Canada by prohibiting the importation of that substance.

Over the last few years, environmental concerns have become more present in our daily lives and are important for the citizens we represent, particularly those living in big cities, who call for an ever healthier environment. They want standards to be established not only to further reduce pollution, but also to improve the overall quality of the environment.

Therefore, it is legitimate for the government to act in order to protect people's health and to legislate on the issue of dangerous substances contributing to the deterioration of the global environment.

• (1240)

However, the bill before us today does not stem from a desire to protect the environment or public health. Instead, it seems motivated more by a desire to meet the expectations of the automotive industry and those of Ontario corn growers who hope to see a whole new market develop for them, that of ethanol, an additive made from corn, which could eventually replace MMT.

This bill came about in 1994, it must be remembered, thanks to a powerful lobby of automobile manufacturers. According to them, MMT, a substance that has been added to unleaded gasoline since 1977, causes damage to the pollution control equipment in automobiles and is detrimental to public health.

It goes without saying that car manufacturers are quite opposed to the addition of additives to gasoline, be it MMT or any other substance.

Faced with a threat by car manufacturers to raise the price of cars in Canada and limit their warranty if the practice of adding MMT to gasoline continued, the environment minister of the day, the current Deputy Prime Minister, caved in and introduced Bill C-94, which eventually became Bill C-29.

For us, at second reading, this bill is still raising the same questions. We voted in favour of this legislation so that the two major stakeholders in this debate on banning MMT could present their respective point of view. These stakeholders are the car manufacturers and the oil industry, especially the Ethyl Corporation, the only company to produce and export MMT to Canada.

We hoped that the Standing Committee on the Environment would conduct an in-depth review based on studies by both parties concerned.

Already then, it was obvious that the former environment minister was not taking into account studies showing that MMT was not a threat to public health. Indeed, in a study dated December 6, 1994, Health Canada concluded that MMT was not a health hazard. Obviously, any substance added to gasoline is, to a certain extent, a pollutant as is gasoline. But for Health Canada, MMT in itself is clearly not a health hazard.

In the United States, the automobile industry has had to reconsider its position on MMT as a result of a decision by an American court to the effect that the ban on MMT had to be lifted for lack of conclusive evidence of any harmful effect on antipollution devices.

Indeed, in its decision, the United States court of appeal for the District of Columbia pointed out the lack of evidence in the arguments made by supporters of a ban on MMT, and I quote: "Concerning the arguments presented by the American Automobile Manufacturer's Association to challenge the finding of the Environmental Protection Agency that MMT does not affect either partially or totally the functioning of the emission system of vehicles, the American court has deemed these arguments unfounded. First of all, the court pointed out that the agency had established the Ethyl additive had easily passed the tests required for all the most severe investigations ever conducted".

It must be kept in mind that, in April 1995, this same court made a decision rejecting the claims of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to the effect MMT was harmful to health, even though the Agency recognized MMT was not playing any role in the deterioration of pollution control equipment.

Therefore, it is more than likely MMT will be reintroduced in the United States, and very rapidly so.

The oil companies favour the use of additives in gasoline. According to some data, MMT added to gasoline would help reduce nitric oxide emissions, which are harmful to the environment and one of the causes of urban smog.

• (1245)

From the hearings of the Standing Committee on Environment, it has not been shown, on the basis of scientific studies, that MMT is a toxic substance and a risk to public health. It has not been demonstrated either that MMT is harmful to pollution control equipment in automobiles. Furthermore, the objective of harmonizing our gasoline policies with those of the United States does not hold any more since the ban on MMT was lifted by our neighbours to the South, which makes possible the addition of MMT in gasoline in the United States.

In fact, what this bill is proposing us, is to comply with the requests of the automobile industry. As I said earlier, at the present time, nothing argues for the banning of MMT. If MMT has such a detrimental effect on public health in general, it should have been banned by Health Canada or under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. What this bill proposes is not to ban MMT as a product but to ban the importation and interprovincial trade of this substance.

What are the consequences of this trade ban? First of all, it must be pointed out that Ethyl, an American corporation, is the only company that manufactures this product and exports it to Canada. The plant importing it, which is located in Ontario, mixes MMT with other fuel additives. These products are then shipped to refineries. Under this bill, which bans interprovincial trade in and the importation of MMT without banning its use or production, if the Ethyl corporation ever built an MMT manufacturing plant and set up the distribution of this substance in every province and territory, unleaded gasoline produced across Canada could still contain MMT. I am not an expert in this area, but I think we would be deluding ourselves if we believed that the real purpose of this bill is to protect public health and the environment.

Nothing in this bill would prevent the scenario I just described from becoming reality, because MMT has not been banned. This is a rather extraordinary way to deal with a substance which, in the opinion of the Minister of the Environment and the Deputy Prime Minister, is deleterious to the health of Canadians and Quebecers.

At a time when businesses are looking to rationalize their operations, it would be rather surprising for Ethyl to decide to open plants in every province and territory of Canada. This means that, under Bill C-29, it will be forced to shut down its operations in Canada.

Some 40 jobs would be lost if the plant in Ontario closed. Also, MMT no longer being available, oil companies would have to change their refining and production methods.

The oil industry estimates that it would cost close to \$100 million to produce gasoline that is equally performant without MMT, as a result of this bill. This extra cost will inevitably make the price of gas at the pump go up. As usual, consumers will pay for this initiative, not to mention the potential job losses resulting from this price increase.

We have come across another possible effect a few weeks ago. On September 10, feeling aggrieved by this ban on MMT exports to Canada, Ethyl gave notice of its intention to file a complaint under the North American Free Trade Agreement.

The company argues that Bill C-29 is in conflict with certain provisions of NAFTA, as the subject-matter of the ban is not the product itself but its import. As was pointed out, the production, sale and use of MMT are not prohibited. As a result of such

Government Orders

contraventions of NAFTA, Ethyl will sustain damages, actually more than \$200 million American, or nearly \$275 million Canadian, in loss of revenue.

Questioned on this in the House last Wednesday, the Minister of the Environment insisted this bill was essential to protect both the environment and the health of Canadians. In light of the consequences this bill will have, we can only doubt his sincerity and, consequently, vote against the bill.

• (1250)

Again, not only did the federal government encroach on provincial jurisdictions by legislating in interprovincial trade, but it also ignored the opposition to Bill C-29 expressed by the provinces.

Last May 1, Quebec's legislature unanimously passed a resolution requesting the postponement of federal Bill C-29 concerning gasoline additive, MMT, as long as environmental studies had not been conducted in a properly scientific manner.

As always, the Liberal government turns a deaf ear to the requests from Quebec and the other provinces that the minister withdraw the bill in order to examine its real impact and what is really at stake.

When this government decided to interfere in interprovincial trade and ignore the pleas of the provinces, it demonstrated once again how it really sees co-operation between the federal government and the provinces. Its idea of co-operative federalism is to wax eloquent on federal-provincial agreements, and then keep moving in on provincial jurisdiction constantly breaking its promises.

For these reasons, the Bloc Quebecois is once again asking the minister to postpone passage of this bill. The environment and the health of our fellow Canadians are too important to simply be used to further the expectations of the strong lobby of Ontario's motor vehicle manufacturers and corn producers.

[English]

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed in the Bloc member's argument. To use provincial versus federal technical arguments about jurisdiction with respect to an issue which involves the health of all Canadians strikes me as a very dangerous approach.

We are getting close to the end of the debate on this legislation which will effectively ban manganese in gasoline in Canada. I would remind the member opposite that manganese is a heavy metal. It gets into the environment. Once it is in the environment, in the ecosystem, it stays there.

The hon. member says that there are doubts. Very often in scientific studies it is difficult to prove something absolutely conclusively. If there are doubts about something that might be poisoning our children in the same way as years ago there were

Government Orders

doubts about lead, which was in gasoline, and how it affected us and our children, then we should err on the side of safety. Eventually it was proven that lead affects us and our children and legislation was passed, but that was after generations of young people had grown up and their brains had been affected by the lead. Use the precautionary principle and vote for this legislation.

I have spoken twice at some length in parts of this debate and I do not want to repeat all of those arguments. However, I rise now to point out to the member that in my riding of Peterborough we have many workers who work at the General Motors plants in Oshawa. They have come to me and explained very carefully the proven impact of manganese on the on-board emission control systems which are going into the modern vehicles they are producing and which they have to sell abroad competitively.

These automobiles are being produced with \$2,000 or \$3,000 worth of emission controls and we are filling them up with gasoline which has manganese in it. First of all, we damage these expensive items in our cars and then, because these systems control all the pollutants and not just manganese going into the environment, we damage the control systems. As a result we allow pollutants of all sorts which are in gasoline to get into the environment. This is not the case in the United States.

• (1255)

To the auto workers in my riding I would say this: The Canadian Automobile Association in my riding and nationally, which represents all the motorists in Canada, wants Bill C-29 to go through. The auto parts manufacturers, the people who make the computer-like emission control devices, want it to go through. That is in addition to all the people who are interested in the health of Canadians and to all of the people who are interested in the environment.

I would be most grateful if the member would search her heart and not use these technical, legal matters because of her position with respect to the separation of Quebec in an area which affects the health and environment of all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: Mr. Speaker, I listened to what my colleague had to say with great interest. However, I totally disagree with him when he compares lead to manganese.

I began to study nursing forty years ago, in a pediatric hospital. Forty years, that is quite a long time ago. There were no anti-pollution systems at that time. Forty years ago, children were being admitted to hospitals with lead induced encephalitis. Therefore, lead toxicity was already a recognized phenomenon.

As far as manganese is concerned, at present there is no evidence to show that it poses any threat to public health. Granted, all of the heavy metals are dangerous. Copper is dangerous, but we have some in our system. If we had to remove everything that is dangerous, there would be nobody left on the planet.

The arguments made by my colleague to the effect that plant workers are convinced that the anti-pollution systems are greatly affected by manganese in fuel, are something that I can understand, coming from these workers, but we must also look at rulings, especially by U.S. courts, to the effect that this has nothing to do with deterioration of anti-pollution systems.

Everybody looks to his own interests. In itself, that is not surprising. But I do not think that we should use the excuse of public health to support the interests of powerful lobbyists. I believe that the role of a government whether federal or provincial, is to look after the well-being of its citizens, all of them, and not to privilege one group in particular.

[*English*]

Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose. Just as in the case of Bill S-9, the alternative fuels act, we have 295 members of Parliament, most of whom are technological illiterates, attempting to referee between two powerful corporate lobbies. The cabinet is divided, but the government, for whatever reason, is going to persist in ploughing ahead with this legislation.

The red herring of health effects keeps being mentioned. It was brought up during questions and comments after the last speaker.

I would like to quote from the health protection branch of Health and Welfare Canada, which in 1992 issued a paper on the health impact of MMT. It concluded that based on current evidence, experts at Health and Welfare Canada are confident that the risk to human health from MMT derived manganese is extremely small. There is clearly a wide margin of safety between the current intake of manganese from MMT and the lowest concentrations of air-borne manganese known to cause any health effects.

• (1300)

Let us be clear. We are not here debating a health issue, we are here debating a dispute between two industrial sectors, the automotive manufacturers on one hand and the petroleum producers on the other. It has absolutely nothing to do with health.

I understand that the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association came to the government requesting that legislation be introduced to ban MMT. It claims it causes problems to its onboard diagnostic systems, which I will hereafter refer to as OBDs.

Government Orders

The government claims it has attempted to negotiate some sort of a settlement between the automobile and petroleum industries. However, the former environment minister, who happened to represent an industrial area in southern Ontario, promised a ban on MMT before any fruitful talks could even take place. Clearly this has prejudiced any negotiations from the outset.

To encourage the government to move forward with legislation the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association informed the government that if MMT is not removed from gasoline its members will void warranties for new model cars, thereby inconveniencing thousands of Canadians who become car owners. And to ensure its point is appreciated and to exert a little bit of blackmail pressure, the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association has threatened to charge Canadian consumers an additional \$3,000 per car to offset the costs associated with OBD warranty claims.

The Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association claims that it can validate its allegation that MMT causes malfunctions of its OBD systems. However, it will not make its research publicly available for review. It is worth noting that a U.S. court of appeals has stated that the automakers evidence, whatever it is, has not come close to refuting the Environmental Protection Agency's claim that MMT does not contribute to or cause the failure of OBD systems.

The claim that MMT negatively affects the functioning of OBDs in Canada has to be questioned given that the automakers have long been experiencing similar problems in the United States where until last year MMT was banned. So in the absence of MMT the car companies in the United States have fingered a very wide and diverse range of culprits for their problems. And these include sulphur in the fuel, which I suspect is probably the major one, cold weather, high altitude and road conditions.

Are we going to have the government taking action on these fronts as well? We could get our national highway system fixed up a bit, and a lot of Canadians would really appreciate a federal ban on cold winter weather.

The Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association has also succeeded in creating the impression with some of our hon. colleagues that the failure of OBD systems contributes to increased air pollution. That is false. OBDs are monitoring systems. They have nothing to do with the actual emissions of the automobile. So it has been necessary for the car makers, in order to cover their own failings in the design of their OBDs, to link this problem to the environment because otherwise they would not have got through the doors of the various Liberal ministers responsible. We had Liberal ministers of the environment introducing some very ill conceived legislation.

In theory one would expect that a minister of the environment would have very little in common with automobile manufacturers. After all, what is the leading cause of smog? It is the automobile. If we take MMT out of automobile fuels, we will have more smog. That, at least, is beyond scientific dispute.

• (1305)

On the other side of this issue there is the petroleum industry, which uses MMT to boost octane to make a cleaner burning gasoline, and there are the producers of MMT. They dispute the claims of the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association and point to scientific research done in the United States as part of one of the most extensive testing programs to date conducted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The EPA test results demonstrated conclusively that MMT in gasoline does not cause or contribute to the failure of any emission control device or system.

The Canadian Petroleum Products Institute, which represents the majority of petroleum refining and marketing entities in Canada, has stated that it is strongly opposed to the proposed ban and has made efforts to have the Minister of the Environment see its perspective on this issue.

Here it is, two of the most powerful corporate lobbies in Canada both fighting for the attention of the minister on this issue, both presenting scientific data. We do not know really how much of the scientific data are valid because we have not properly addressed the issue.

The committee is where this should be dealt with. There should be a lot of witnesses coming in. We should not be jumping into this with both feet and playing favourites between these two groups of corporate giants.

The Canadian Petroleum Products Institute wants the Minister of the Environment to allow industry, both parties, to examine the effects of MMT through a facts based joint assessment conducted by impartial scientific observers. The minister has ignored calls for an independent testing program and is still forging ahead with this legislation.

I fail to understand how the Minister of the Environment and his colleagues can justify taking our time to review a situation when what obviously needs to happen is that the Canadian Petroleum Products Institute and the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association should solve their own problems between them. We do not need government intervention on this.

Why does the government, specifically the Minister of the Environment, feel so compelled to get involved in an industry dispute? If the government decided that it did have to intervene, one would at least have expected that it would do so based on scientific facts and not pander to either one political lobby or the other.

If we are going to restrict interprovincial trade, which is very deeply embedded in this legislation, one would have thought that the provinces would have been consulted. Seven provinces, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Newfoundland, are all resoundingly opposed to this bill. Rather than creating green grass, the environment minister

Government Orders

seems to be expanding his turf war with the provinces by pushing ahead with Bill C-29.

I would like to quote briefly from examples of some of the provincial opposition. A letter dated May 14 from Premier Klein of Alberta said: "I am deeply troubled about the unilateral manner in which this issue was decided and implemented. There is a need for strong federal-provincial agreement and co-operation on national environmental issues such as air quality".

On May 1, 1996 the Quebec National Assembly unanimously approved the following resolution: "That the national assembly request the postponement of federal Bill C-29 concerning the gasoline additive MMT as long as environmental studies have not been conducted in a conclusive manner". I might add, not conducted in a properly scientific manner.

• (1310)

About 10 days ago Manitoba and Newfoundland joined with the other provinces in requesting that this very ill thought out legislation be slowed down. It is the provinces that will bear the direct deleterious result of the removal of MMT from gasoline which is the significant increase in emissions of nitrogen oxide. It seems reasonable to think that they should therefore have a voice in this decision.

In fact, the ban of MMT will mean that the provinces will be required to forfeit the most cost effective method of reducing smog causing agents in gasoline, and they will be required to accommodate anywhere from a 16 per cent to a 20 per cent increase in nitrous oxide emissions.

Calls to the government to identify what will replace MMT are still unanswered. No scientific testing is planned and it is difficult to predict what is going to happen next. Surely the government has something in mind to replace MMT.

Clearly all Canadians hope the members opposite will not support this bill without putting forward a credible plan to deal with increased urban smog.

We have made good progress toward reducing our nitrous oxide content of emissions in this country, but with this legislation we run the risk of wiping out those gains and saddling ourselves with increased problems. We are clearly moving in the wrong direction.

Therefore rather than construct environmental policy on speculation and half baked voodoo science, what is needed is some leadership from the government. If we are to address the problem of worsening air quality in Canada the auto companies and the oil companies must work together. It is equally clear that there is a need to have the federal and provincial governments co-operate on environmental issues of this nature.

The way to accomplish this is obvious. Withdraw this bill, do some decent scientific work and come back to this House when you know what you are doing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there is something I would like to make clear right at the outset, because viewers might have the impression that those who care about environment are sitting on that side and those who do not care are sitting on this side. This is an oversimplification.

I want to say right away to people joining us for the debate that it has to do with the fact that the government is proposing a bill seeking a ban on a gas additive, which would have as a major impact substantial adjustment costs for whole segments of industrial sectors, such as oil refineries, without any scientific studies to back it up.

The official opposition, first through its critic, the hon. member for Laurentides, and through successive members, wants to make it clear that, when the environment minister or any other independent third party will be able to table in this House rigorously scientific and conclusive studies showing that this additive called MMT harms the environment or damages antipollution systems in vehicles, the Bloc, as well as the Reform Party surely, will reconsider its position.

It is unthinkable that an environment minister, with a carelessness that is out of keeping with the seriousness of this issue, would ask Canadian members of Parliament to pass legislation that will impose substantial adjustment costs on industrial sectors that are already in difficulty, on the basis of representations made by a auto makers lobby. That is not how things should be done.

• (1315)

I am particularly pleased to take part in this debate because, as you know, I am one of the members from Montreal, more specifically from East Montreal. When I was younger, East Montreal had six refineries. Today there are only two left, because of a number of problems which are international in nature but sometimes have a more national resonance.

I cannot accept, and I fail to understand how the government can do a good job when it asks us to pass a bill that, I repeat, involves considerable adjustment costs for the oil refinery sector, without thorough, scientific and conclusive studies to support its decision.

It does not make sense to have jobs, jobs, jobs as a political mantra when you create problems for those who want to save jobs. In the case of East Montreal, I would like to point out that the two remaining refineries that continue to operate—when I was a kid there were six—employ 4,000 people. I would like to include in my speech a point of view that is typically Montreal and a flavour that is East Montreal by sharing with you two letters I received from

Government Orders

interest groups that represent their community and have a stake in the local economy.

I am not referring to the Saint-Jean-Baptiste Society which is our ally on sovereignty. I am not talking about the Mouvement national des Québécois, but about interest groups, the first of which is called Pro-Est. These are businessmen, people who are concerned above all about the economic recovery of East Montreal.

You will recall that in 1984, there was a wave of business shutdowns which led the people of East Montreal to organize. The result was a group called Pro-Est, an authorized pressure group that tries in various ways to give East Montreal a prosperous economy so that people will want to stay there.

Pro-Est is concerned about the subject matter of Bill C-29. I would like to share this short letter with you, and I would like to recommend its contents to the attention of the government side, so they will understand that the reaction to Bill C-29 goes back to what is at stake in the economy of a number of communities, including East Montreal.

The letter says: "Pro-Est wants to express its concerns about the possible adoption of Bill C-29 regarding MMT as an additive in gas". It goes on to say: "In fact, the passage of this bill would have a negative impact on the competitive position of the industry".

The words competitive position really mean something from the economic point of view, and I hope the government side will appreciate that. So the letter reads: "The passage of this bill would have a negative impact on the competitive position of the refineries of East Montreal. The withdrawal of MMT would oblige refineries to compensate in other ways, which would represent an additional cost of seven or eight million dollars annually for the refineries in East Montreal alone".

So seven or eight million dollars annually for the refineries in East Montreal alone, and earlier we heard a figure of about \$40 million for the entire petrochemical sector in Quebec.

The letter goes on: "We remind you that the petrochemical industry is one of the cornerstones of economic development on the east side of the island of Montreal. The takeover of Kemtec by Coastal, the high placement rate of graduates of the Institut de chimie et de pétrochimie and the viability of the Petro-Canada and Shell refineries are a good indication of the consolidation of this sector in our region. Because of these important economic spin-offs and the considerable number of secondary jobs, the petrochemical industry is a key sector in the economic recovery of the greater Montreal area".

As you probably know, the environment is an important issue for Pro-Est, and I may point out that Pro-Est is a group that has identified the environmental sector, the whole issue of plastics

recycling, as a sector to be developed in this region. So we cannot accuse them of not being sensitive to this problem.

• (1320)

I will continue reading the letter: "Hence, we agree with several other Quebecers who are suggesting to defer the passing of Bill C-29 until independent experts can clearly show that MMT is environmentally safe. We thank you for your interest—", and so on. That letter is signed by Pierre Bibeau, chairman of the Pro-Est group.

I also heard the same thing from the chairman of the chamber of commerce of eastern Montreal Island, Alain Riendeau. When the businesspeople and all the stakeholders who are concerned about economic growth and who want to ensure the communities remain competitive join together to make representations, something they can do within our system, I hope the majority in office is listening.

Earlier, my colleague, the hon. member for Peterborough, said that a few years back no one would have imagined that lead could become such a problem and a health hazard. Again, when studies carried out by independent third parties show that there is cause for concern, that will be the time to take concrete measures. But this cannot be done on the basis of non-scientific allegations and on the basis, finally, of representations by a local lobby, which naturally has the attention of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister of the Environment who are both Ontario members.

It takes some nerve to come here and tell us that our concern today is for public health. In that case, let us remind ministers that they gave this issue to the wrong minister. If it were a public health issue, if the health of Canadians was really in jeopardy, I would hope that the health minister, the hon. member for Cape Breton—Richmond-East, would stand in this House and explain to us, parliamentarians and, thus, to all Canadians, how this concerns his department and what remedies he intends to take.

Let us go a little further. If this is a toxic substance, why is it that the federal government has not taken any measure so far to ban it and why are imports at issue here? If this substance is a toxic substance, then it is so everywhere. Be it within a province or in interprovincial trade, the toxic content remains the same.

You know, as the last speaker for the Reform Party also said, I think, what we are talking about here are representations by lobbyists, by people who are settled in Ontario and are concerned with the automotive industry.

If auto makers have decisive studies on the operation of anti-pollution systems, and the resulting impact on their competitiveness, that should concern us as parliamentarians, let them make these studies public. In a democracy, the best way to oppose an idea

Government Orders

is to suggest a better one. That is how things can be done democratically.

How accurate was the auto makers' demonstration? What did they contribute to the debate? Not much. They are unable to make a clear and significant demonstration of the dangers that should bring us, as members of Parliament, to ban MMT.

I really want to be very clear about the possible consequences of such a ban in a community like Montreal, where the petrochemical sector has already been under considerable strain for the last ten years. Investments of \$7 million to \$14 million will be needed to adjust to new production equipment. This is the first reality to keep in mind.

● (1325)

If the Minister is the sensible man I believe he is and anxious to start a dialogue, there is a second reality that should at least be of some concern to him. Right now, there are seven provinces in different regions, with governments of different political stripes, and with different economic bases—that is quite a number of provinces—that have taken a united stand and ask the federal government to review its position and delay the adoption of this bill.

I think the government ought to be impressed by some of the arguments that have been made. If the government cares about the quality of our environment, it will see to it that we make decisions based on accurate and scientifically recognized studies and that we pass legislation based on documentation that is really useful to us in our debates.

I cannot resist temptation. You know how disciplined I am, but sometimes I like to let my imagination go, especially on a difficult Friday such as this one, given the difficult issue of the referral to the Supreme Court. You know that nothing is simple in this Parliament.

Mr. Morrison: Things will change now.

Mr. Ménard: I see my colleague from the Reform Party shares my opinion. I would like to share with you a letter that was sent to the government by the natural resources minister in the Bouchard government, François Gendron. Let me draw your attention to one aspect of this correspondence. The minister writes: "I am writing again, on behalf of the minister of state for economy and finance, Bernard Landry, and of the transport minister in charge of Canadian intergovernmental affairs, Jacques Brassard, and on my own behalf, to state the firm position of the Quebec government on the bill being studied".

He continues: "That bill, the Manganese-based Fuel Additives Act, will reach the third reading stage in the House of Commons in just a few months. It seems your government is quite determined to follow through with that bill. That bill concerns the importation

and selling of MMT in Canada. It seems the Canadian government wants to pass this bill because the auto makers claim that gasoline containing MMT will cause damage to the pollution control equipment in new cars".

This is getting interesting, it should shake up government members a little. It goes on: "With free trade between Canada, the United States and Mexico, recent developments in the United States and Mexico are pointing in another direction".

What does it mean? You will remember that in the past few years the Environmental Protection Agency has been trying to have the use of MMT banned in the United States. The case was dismissed by a district of Columbia appeal court which ruled that the evidence presented was not conclusive enough.

Not only were the United States defeated, not only was the EPA defeated, but now the regulation banning the use of MMT as a fuel additive in the United States can no longer be enforced, and in Mexico—as you might recall, the Mexican president sat in your chair and made a speech to Canadian parliamentarians—they are faced with the same situation.

So, when we are told that if the bill is not passed, we will no longer be competitive, there is something not quite right with government members' logic, since the production and use of MMT as a fuel additive will now be allowed in the United States, our major trading partner—and you know how strong our commercial ties are with them, especially when it comes to the automobile industry. And not only in the case of the United States, but also in the case of Mexico.

So, this is a situation of ministerial stubbornness. The minister is stomping his feet with a rather childish stubbornness saying we must go in that direction, with some sort of determination that is almost unreasonable, no, I correct my words, that is not reasonable at all.

What must we do, as members of Parliament, to convince the minister? What efforts must we make when seven provinces are opposed, when the Canadian Petroleum Products Institute is opposed, when entire industrial sectors are at risk, particularly in regions that cannot afford to lose jobs if they want to maintain their economic prosperity. Of course, I am talking about East Montreal.

So today, we must send the environment minister a cry from the heart so that, for the sake of rationality, he can go beyond partisan considerations and find a reasonable compromise. And this reasonable compromise can only be the public tabling, for debate, of much more substantiated studies commissioned by third parties and focusing on the potential or not, on the beneficial or deleterious nature, of using MMT in gasoline.

I do not think what we are asking today is unreasonable. I do not think the consensus of the seven provinces, regardless of any partisan leaning, is unreasonable. It seems to me if the Minister of

Environment is concerned with the environmental issue, there are other bills, other problems that should hold his attention.

We have been told about the pollution in the Great Lakes. There would be something there that could be very interesting from a legislation viewpoint.

So why take up the time of the House to deal with poorly defined problems, with untested propositions, on an issue where almost everyone is not convinced by or satisfied with the evidence tabled by the minister.

I intend to take a very firm stand on this. Again, there used to be six refineries in the east end of Montreal. The petrochemical sector used to be prosperous, but with measures such as those proposed today—I have a feeling my time is running out, so I make a last appeal to the minister to use common sense and defer his bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It being 1.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*Translation*]

INCOME TAX ACT

The House resumed from June 3, 1996, consideration of the motion that, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider amending the Income Tax Act to provide a Care-Giver Tax Credit for those who provide care in the home for pre-school children, the disabled, the chronically-ill or the aged.

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address Private Members' Motion No. 30. The motion reads as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider amending the Income Tax Act to provide a Care-Giver Tax Credit for those who provide care in the home for pre-school children, the disabled, the chronically-ill or the aged.

The purpose of this motion is to help people who greatly need to be helped. The disability tax credit is a tax measure that exists at the provincial level, at least in Quebec, and at the federal level. It is a non-refundable tax credit.

In 1994, this credit amounted to \$4,233. It is to be noted that it was originally established to help those who became disabled during the war. In order to be eligible for the credit, the applicant must submit, with his income tax return, a Revenue Canada form duly completed by a doctor or an optometrist.

Private Members' Business

There are currently a number of tax measures designed to help families that take care of elderly or disabled people. However, we believe these measures are not enough.

The numerous flaws of the current taxation system make me quite angry at times. How can this government turn a deaf ear to such a motion, while seeking to smother the scandal of family trust assets transferred tax free to the United States? Two billion dollars left the country tax free, while ordinary taxpayers are being taxed to the hilt.

• (1335)

My colleague, the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot and official opposition finance critic, mentioned recently that Liberals question the qualifications of the Auditor General and his team by refusing to answer his questions, and suggesting that Mr. Desautels has stepped outside his terms of reference.

Liberal members of the finance committee are trying to demean an institution whose main goal is to make sure the government is held accountable.

I am also quite sensitive to the treatment of older people, in my capacity as the official opposition representative for seniors organizations. I have taken the floor many times in the House to uphold the rights of seniors. We should not forget the Canadian population is growing older.

A 1991 survey on aging and self care has shown that nearly one third of Canadians were 45 or older in 1991, with 19 per cent being between 45 and 64 and 11 per cent 65 or older. As the baby boomers grow older, we can expect a rapid increase in the number of seniors.

Projections over the 1991-2001 period tell us that the population growth in the 45 plus group will be almost three times faster than in the general population, that is 32 and 13 per cent respectively.

The well-being of the aged, as measured by their health, their revenue and their degree of integration in society, seems to be strongly related to the quality of housing and the ability to move around in their community. Seniors and the disabled very often prefer to stay in their community with the assistance of a member of their immediate family or another relative.

It appears quite reasonable to give a tax credit to a taxpayer who can work full time and give appropriate care to a dependent person. People who do not have to move into residences run by strangers experience a better quality of life.

Seniors are often seen as a burden in our communities. They are socially dead. But if they remain in their own community, these people can be part of their community and feel more secure, financially or otherwise.

Private Members' Business

I also rose in this House to have a grandparents' day celebrated every year and also have a grandparents' year designated, to recognize the role these people play in the family unit, especially in child rearing.

These people are often the link between the past, the present and the future. Therefore, you will understand why Motion No. 30 is of particular concern to me and why its implementation raises several questions in my mind.

Today's edition of *Le Devoir* includes highlights of the report of the Auditor General of Canada, Denis Desautels. It says that Revenue Canada has laid itself open to fraud by not sufficiently controlling or assessing the GST credit program and the child tax benefits, which combined and replaced the old family allowance and child tax credit. These programs cost \$8 billion every year.

It adds that among the issues that were raised was the fact that Revenue Canada does not require a birth certificate before granting the tax benefit. The assessment of the applications for disability benefits paid by the Canada Pension Plan is inadequate. The total amount of these benefits has tripled in the last 10 years, increasing from \$841 million to \$3 billion. In comparison, disability benefits paid by the Régime des rentes du Québec have remained almost stable during the same period.

The report also concluded that a general improvement of government phone services was in order. Too often, the lines are overloaded and the information given by the operators is incorrect. Revenue Canada has a particularly poor performance, in this regard.

• (1340)

How can we not worry about potential fraud, since there are people who abuse the system, unfortunately.

Moreover, if the government gives the tax credit to people who stay at home and take care of preschool children or handicapped, chronically ill or senior members of the family, it could be tempted to reduce benefits, in particular the old age security or the child tax benefit.

To conclude, Motion M-30 brought forward by my colleague for Mississauga-South is valid in principle, but it would require increased vigilance to avoid potential fraud.

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here this afternoon to debate this motion tabled by the member for Mississauga South.

[English]

The motion reads:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider amending the Income Tax Act to provide a Care-Giver Tax Credit for those who provide care in the home for pre-school children, the disabled, the chronically-ill or the aged.

[Translation]

It is, of course, a very valid proposal, a step in the right direction, and we can all subscribe to its objective.

[English]

The motion proposes that the government augment its existing tax credit system for caregivers. This motion, because it identifies preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill and the aged is not unlike some of the proposals I have made in the past. I would be hard pressed not to support my colleague and that is what I intend to do philosophically in the direction in which he is going.

I want to review some of the things we have in place today. There are a number of very laudable programs that not everyone is aware of. These were reviewed by the hon. member for St. Paul's but I want to share some of them briefly with my colleagues.

With respect to the disabled and the aged, the disability tax credit is aimed at benefiting those with a severe and prolonged mental or physical impairment. There is also medical expense tax credit which provides assistance to those with exceedingly difficult medical expenses. This credit benefits families helping to care for elderly or disabled relatives. There is the infirm dependant credit which helps to reduce the federal tax for supporting relatives.

With respect to preschool children the child care expense deduction assists parents with modest incomes with child care expenses. The supplement to the child tax benefit assists those who remain at home to raise their children. It is a form of assistance to families with modest incomes who have to stay at home to care for their young children without utilizing child care. There is the working income supplement, a non-taxable benefit which helps low income working families with child care expenses and transportation costs.

I believe we need to offer credits to assist caregivers. In fact as I indicated previously I have suggested motions which deal with tax credits in the past.

[Translation]

I think the purpose of this motion is very commendable and that each of us agrees, at least in principle, on the necessity of providing such assistance. On the other hand, there may be different ways of dealing with this issue.

[English]

In the past I proposed a motion to change the child related tax benefits and child care deductions. I felt that they should be based on need irrespective of care. I also proposed a motion that was aimed at assisting single income families. I thought this was particularly important and I still do so today.

Our tax system is continually evolving to meet the changing needs of our population. Let us look at this motion specifically. Some people have suggested that it may not be specific enough and that the motion may not have sufficient details so that we can deal with it appropriately.

I want to share with my colleagues a couple of observations with respect to experiences I have had recently in dialoguing with fellow Canadians and experts of different disciplines who have a great deal of knowledge about our Canadian population.

• (1345)

I had the good fortune to meet with a number of individuals of diverse backgrounds to discuss the future of government in Canada. We wanted to see how government might operate and how it might respond even more sensitively than it does now to changing needs. Clearly that could be done if we had a better picture of how the Canadian population is changing.

I must confess these discussions have been rather fascinating. A number of themes emerged during this exchange, but one of the common threads that came about was the flexibility of government.

[*Translation*]

Without this great flexibility, whether it be at the federal, provincial or municipal level, we will have serious problems. Why? Because it is obvious that the needs of the population vary greatly from region to region. It is true that there are common needs, but it is also true that, depending on the population, the needs can vary considerably from province to province, from region to region, from territory to territory.

[*English*]

Interestingly, the discussions have identified numerous support mechanisms, some of which are very innovative. We have to stop thinking that it is only the federal, provincial and municipal governments that can assist citizens. There are a number of organizations out there that do laudable work with very little investment from Canadians, that is very little investment relatively speaking. However, I am targeting that which we refer to as community groups. We need to take a look at that and see what else they might provide in services to improve the quality of life of all Canadians who need special assistance.

When I talk about support I am using the term loosely. I do not say that pejoratively, but in a very broad sense because it can mean a lot of things. It can mean flexibility, which I have already mentioned, in the workplace to allow time, for example, away during difficult periods without the threat of a job loss. It can mean the expansion of health care services to provide better, long term care in the community and elsewhere. It can mean flexibility to the

Private Members' Business

CPP. It clearly could mean tax credits, but these are not the only solutions.

I guess where I am at right now, I would argue that a study would need to be carried out to examine exactly what the \$1.4 billion in existing assistance means to Canadians. Do they know that this is happening? Are they sufficiently familiar with these programs? Are individuals currently aware of what credits for which they are all eligible? Is the current system being utilized appropriately? We have talked about some people misusing the system but there are a number of people, which I think has been documented, who are not aware of the systems and programs that exist.

When we look at this holistically, we need to ask where the gaps are. Clearly there must be some. There are weaknesses in the system. What measures are required to fill these gaps and be more responsive to Canadians and their needs? Maybe tax credits are required. Perhaps there are other solutions that need to be explored.

[*Translation*]

Basically, the point I want to make this afternoon is that it is a good idea as such, an idea we all support. However, before going any further, we should look at all the programs I have mentioned and others in order to determine how well they meet the needs for which they were designed. Then we will be able to determine if the system is deficient, if certain programs need to be strengthened, changed, eliminated or replaced.

What my colleague is proposing is simple, but it is something that we should do only after having reviewed all programs, after having gained a better understanding of the needs of Canadians across the country and after having made sure that future changes in the Canadian population are taken into account in the measures we propose.

You certainly know—if I am not mistaken, we are talking about a population over 65 years of age representing 11 or 12 per cent of the total population in Canada—that the senior population is expected to double over the next thirty years or so. Women, who already live longer than men, are expected to live even longer. And even men will also live longer.

What does that mean as it relates to health, entertainment, work? What does it mean when we look at this new Canadian population which will be different from what it is today?

• (1350)

Incidentally, I should point out that this solution is not so different from what can be found in a number of European countries.

I suggest that we keep in mind the idea put forward by my colleague from Mississauga South until we have an opportunity to thoroughly review all the programs. We can then look at the shortcomings and determine if changes are required, if some of the

Private Members' Business

programs should be altered or if the solution proposed by the hon. member is the best alternative.

And this concludes my remarks.

[*English*]

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to debate this important private member's motion. First, I would like to support the idea of the private member's motion. I read a bit of history not long ago and found that in times past Parliament was taken up essentially with motions and bills brought forward by private members.

Over time, this has eroded to mostly government initiated bills and motions. If the government says go for it, then fine. If the government is against it, it would not bring in the bills or motions. Consequently, the legislative agenda is greatly limited.

I appreciate the concept of private members' motions. I sincerely hope that we will not see in this private member's motion the kind of interference from the government side that we did in the previous one earlier this week. I hope, sincerely, that members of Parliament will be able to assess the merits of this motion on its own and to vote freely, without interference from the government side.

Specifically the question is one of taxation. This topic comes up over and over again in the House. It is a problem, I suppose it would be proper to say, that has seized the attention of Canadians.

I was married 35 years ago. I would like to congratulate my wife for having stayed with me for that long. It is a miracle in itself. A friend of ours said recently: "She deserves a medal", and I would concur with that.

When we were first married in 1961, my salary was a little over \$400 a month. My income tax deduction was \$35 a month, about 8 per cent. On that salary, I was able to provide for my family. At first we had a rented house. We went from that to purchase a house on a single income.

I was able to provide enough groceries. People can see over the years that I, as the representative sample of our family, have not suffered in the starvation department. We have been able to manage quite well.

We are one family who made the choice that, when our children were young, mother would be a full time mother. She would be the manager of the home. She would be there for the children in the morning when they were off to school as they grew older. She stayed with them, of course, full time before they went to school. She was there when the children came home from school in order to give a solid, loving home base to the children as they were growing up. Consequently, we lived on my income only during those years.

Unfortunately, times have changed during these 35 years. To my view, they have changed to the detriment of the family. For most Canadians over half their income is spent for them by politicians and bureaucrats at the three levels of government. No longer do we have an 8 per cent rate of taxation. We now have a 50 per cent rate of taxation, plus GST. People cannot get away from that. No matter where they turn to purchase anything, there is the GST.

I had to buy a part for my vehicle the other day. I ended up paying \$10 in GST. The part was quite expensive. I said to myself, why should I pay a penalty of \$10 to some federal program that is wasting my money because I have to repair my vehicle so that it will run.

• (1355)

The motion underlines the fact that we are taxed to death. In particular, as families we are being taxed to death. It is no longer true that families have a choice, as we had, to say that one member will stay at home full time. They cannot live on one income. The reason is very simple. So much of a family's earnings are now taken away from it by the coercion of taxation that the amount that it has left is insufficient to provide for shelter, clothing, food, education and then some of those other things that are valued.

It is wonderful if children, as they are growing up, can learn more than what is taught just in the home and in the school. I benefited from piano lessons. My parents sacrificed so that I could learn to play the piano. I love playing O Canada when we go out to some of the meetings in my constituency. I always say: "Make sure there is a piano there so that I can play it". My parents sacrificed for that. More and more families cannot do that.

I spoke recently with parents who said they have no choice but for both of them to work. Otherwise they could not afford to have shelter, clothing and food. They are hard pressed to provide some of those other things which are so valuable in the development and the growth of children.

This motion says there should be a tax credit for those who choose this particular lifestyle. In principle, I agree with it. The principle is that we want to reduce the tax load on families so that they can, with their own earnings, provide the care for their families. That is a commendable goal. In principle, I am in favour of what this bill says.

At the same time I seriously ask the question of whether this is the best way to go. First, governments at all levels should sharply reduce their demands for money to be shipped to Ottawa by the truckload, trainload or however it is brought here. The federal government over spends. There is no doubt about it. Too large a proportion of government expenditures are going to interest.

Private Members' Business

It is absolutely mandatory that the government reduce not only its annual borrowing so that the debt goes up more slowly, it is far beyond the time already when it should have reduced the deficit to zero. Government should be living within its means, including the payment of interest on the present debt. Members should start looking at reducing the debt which would reduce the amount of interest so that Canadians can be given a tax break. Consequently those Canadians would have more of their own money to spend as they see fit. If parents value the ability to choose that one of them stays home, then they should be able to afford that.

It is true that in the present system the greatest amount of future planning, retirement planning and family budgeting has to do with meeting the tax budget and the tax demands. I attended a seminar some time ago on retirement planning. I was appalled when I realized that about 10 or 15 per cent of the time was spent making wise investment decisions and things like that and about 85 per cent was used on how to either postpone or avoid paying taxes. It points out the fact that taxes are too high.

This bill says let us give a tax credit to those families in which there is only one wage earner. Let us make it easier for families to make that choice. Not long ago there was a poll taken and it showed that fully two-thirds of parents of young children said if they really had the choice they would choose for one or the other of them to stay home full time with the children. They feel they do not have the choice and inasmuch as this motion is a step in the right direction, it would be wise of us to support it.

• (1400)

Mr. John Bryden (Hamilton—Wentworth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to speak to Motion No. M-30 which would give a tax credit to home caregivers.

It is particularly a pleasure to speak to this motion because it gives me an opportunity to demonstrate to Canadians who may be interested that we who are members of political parties, be it the Reform Party, the Bloc Quebecois or the Liberal Party, are not necessarily ideologues, that we do not necessarily follow or hold all the views of our respective parties.

In this case I am referring to the position taken by my own Liberal Party on day care during the last federal election. The Liberals came out very strongly in support of government subsidized day care. The NDP came out even more strongly. If I remember correctly, the NDP promised to spend \$1 billion on subsidized day care which the NDP said would create some 70,000 jobs. The Liberals promised much less than that; their program was a couple of hundred million dollars which would create about 10,000 jobs if I recall correctly.

From the outset I was opposed to both concepts in principle. I made it very clear when I ran for election that I did not support everything in the red book, and I certainly did not support the Liberal position on day care. The fundamental reason was that in my mind the promise of 70,000 jobs for \$1 billion was a promise of 70,000 marginal jobs basically for women to look after children other than their own. I did not see the practicality of that.

The desire for subsidized daycare has its origins in the socialistic movement of the previous decades, of the 1960s and the 1970s. It was based on two premises. One premise was that parents, particularly women, should not have to sacrifice for their children, for raising families. The premise was that they should be able to have children and also have a worthy job. The other premise, an important one, was that the state could provide some fundamental social caregiving like the family in looking after children.

It has become very clear in the course of the 1980s when we see what has happened to the great totalitarian socialist states like the former Soviet Union and even communist China, that institutionalized family services do not work. In the end they create problems. They create young people who become adults who are not effective citizens.

The services become unmanageable in their actual implementation. Look anywhere in the experiences of the Soviet Union and communist China and lesser so in some of the Nordic states and we will find there have been many problems in trying to successfully implement state run family care. It is not a concept that we recognize as being very successful any more.

The proof of the pudding is in my own riding. When I campaigned from door to door particularly on Hamilton Mountain, a great number of the lower income families obviously had both parents employed. As I went along the streets, I saw that block after block the streets were empty, the houses were empty. The driveways usually had spaces for two automobiles. Most of these parents probably had their children in day care if they were not in school.

As the member for Mississauga South pointed out, the emancipation of the other spouse, be they male or female, basically puts two people in a position of marginal income at the sacrifice of the children. The statistic is basically that a person earning \$25,000 with two children in day care makes a net profit of \$100 a week. I submit that is not worth the trial, tribulation and even the damage which it inflicts on young children.

• (1405)

In my area there are some subsidized day care facilities. I have visited them as a member of Parliament. What do we do when we enter a subsidized day care facility and see the children playing not on real grass but on plastic grass? Money has been raised to support these day care centres and in someone's incredible wisdom the things which children relate to have been removed; simple things

Private Members' Business

like real grass and real dirt. In other words, the paid caregivers do not want the children to get dirty. I would say that has the potential of being a traumatic experience for children. I cannot accept it.

I have three children. I have also been the parent who has stayed at home while my wife worked. I have been the primary caregiver. My children were preschoolers. I worked at the Toronto *Star*. I would come home very late at night. I made a point every night before the children were in school to go directly home to read fairy tales to them. Actually, I can imitate just about every voice in every fairy tale. I can do Pinocchio, I can do the good fairy and all of those voices. Also Long John Silver. The pay off was that my children were capable of reading by the time they were in grade 3. They were reading fluently all the books which they had before them. I submit that was because I was the caregiver who read them those stories.

I have had occasion to go to schools to read to children after school was out. They could not go home because their parents were working. They did not have their own mom and dad to read to them, so they had to rely on a stranger. In this case the stranger was a member of Parliament. It is not the same thing. It is not as good.

What the motion directs us toward is looking once more at where we stand as a country with respect to traditional family values and the importance of the family. The motion is a direction to Parliament to set aside the socialist ideologies of the past and to look to the future, remembering that there are genuine values in the traditional family. As we go into the next century these values are going to be even more accentuated.

We have now entered the computer age. I live in a little village far from Toronto, a remote village in southern Ontario. It does not have a lot of amenities. There is a mother who lives across the street who has developed a tremendous business as a computer troubleshooter. She has one room set aside in her home and she is on the phone with businesses all over the world. She makes a good wage.

That mother is also the primary caregiver. She has three small children. She is able to look after those children. She has a career and a sense of worthiness, a sense of participating in society, and she also has the opportunity to give her children the natural care which they deserve. I do not see any reason for the government not to recognize the value which she is contributing to society by being at home and looking after her children.

• (1410)

The present situation is that when one member of a couple, be they male or female, elect to stay at home, the government gives them nothing. The present tax situation is such that the government encourages both parents to work and as we have seen, it is only to marginal advantage.

Finally, tomorrow I face an audience of about 300 people in one of the largest halls in my riding to discuss the Young Offenders Act. There was a terrible shooting in my riding about two months ago in which a young man was seriously wounded by teenagers with a handgun which fired a hollow nosed bullet. The young man is now paralyzed. This has raised an enormous concern in my riding with respect to possible amendments to the Young Offenders Act.

We will discuss the act. But behind our discussion about changing the Young Offenders Act and increasing the penalties and the opportunities for rehabilitation for young people is the fundamental problem that in the past 20 years we have left the family unit behind and we have failed our young people. I think that shows up in the increased incidents of youth crime.

I support the motion 100 per cent. It is a fine motion and I congratulate the member for Mississauga South for bringing it before the House.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I share the concerns of the hon. member for Mississauga South, which have prompted his Motion No. 30. This motion proposes an amendment to the Income Tax Act to provide a caregiver tax credit for those who provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill or the aged.

You are, no doubt, aware that women generally invest more time than men in the care and nurturing of children, and this, for many of them, results in increased difficulty in entering the work force and in reduced earnings. During their lifetimes as well, they generally devote more time than men to the care of dependent members of their extended families, the sick, the disabled, or the elderly.

According to Nancy Guberman, in *Actes du colloque*, the proceedings of a symposium held in Montreal on May 5, 1995, women are responsible for 85 per cent of the assistance provided within families. According to *Canadian Social Trends*, in 1992 virtually all of the 3.4 million people whose principal activity was caring for the family home were women.

An examination of these statistics clearly shows that the measures in Motion No. 30 would, for the most part, affect Canadian and Quebec women. It is therefore important to compare the demands being made by those most concerned by this with the objectives of the motion we are addressing at this time. But serious attention must also be given in particular to the means which will be used to achieve those goals.

The aim of the motion proposed by the member for Mississauga South is to recognize the child-rearing done by the parent at home. We entirely agree with the member regarding the need for society

to recognize the considerable value of unpaid work performed by women at home, on the farm or elsewhere, whether it be housework, the care and nurturing of children or providing care to the aged.

People who work at home are extremely resentful of the lack of understanding and social respect from which they still suffer today. Changes are therefore necessary in order to attach more value to unpaid work and to the social role that those people play. This is what Motion No. 30 proposes. This why we support the motion of the member for Mississauga South, which responds with good intentions to the legitimate claims of those people.

But, in order to achieve these goals, the government must be guided by two key principles: the search for equity or social justice and the search for an efficient allocation of resources.

• (1415)

We support this motion, although we still have some concerns about its implementation and implications.

It would be unacceptable, for instance, if this motion were to send women back to their kitchens, that is to say encourage them to stay home and discourage those who are working outside the home.

It is important to support women's legitimate aspiration to full participation to society, whatever their place of work.

Women are free to choose to stay home to take care of someone in their immediate family, but they are also have a fundamental right to work. We must recognize that being away from a paid job has long-term consequences, because women who leave the workforce not only have to do without the income but, upon returning to work, they will never earn as much as they would have if they had not left.

Motion M-30 would help make up for this loss of income. In most cases, women work outside the home because they are single mothers, have to supplement their partner's income or because they want to contribute to society the knowledge and skills they have. It is important to support those who work at home, but it is equally important to support women who are in an occupational setting or would like to be.

Our second concern has to do with the adverse effects the changes proposed in Motion M-30 could have if they are not implemented with care. Yes, we should help women working in the home, but it is important to watch out for a tax system that would introduce further inequality and exclusion. We must categorically oppose a system that seeks to realize savings by eliminating jobs, and reducing the demand for daycare places and services. Such a system would be a disincentive to jobs and training, and would

Private Members' Business

limit women to the status of part-time workers or make them dependent on their spouse or the government.

Today, and there are a number of reasons for this, the care and raising of children no longer usually require the full-time presence of the mother in the home for the greater part of her working life. We tend to have fewer children, and our children leave home for school at an early age. The phenomena of separation and divorce, and the increase in single parenthood, have also meant that a woman's ability to earn her living has become the best guarantee of economic security for women and children. But let us never forget that this ability is strongly dependent on academic training and work experience and whether women have sufficiently remunerative work.

Motion M-30 is rooted in a good intention, in wishing to provide a tax credit for those looking after relatives at home. It is a way of promoting the equality and autonomy of these women. But let us take care that measures such as those proposed in M-30 do not lose sight of the fact that women are people in their own right and not dependents of a spouse, or people whose identity is lost in that of the family.

My third reservation concerns the beneficiaries of the assistance proposed in Motion M-30. Such measures must, of necessity, be directed towards individuals working in the home. In the demographic and economic context we are now facing, the tax system and transfer payments must support the movement of women towards economic autonomy, by encouraging them to take training, to acquire relevant work experience and to develop their knowledge and know-how on a life long basis. We must be wary of fixating on measures that force individuals to maintain family solidarity, and remember the importance of basing the tax system on individuals first and foremost. The work of a person providing care in the home for children, the chronically ill, the disabled or the aged must be recognized independently of family income.

• (1420)

Any measures likely to slow down women's participation in the labour market and to increase their economic dependency on their spouse or on the government risk having a high social cost over the long term.

Motion No. 30, I repeat, should not be used as an excuse for confining women to home nor as a justification for removing government commitment, which could reduce the benefits already enjoyed by certain categories of people such as seniors or handicapped people.

It should not be used either to make savings on the backs of workers who could lose their jobs because of a decrease in the demand for services. This is no way to create jobs.

Private Members' Business

Finally, the Bloc Québécois reiterates its comments on how important it is for Quebec to give itself a comprehensive family policy, something it cannot do right now within the federal system. Indeed, the existence of two levels of government in many areas affecting women's life is cause for overlapping and duplication of programs and structures and, as a result, a waste of taxpayer money.

As for me, I think the interest of Quebec women would be best served if there were only one decision maker and only one provider of funds. For Quebec, it would mean that it would be possible to give itself a consistent and comprehensive policy dealing with the status of woman and the family.

We are convinced that only sovereignty for Quebec will allow us to reach these goals.

[English]

Mr. Ian Murray (Lanark—Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak today in favour of Motion No. 30 brought forward by my colleague from Mississauga South.

At the outset I would like to say that I have not looked at all of the financial implications of this motion and, from that perspective, we must bear in mind that this is a motion and not a bill. What we are really trying to do is encourage the government to look for ways to fulfil the objectives the member for Mississauga has in mind. I am very pleased to see that there is so much support on both sides of the House for this motion.

I think it is fair to say that there is a growing sense among Canadians that governments at all levels place less value today on the role parents play in raising children. One may argue that it is a personal decision to have children and that society already plays a large role in the development of those children. We can look at health care and education as two examples of general tax revenues being used for the indiscriminate benefit of all of us.

The fact that all taxpayers contribute to the education system demonstrates that society has historically recognized that well educated children and, as a consequence, a well educated workforce and citizenry are good for the well-being of the whole community.

The decision to have children means years of financial sacrifice for parents. There is a further loss of income if one parent stays home to look after the children. I have long believed that income splitting would be the preferred way for governments to recognize the costs involved when a parent stays home to care for a child or children. My colleague from Mississauga South has already introduced a bill which proposes that to the government and I still believe this approach should be looked at by the government when it is looking for ways to help families.

In the past 50 years we have seen a dramatic change in the Canadian family. In 1968 only 30 per cent of families had two incomes. In a 1994 study by Statistics Canada 60.4 per cent of all families were dual earners. Now more often than not both parents work outside the home. One of the reasons for this change often is that both parents have vital careers and want to continue their professional lives.

However, as a recent Angus Reid survey showed, over 70 per cent of parents where both were working and had preschool children said that if they could they would choose to have one parent stay at home to provide for their children. However, this choice is not available to all families. The realities of today's economy force many parents to both work just to make ends meet.

Being a dual earner family causes other problems, in particular the extra expense of child care. This additional child care expense is substantial. For example, when a second spouse is working and earning \$25,000 with two children in child care the net pay is less than \$100 per week. In many cases it does not justify the family hardships and sacrifices made when both spouses are working.

● (1425)

I would like to read a letter from one of my constituents whom I have spoken with at some length. He has written to me recently again, Mr. Don Bell from Kanata, Ontario. I will quote one paragraph from his letter:

Existing income tax laws provide day care rebates to the lower income earner in a family, rebates which increase as salary increases. This encourages the second wage earner to work full time, even overtime, to maximize benefits. A custodial parent with children finds it easy to obtain welfare benefits after divorce, making marriage break-up financially attractive. What incentives are there for parents to stay home and care for their own children, or to stay married and assume responsibility for each other's care? Sadly, there are none. Dependent child deductions have disappeared from the income tax form. The spousal deduction has been so eroded by inflation that even a small part time income wipes it out, again leading both parents to work and burn themselves out full time.

As the tax system stands now, there are no significant benefits for stay at home parents. Motion No. 30 would help remedy this oversight. By providing a caregiver tax credit, the federal government would be making it possible for many parents to decide whether to work or stay at home.

I would actually go beyond what is in the motion. I would not limit this to preschool children. It is important that we have parents available throughout a child's development through school and try to avoid problems of latch key kids coming home from school when there is nobody home.

I am not sure why this was limited to preschool children. Perhaps this is looked on as the art of the possible, but if government is looking at using the tax system to help families raising children, it really has to look at supporting families right through to the end of high school for children.

One could also argue there would be immediate economic benefits if the government is to adopt Motion No. 30, assuming that it encourages people to stay at home. Those parents who choose to stay at home to raise their children will immediately free many jobs. This would lead to a lowering of the unemployment rate and, in addition, will open more quality child care spaces. This will ensure that the children of dual earner families have professional care givers looking after them. Those child care workers are individuals who have the education and training to make a child's preschool years a rewarding experience.

More important, this motion will have a substantial positive effect on the next generation. As we all know, children are the future of our country and we, as today's parents, have an important influence on the shaping of their character and beliefs.

Study after study shows that the early years of life are instrumental in the development of a child's lifetime character. One of the latest of such studies, published in April 1996 by Dr. Steinhauer of the Caledon Institute of Social Policy, concluded with the statement that society needs to develop a system: "designed to help all families better meet the critical developmental needs of their children while increasing their sense of mastery and control of their own and their children's lives. Then and only then can we be confident that the next generation of children will have the good early childhood experiences that will enable them to achieve, for themselves and for society, their potential for personal success and for both human and economic productivity".

This motion does not deal only with the raising of children. It also recognizes the needs of people caring for the disabled, the chronically ill and the aged.

We are each aware of people whose lives are affected totally by the demands placed on them by caring for loved ones who are ill or disabled.

In particular I think of an elderly woman who spoke at one of my town hall meetings on health care whose husband has Alzheimer's disease. Essentially this woman, who is not all that well herself, finds herself up all hours of the day and night tending to her husband's needs. She loves her husband and wants to keep him at home as long as she can but she is burning herself out. She feels there is absolutely no recognition of the fact that she is providing this care.

Private Members' Business

There are many others out there as well. I am involved with the Alzheimer's Society. This is a growing problem. We will continue to see this grow in the future.

If there is any possibility of keeping someone out of a public institution, we should look for ways to support those who are willing to make all those sacrifices involved in looking after somebody 24 hours a day in the home.

This is important for parents to know that society recognizes their contribution. Those who provide care to the ill, the disabled or aged also have this need.

The financial aspect is extremely important but also the fact that society recognizes what people are going through. These are stories we rarely hear about because they are behind closed doors in people's homes. There are tremendous struggles going on out there. We need in some way let people know we appreciate what they are doing. The demands on our chronic care system are only going to continue to grow over time.

I wish to again congratulate my colleague from Mississauga South on this motion. He is being consistent and persistent when it comes to raising these problems with us. I hope with the goodwill of the House we will have this motion passed when it comes time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I will call for resumption of debate. Seeing that there is a member ready to speak and also in consideration of the time on the clock, I will not put the question because the member for Lisgar—Marquette wishes to speak.

When this business comes back to the House it will be the Reform Party which will have the next opportunity to speak to this motion. With the agreement of the House I will call it 2.30 p.m.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

It being 2.30 p.m., this House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24.

(The House adjourned at 2.30 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.
Discepolo, 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 27th, 1996 — 2nd Session, 35th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: **Raymond Bonin**

Vice-Chairmen: **Claude Bachand
John Finlay**

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

Associate Members

Garry Breitkreuz John Bryden	Marlene Cowling Maurice Godin	Dick Harris Audrey McLaughlin	Len Taylor
---------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chairman: **Lyle Vanclief**

Vice-Chairmen: **Jean-Guy Chrétien
Glen McKinnon**

Cliff Breitkreuz Murray Calder Bernie Collins	Wayne Easter Patrick Gagnon 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	Harold Culbert John Cummins Allan Kerpan	Laurent Lavigne John Maloney Denis Paradis	John Solomon Paul Steckle Len Taylor
--	--	--	--

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chairman: **Clifford Lincoln**

Vice-Chairs: **Gaston Leroux
Beth Phinney**

Jim Abbott Guy H. Arseneault	Mauril Bélanger Pierre de Savoye	Hugh Hanrahan Raymond Lavigne	Pat O'Brien Janko Perić	(11)
---------------------------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------	------

Associate Members

John Bryden Simon de Jong Stan Dromisky	Antoine Dubé John English	Christiane Gagnon Rey D. Pagtakhan	Louis Plamondon Monte Solberg
---	------------------------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------------------

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair: **Eleni Bakopanos**

Vice-Chairmen: **Stan Dromisky
Osvaldo Nunez**

Mauril Bélanger Judy Bethel	Maud Debien Hugh Hanrahan	Dan McTeague Val Meredith	Maria Minna Tom Wappel	(11)
--------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------	------

Associate Members

Colleen Beaumier Simon de Jong Paul Forseth	Beryl Gaffney Christiane Gagnon	Sharon Hayes Gar Knutson	John Loney Rey D. Pagtakhan
---	------------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------------

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: Charles Caccia

Vice-Chairs:

Monique Guay
Jean Payne

Peter Adams
Jack Iyerak Anawak

Gérard Asselin
Paul Forseth

Daphne Jennings
Gar Knutson

Karen Kraft Sloan
Paul Steckle

(11)

Associate Members

Margaret Bridgman
Rex Crawford
John Cummins
John Finlay

Maurice Godin
Clifford Lincoln
Bob Mills

Pat O'Brien
John O'Reilly
Julian Reed

Geoff Regan
Darrel Stinson
Len Taylor

SUB-COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS FOR SUSTAINABILITY

Chair: Karen Kraft Sloan

John Finlay
Paul Forseth

Monique Guay

Jean Payne

Len Taylor

(6)

FINANCE

Chairman: Jim Peterson

Vice-Chairs:

Yvan Loubier
Susan Whelan

Richard Bélisle
Leon E. Benoit
Dianne Brushett

Barry Campbell
Brenda Chamberlain
Ronald J. Duhamel

Ron Fewchuk
Herb Grubel
Gary Pillitteri

Roger Pomerleau
Monte Solberg
Brent St. Denis

(15)

Associate Members

Reg Alcock
Eleni Bakopanos
Judy Bethel
Paul Crête
Nick Discepola
Joe Fontana

Jim Gouk
Bill Graham
Stephen Harper
Jake E. Hoepfner
Dale Johnston
Karen Kraft Sloan

René Laurin
Peter Milliken
Bob Mills
Andy Mitchell
Rey D. Pagtakhan
Nelson Riis

Yves Rocheleau
Benoît Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Jim Silye
Paddy Torsney
John Williams

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Chairman: Brent St. Denis

Richard Bélisle

Herb Grubel

(3)

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**

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

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy Vic Althouse	Ron Fewchuk Fred Mifflin	Yves Rocheleau Roger Simmons	Paul Steckle Elsie Wayne
--------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chairman: Bill Graham

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

Sarkis Assadourian Michel Dupuy Jesse Flis	Beryl Gaffney Francis G. LeBlanc John Loney	Bob Mills Lee Morrison Philippe Paré	Charlie Penson Benoît Sauvageau Bob Speller	(15)
--	---	--	---	------

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy Réginald Bélair Leon E. Benoît Bill Blaikie Maud Debien	Jack Frazer John Godfrey Herb Grubel Jean H. Leroux	Gurbax Singh Malhi Keith Martin Ted McWhinney Val Meredith	Rey D. Pagtakhan Janko Perić Svend J. Robinson 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

Maud Debien	Beryl Gaffney	John Godfrey	Keith Martin	(5)
-------------	---------------	--------------	--------------	-----

SUB-COMMITTEE ON TRADE DISPUTES

Chairman: Michel Dupuy

Sarkis Assadourian	Ron MacDonald	Charlie Penson	Benoît Sauvageau	(5)
--------------------	---------------	----------------	------------------	-----

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chairman: Tony Valeri

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

Colleen Beaumier John Bryden	Paul Crête Bill Gilmour	Stephen Harper John Harvard	Ovid L. Jackson Ian Murray	(11)
---------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	------

Associate Members

Ghislain Lebel Ian McClelland Carolyn Parrish	Janko Perić George Proud	John Solomon Randy White	Ted White John Williams
---	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------

HEALTH**Chairman: Roger Simmons****Vice-Chairs:****Harbance Singh Dhaliwal
Pauline Picard**Antoine Dubé
Bonnie HickeyGrant Hill
Keith MartinJohn Murphy
Andy ScottPaul Szabo
Joseph Volpe

(11)

Associate MembersMargaret Bridgman
Pierre de Savoye
Maurice DumasRéjean Lefebvre
Audrey McLaughlin
Réal MénardPat O'Brien
Svend J. RobinsonRoseanne Skoke
Rose-Marie Ur**SUB-COMMITTEE ON HIV/AIDS****Chairman:**Réal Ménard
Pat O'BrienSvend J. Robinson
Paul Szabo

Rose-Marie Ur

Joseph Volpe

(6)

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**Chairman: Maurizio Bevilacqua****Vice-Chairs:****Jean Augustine
Francine Lalonde**Gerry Byrne
Christiane Gagnon
Patrick GagnonDale Johnston
Gurbax Singh Malhi
Ian McClellandLarry McCormick
Robert D. Nault
George ProudJim Silye
Anna Terrana
Stéphan Tremblay

(15)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Warren Allmand
Chris Axworthy
Leon E. BenoitJan Brown
John Cannis
Marlene Cowling
Paul CrêtePaul DeVillers
Antoine Dubé
Jim Gouk
Herb GrubelKeith Martin
Réal Ménard
Svend J. Robinson
Andy Scott**HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE STATUS OF
PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES****Chairm: Sheila Finestone****Vice-Chairmen:****Maurice Bernier
Andy Scott**Warren Allmand
Sarkis AssadourianJean Augustine
John GodfreyDeborah Grey
Sharon HayesRussell MacLellan
Réal Ménard

(11)

Associate MembersChris Axworthy
Mauril Bélanger
Robert BertrandMaud Debieu
Audrey McLaughlinPhilippe Paré
Svend J. RobinsonRoseanne Skoke
Myron Thompson

INDUSTRY**Chairman: David Walker****Vice-Chairmen: Walt Lastewka
Nic Leblanc**Mark Assad
Morris Bodnar
Bonnie BrownMaurice Godin
Jay Hill
Tony IannoPhilip Mayfield
Réal Ménard
Peter MillikenGeoff Regan
Werner Schmidt
Alex Shepherd

(15)

Associate MembersPeter Adams
Leon E. Benoit
Pierre de Savoye
Bernard DeshaiesNick Discepola
Joe Fontana
Karen Kraft Sloan
Ghislain LebelAndy Mitchell
Rey D. Pagtakhan
Yves Rocheleau
Roseanne SkokeJohn Solomon
Darrel Stinson
Paul Szabo
Len Taylor**JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS****Chair: Shaughnessy Cohen****Vice-Chairs: Michel Bellehumeur
Paddy Torsney**Pierre de Savoye
Paul DeVillers
Nick DiscepolaRoger Gallaway
Art Hanger
Gordon KirkbyFrançois Langlois
John Maloney
Jack RamsayGeorge S. Rideout
Andrew Telegdi
Randy White

(15)

Associate MembersChris Axworthy
Garry Breitzkreuz
John Finlay
Paul Forseth
Jack FrazerChristiane Gagnon
Patrick Gagnon
Jim Gouk
Stephen Harper
Jay HillDerek Lee
John Loney
Russell MacLellan
Val Meredith
Bob MillsGeoff Regan
Svend J. Robinson
Bernard St-Laurent
Myron Thompson**SUB-COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY****Chairman: Derek Lee****Vice-Chairman: George S. Rideout**

Nick Discepola

Gar Knutson

François Langlois

Val Meredith

(6)

LIAISON**Chairman:****Vice-Chair:**Reg Alcock
Eleni Bakopanos
Maurizio Bevilacqua
Raymond Bonin
Charles Caccia
Mary ClancyShaughnessy Cohen
Sheila Finestone
Bill Graham
Albina Guarnieri
Michel GuimondGhislain Lebel
Clifford Lincoln
Joe McGuire
Andy Mitchell
Jim PetersonRoger Simmons
Tony Valeri
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
Pierre BrienJohn Cannis
Bernie CollinsJack Frazer
Jim HartJean H. Leroux
John O'ReillyJohn Richardson
Bob Wood

(11)

Associate MembersStéphane Bergeron
Bill Blaikie
Pierre de SavoyeJesse Flis
Gar Knutson
John MaloneyRéal Ménard
Val Meredith
Bob RingmaSvend J. Robinson
Elsie Wayne**NATURAL RESOURCES****Chairman:** Andy Mitchell**Vice-Chairmen:** René Canuel
Peter ThalheimerRéginald Bélair
David Chatters
Marlene CowlingBernard Deshaies
Monique Guay
David IftodyJulian Reed
Bob Ringma
Benoît SerréRoseanne Skoke
Darrel Stinson
Bob Wood

(15)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Gérard AsselinLeon E. Benoit
John FinlayRoger Gallaway
John SolomonBrent St. Denis
Derek Wells**PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS****Chairman:** Paul Zed**Vice-Chairs:** Marlene Catterall
François LangloisDon Boudria
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Jack FrazerMac Harb
René Laurin
John LoneyPeter Milliken
Rey D. Pagtakhan
Carolyn ParrishRay Speaker
Chuck Strahl

(14)

Associate MembersMauril Bélanger
Robert Bertrand
Dianne Brushett
John Cummins
Ken EppRon Fewchuk
Deborah Grey
Michel Guimond
Hugh Hanrahan
Stephen HarperDick Harris
Jim Hart
Jim Jordan
John Solomon
Darrel StinsonSuzanne Tremblay
Elsie Wayne
Ted White
John Williams**SUB-COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS OF SUPPLY****Chair:** Marlene CatterallRené Laurin
John Loney

Rey D. Pagtakhan

John Solomon

John Williams

(6)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**Chair:** Carolyn Parrish

Jack Frazer

François Langlois

John Loney

(4)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chairman: Michel Guimond

Vice-Chairmen: Leonard Hopkins
Denis Paradis

Sue Barnes
Judy Bethel
Rex Crawford

Pierre de Savoye
Ivan Grose

Charles Hubbard
Yves Rocheleau

Jim Silye
John Williams

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
John Bryden
Gilbert Fillion

Mac Harb
Ed Harper
René Laurin

Ian McClelland
Rey D. Pagtakhan
Alex Shepherd

John Solomon
Benoît Tremblay

TRANSPORT

Chairman: Reg Alcock

Vice-Chairmen: André Caron
Joe Comuzzi

Gerry Byrne
Roy Cullen

Joe Fontana
Jim Gouk

Dick Harris
Jim Jordan

Stan Keyes
Paul Mercier

(11)

Associate Members

Vic Althouse
Leon E. Benoit
Paul Crête
Antoine Dubé

Ivan Grose
Jake E. Hoepfner
Ovid L. Jackson
John Maloney

Philippe Paré
Bernard Patry
Yves Rocheleau

Anna Terrana
Stéphan Tremblay
Elsie Wayne

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chairman:

Vice-Chairman:

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Roch Bolduc
Philippe D. Gigantès
Maurice Riel

Peter Adams
John Bryden
Jim Karygiannis
Philip Mayfield

Paul Mercier
Pat O'Brien
Roseanne Skoke

(10)

Associate Member

Ted White

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joint Chairs: Sen. Maurice Riel
Albina Guarnieri

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
Cliff Breitzkreuz

Michel Dupuy
Georgette Sheridan

(12)

Associate Members

Gaston Leroux

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

Geoff Regan
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. Pagtakhan
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 27, 1996

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada Marine Act	
Bill C-44	4787
Mr. Gagliano	4787
Mr. Keyes	4787
Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge)	4789
Mr. Mercier	4790
Mr. Ringma	4790
Mr. Dubé	4792
Mr. Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	4793

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

John Child	
Mr. Cannis	4794
The 150th Anniversary of the Séminaire de Joliette	
Mr. Laurin	4795
Prime Ministerial Appointments	
Mr. Abbott	4795
Drayton Festival	
Mr. Richardson	4795
Arthritis Month	
Mrs. Gaffney	4795
Vaughan Interact Club	
Mr. Bevilacqua	4795
Anne Hébert	
Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	4796
Young Offenders Act	
Mr. Ringma	4796
Agriculture	
Mr. Althouse	4796
Impaired Driving	
Mr. DeVilliers	4796
Canadian Unity	
Mr. Bellemare	4797
Health Care	
Ms. Bethel	4797
The Minister of National Defence	
Mr. Leroux (Shefford)	4797
The Late Bert Hargrave	
Mr. Solberg	4797
Reference to the Supreme Court	
Mr. Bertrand	4798
Reference to the Supreme Court	
Mr. Discepolo	4798
Criminal Justice System	
Mr. Stinson	4798
Fisheries	
Mr. Adams	4798

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Constitution	
Mr. Duceppe	4798
Mr. Rock	4799
Mr. Duceppe	4799
Mr. Rock	4799
Mr. Duceppe	4799
Mr. Rock	4800
Mr. Ménard	4800
Mr. Rock	4800
Mr. Ménard	4800
Mr. Rock	4800
Canadian Armed Forces	
Mr. Hart	4800
Mr. Massé	4800
Mr. Hart	4801
Mr. Massé	4801
Mr. Hart	4801
Mr. Richardson	4801
Jerusalem Tunnel	
Mrs. Debien	4801
Mr. Pettigrew	4801
Mrs. Debien	4802
Mr. Pettigrew	4802
Quebec	
Mr. Solberg	4802
Mr. Rock	4802
Mr. Solberg	4802
Mr. Rock	4802
Revenue Canada	
Mr. Laurin	4803
Mrs. Barnes	4803
Mr. Laurin	4803
Mrs. Barnes	4803
Telecommunications	
Mr. Abbott	4803
Ms. Copps	4803
Mr. Abbott	4803
Ms. Copps	4803
Canada Pension Plan	
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral	4804
Mr. Young	4804
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral	4804
Mr. Young	4804
Government Assistance	
Mr. Duhamel	4804
Mr. Massé	4804
Gun Registration	
Mr. Stinson	4804
Mr. Rock	4805
Mr. Stinson	4805
Mr. Rock	4805
The Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission	
Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	4805

Ms. Copps	4805
Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	4805
Ms. Copps	4805
Canada Communication Group	
Mr. Gilmour	4805
Mr. Anderson	4805
Mr. Gilmour	4806
Mr. Anderson	4806
Hong Kong	
Mr. English	4806
Mr. Chan	4806
Returning Officers	
Mr. Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	4806
Mr. Gagliano	4806
Business Contracts	
Mr. Morrison	4807
Mr. Pettigrew	4807

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Ms. Catterall	4807
Motion for concurrence in 31st report	4807
(Motion agreed to)	4807
Business of the House	
Mr. Boudria	4807
Motion	4807
(Motion agreed to)	4807
Petitions	
Deficit Reduction and Job Creation	
Mr. Bevilacqua	4807

Terms of Union	
Mr. Duhamel	4808
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Keyes	4808

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada Marine Act	
Bill C-44. Consideration resumed of motion	4808
Mr. Brien	4808
Mr. Gilmour	4809
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral	4810
Division Deferred	4811
Ms. Catterall	4811
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral	4811
Manganese-based Fuel Additives Act	
Bill C-29. Consideration resumed of third reading.	4811
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral	4812
Mr. Adams	4813
Mr. Morrison	4814
Mr. Ménard	4816

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Income Tax Act	
Motion	4819
Mr. Dumas	4819
Mr. Duhamel	4820
Mr. Epp	4822
Mr. Bryden	4823
Mrs. Debien	4824
Mr. Murray	4826
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://www.parl.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.**