



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 134 • NUMBER 087 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Monday, October 21, 1996

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

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

Monday, October 21, 1996

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*Translation*]

AN ACT TO REVOKE THE CONVICTION OF LOUIS DAVID RIEL

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ) moved that Bill C-297, an act to revoke the conviction of Louis David Riel, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I think that today is a great day for our country as we begin debate at second reading of Bill C-297, an act to revoke the conviction of Louis David Riel.

In presenting this bill, I was not carried away by my imagination. I am following in the path of a number of colleagues from different political parties who have, over a period of many years, taken various steps that should help us finally bring about a resolution to a longstanding paradox: Riel has been recognized as one of the Fathers of Confederation, but, legally, he remains a criminal sentenced for high treason.

Louis David Riel played a very important role in the history of Canada. Among other things, he is considered one of the founders of the province of Manitoba, and the person principally responsible for its subsequent entry into Canadian Confederation. He was, at the time, a very strong voice for the west. Without his intervention, the federal government of the time would have turned the present western provinces into territories run by governors appointed by Ottawa.

• (1105)

It was thanks to him that Canada pushed back its frontiers to the Far North and then to the Pacific. In 1871, he organized the resistance to the American invasion that allowed the country to consolidate its borders. He was the first to defend the rights of the Métis, the first nations and francophones.

The House of Commons recognized Louis David Riel's, and I quote: "deep devotion to his people and his willingness to pay the ultimate price of his life to help his people".

The question of Louis David Riel has quite a history in the House of Commons. Let us take a brief look at the various actions taken.

On September 23, 1983, the Conservative member for Edmonton East, William Yurko, tabled Bill C-691, an act to grant a pardon to Louis David Riel. On March 14, he tried again with Bill C-228, but with no more success.

On June 28, 1984, there was Bill C-257 and, on December 13, 1984, Bill—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot on a point of order.

Mr. Loubier: Mr. Speaker, would it be possible to ask my colleagues from the Reform Party to keep the noise down a bit while my colleague, the member for Rimouski—Témiscouata is speaking.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I am sympathetic to the request, but it is not a point of order as such. The House notes the intervention of the hon. member and we hope that the debate will go on according to the parliamentary practice of the House. The hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata.

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): With Bill C-257 on June 28, 1984 and Bill C-217 on December 13, 1984, Les Benjamin, the NDP member representing Regina—Lumsdon, called for the guilty sentence against Louis David Riel to be overturned.

On November 28, 1985, on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of the hanging of Louis Riel, the hon. member for Hamilton East, the present Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, asked the House for a posthumous pardon for Louis David Riel.

I would like to read what the hon. member said on November 28, 1985, and to adopt the words as my own: "We are now in November and one hundred years have gone by since the hanging of Louis Riel. I now ask that this Conservative government exonerate the victim of the conspiracy of another Conservative government.

For one hundred years, politicians and historians have shown that the government purposely misrepresented the events known today as the Riel Rebellion. Letters and diaries of the participants

Private Members' Business

and observers reveal the use of unethical tactics to obtain political benefits from the rebellion.

In a letter from the Marquis of Lansdowne to Prime Minister Macdonald on August 18, 1885, the Marquis wrote: "You regard the recent outbreak in the Northwest as merely 'domestic trouble', which should not be elevated to the rank of a rebellion. I am afraid we have all of us been doing what we could to elevate it to the rank of a rebellion and with so much success that we cannot now reduce it to the rank of a common riot".

The reason for the Macdonald government's promotion of a common riot to a full blown rebellion was to win additional funding for the near bankrupt Canadian Pacific Railway. While the CPR benefited from the events of the summer of 1885, a Métis leader was hanged. Louis David Riel, who died unnecessarily, deserves to be exonerated by the Government and recognized as a victim of wrongdoing."

On September 16, 1987, another NDP member, Nelson Riis, representing Kamloops, adopted the idea of his colleague as his own, and tabled Bill C-265. On October 13, 1989, Bob Skelly, the member for Comox—Alberni, also NDP, tabled a motion calling for recognition of Louis David Riel as one of the Fathers of Confederation.

• (1110)

On March 9, 1992, the House of Commons was to take an important step. On that day, the hon. member for Yellowhead, Joe Clark, who was then Minister of Constitutional Affairs in Brian Mulroney's Conservative government, obtained the unanimous consent of the House for the following resolution:

Pursuant to order made Monday, March 9, 1992, the following motion was deemed moved and adopted:

That this House take note that the Métis people of Rupert's Land and the North Western Territory through democratic structures and procedures took effective steps to maintain order and protect the lives, rights and property of the people of the Red River;

That this House take note that, in 1870, under the leadership of Louis Riel, the Métis of the Red River adopted a List of Rights;

That this House take note that, based on the List of Rights, Louis Riel negotiated the terms for the admission of Rupert's Land and the North Western Territory into the Dominion of Canada;

That this House take note that these terms for admission form part of the *Manitoba Act*;

That this House take note that, after negotiating Manitoba's entry into Confederation, Louis Riel was thrice elected to the House of Commons;

That this House take note that, in 1885, Louis Riel paid with his life for his leadership in a movement which fought for the maintenance of the rights and freedoms of the Métis people;

That this House take note that the *Constitution Act, 1982*, recognizes and affirms the existing aboriginal and treaty rights of the Métis;

That this House take note that since the death of Louis Riel, the Métis people have honoured his memory and continued his purposes in their honorable striving for the implementation of those rights;

That this House recognize the unique and historic role of Louis Riel as a founder of Manitoba and his contribution in the development of Confederation; and

That this House support by its actions the true attainment, both in principle and practice, of the constitutional rights of the Métis people.

On November 16, 1994, I followed the lead of my NDP colleagues and introduced Bill C-288, requesting the revocation of the conviction of Louis David Riel.

On February 22, 1996, in answer to a letter from Mr. Ron Swain, President of the Ontario Métis Nation, the Minister of Natural Resources, who was also responsible for Métis issues, noted that a number of steps had already been taken to recognize Louis Riel's contribution to Canada's development: stamp offerings, tributes in the form of statues and cultural performances, and a resolution passed by the House in 1982, recognizing Riel's unique and historic role as a founder of Manitoba. She noted the \$150,000 contribution by the federal government for the new statue of Riel in front of the Manitoba legislature. The minister ended her letter by saying, and I quote: "I would nevertheless wish to assure you that the federal government will continue, in the future, to listen to the views of the Métis".

On May 12, 1996, at the unveiling ceremonies of the new statue of Louis Riel in front of the Manitoba legislature, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, said, and I quote: "For all Canadians, Riel was a Father of Confederation. Promises were made to the Métis that were not kept. As long as I am in a position of power, I will try to make sure that the Métis have full and equal participation in this country".

On June 4, 1996, I made another attempt and introduced Bill C-297, again to request the revocation of the conviction of Louis David Riel.

Mr. Ron Swain, President of the Ontario Métis Nation, wrote to the Prime Minister asking him to support the bill. The Minister of Natural Resources, answering this letter on behalf of the Prime Minister, said, and I quote:

[*English*]

"As part of the process of healing the wounds created by the historical events surrounding the life of Louis Riel to which you have referred, please be assured that the federal government remains committed to pursuing various avenues to recognize Mr. Riel's place in Canadian history."

Private Members' Business

• (1115)

[Translation]

The Indian affairs minister replied, and I quote:

[English]

I understand that my colleague, the hon. Anne McLellan who, as federal interlocutor, deals with Métis issues, will be writing to you in response to your petition to her and the Prime Minister on this issue to assure you that the federal government remains committed to pursuing various avenues to further recognize Mr. Riel's place in Canada's history. To that commitment I should like to add my own personal assurance that I will be supportive of these initiatives as they are developed.

[Translation]

The Secretary of State for Training and Youth replied to Mr. Swain in a handwritten note, and I quote:

[English]

Further to your letter of June 7, 1996 on the issue of Louis Riel and setting the record straight, I will get back to you with a further update on what is happening. I am committed to doing something soon.

[Translation]

But who is this man who, 152 years after his birth and 111 years after his death by hanging, is still talked about with so much passion?

Louis Riel was born in St-Boniface on October 22, 1844 as the son of Louis Riel, a Metis, and Julie de Lagimonière, the daughter of the first white woman to give birth in the North-West. He was the oldest of 11 children in a very close and deeply religious family. His grandfather had settled at Red River at the beginning of the 19th century and married a Metis woman named Marguerite Boucher.

A gifted child, he studied at the Petit Séminaire de Montréal from 1858 to 1865. Louis David Riel was a good student, always among the first in his class. He learned Greek, Latin, French, English and Cree. He also received an education outside of school since he lived at the Manoir de Terrebonne belonging to Mrs. Masson, a high society lady who owned a complete library that had been built up by the famous Louis Joseph Papineau.

After his father died, Riel quit school and worked at Sir George Étienne Cartier's law firm. Two or three years later, he returned to Red River where he would play an important role in protecting the rights not only of the Metis but of all the citizens of Red River. At that time, the colony's population was estimated at 12,000 and far from homogeneous. In addition to a majority of French speaking Roman Catholic Metis, who engaged in buffalo hunting, there were English speaking Anglican Metis, who worked the fields, and Scottish Presbyterian settlers.

Despite their different languages, religions and lifestyles, these groups had learned to live together in a bilingual climate, but Ottawa's territorial ambitions combined with the attitude of some

newcomers would upset this delicate balance. These extremists' strategy was to provoke a civil war in the colony and blame the Metis so as to destroy their political power.

As a result of his two fights in 1869 and 1885, Louis David Riel became the symbol of a linguistic and cultural minority whose survival rights were ignored for a long time and are still threatened, and of the struggle waged by Western settlers who were concerned above all with being free and communing with nature so as to prevent civilization from disrupting their lifestyle.

Unfortunately, Riel has sometimes been portrayed as a traitor or a madman. He was a founder of Manitoba and was elected three times to the House of Commons. He was a spokesperson for his community and fought racism by championing human rights.

Basically, Louis Riel was hanged all those years ago because he had fought for rights which are now generally recognized as legitimate: the right of any people to govern itself, with universal suffrage and responsible government; the right of the Metis to own property, which much be recognized and respected; the recognition of the Metis as a nation and a distinct society; the right of the Metis to have their own language and religion, a right recognized by granting bilingual status to their laws and courts, and a dual denominational school system.

The rights claimed by this native leader at the time have, for the most part, been inscribed in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms of 1982. Riel fought vigorously for the rights of the Metis and successfully conveyed the concerns the first western Canadians had. He embodied the dreams of the Metis and instilled in all native peoples the desire to fight for their dreams and beliefs.

• (1120)

A growing number of western Canadians are realizing that Riel was the first to defend western Canada against the central government and a forerunner of the movements opposing central Canada's economic and political power.

We are not asking that history be rewritten. What is done is done, and Riel is dead. But the memory of Louis Riel is alive and, for that reason, he must be cleared. Precedents exist around the world where innocent victims, often political opponents sentenced for reasons of state, have been pardoned.

In the letter containing his last wishes, Louis David Riel asked to be given a simple funeral and surrounded with the comfort of religion. "Far be it from me and my mortal remains to seek vengeance. I forgive those who have been so unfair to me".

Motions to pardon Louis Riel have been tabled in this House by Conservative, Liberal, NDP and Bloc Québécois members. On March 10, 1992, this House unanimously passed a resolution recognizing that "Louis Riel paid with his life for his leadership in a movement which fought for the maintenance of the rights and freedoms of the Métis people". All the parties represented in this

Private Members' Business

Parliament must now unite not to restore the great Canadian that Louis David Riel was to life but to restore the dignity he was stripped of.

I would like to conclude with this poem by Manie Tobie:

Fils d'un rugueux pays, écoute, prête l'oreille,
Jamais tu ne croirais une chose pareille.
Certes, après tout ce temps, la terre parle de toi.

Et ton souvenir cause partout l'émoi.
Tu passes pour un héros, mais plus souvent rebelle.
La mention de ton nom fait surgir la querelle,
Ou bien l'admiration. Difficile labeur?
Resteras-tu vaincu? Deviendras-tu vainqueur?
Se rappelant encore, on traîne ta mémoire,
On te rend innocent en admettant ta gloire,
Hélas! beaucoup trop tard arrive l'amnistie.
Ceux qui au bout des ans t'auront enfin connu,

Regretteront toujours que tu fus le pendu.
Si ce n'était pas toi, qui donc commit le crime,
Dont tu fus par erreur l'innocente victime?
Le sang crie, cher riel: la force est dans l'union.
Et ceux qui croient en toi te donnent encore raison.

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take part in today's debate and I want to congratulate the hon. member who just spoke on this important initiative.

[English]

I take pleasure in addressing this House on a matter very dear to the hearts of the Metis people of this country and one that is of significant importance to all Canadians. Clearly it is a matter of great interest to this government as well. I applaud what appears to be at first glance a laudable objective.

[Translation]

—to recognize the injustices suffered by Louis Riel and to correct the situation.

However, a number of questions were raised. Can we actually do what is being proposed here today? Can the legislative branch of the government overlook a judicial decision? This is a constitutional issue. Is this bill supported by a majority of Metis people in Canada?

The hon. member's initiative is laudable but, given the Bloc's vision, some wonder whether it is a ploy to make the agenda of the Bloc and the Parti Québécois more palatable. Is the hon. member a pawn for the separatists forces? I am not saying this to be mean. However, we are well aware that the Bloc's vision is different from

that of the other political parties. This issue must be raised here in this House, otherwise we would be denying reality.

[English]

Parliament is being asked today to do something which it may or may not be able to do, to revoke the conviction of Louis Riel. It can do so, but is it constitutionally solid? Will it stand? Could it be contested? Those are questions we need to raise.

• (1125)

I have conducted considerable research in this area. I have discussed Louis Riel and the constitutional implications of what is being proposed with the finest experts in the land. There is a great deal of debate. It seems, according to certain authorities, that a legislative revocation of the conviction may in fact be invalid. It may be unconstitutional.

It would appear, according to those same sources, that it would be highly unlikely that a judicial overturning would stand up in the courts or would stand up to that kind of challenge. It might be improper since it may be a breach of the constitutional divide between the legislature and the judiciary.

Hon. members know that some eight private members' bills have been tabled in the House since 1978 on the matter of Louis Riel. A considerable amount of parliamentarians' energy continues to be expended trying to find ways to heal the unfortunate events of the past while also trying to find appropriate ways to honour Louis Riel's contribution to the building of Confederation.

I have been among those who have been proud to speak out on this matter. For example, in 1995 while debating this issue, I suggested that we form an all-party committee with an MP from each political party to determine whether this bill was feasible or whether there was a more appropriate option. I was not able to find unanimity to proceed in that way. I wanted to discuss what might be the best course of action for which we could find unanimous consent.

I have worked with certain authorities such as the Library of Parliament. I have held discussions with people of St. Boniface, my riding, where Louis Riel is buried, with ministers of justice and the solicitor general on this issue, including our senior minister for western Canada, the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

I also had the opportunity to speak on this matter in 1992 when I supported the resolution:

[Translation]

"That this House recognize the unique and historic role of Louis Riel as a founder of Manitoba and his contribution in the development of Confederation; and that this House support by its actions the true attainment, both in principle and practice, of the constitutional rights of the Metis people".

[English]

I supported this motion. I even requested that we take a further step.

[Translation]

I said that, in a spirit of justice, we should go a step further and “recognize Louis Riel not only as the founder of Manitoba but as a Father of Confederation”.

As you can see, I strongly support the idea of clearing Louis Riel, and I support the principle underlying the bill. However, as I said earlier, I am somewhat concerned about where it could lead us.

I find it ironical that a political party has once again tabled a private member’s bill, allegedly to settle the issue of Louis Riel’s conviction, but which essentially seeks to take advantage of the circumstances surrounding this case to possibly build a wall between English and French Canadians, something that would be unfortunate.

I am not the only one concerned. In a letter to the Prime Minister regarding this bill, the president of the Metis National Council, Gérald Morin, said, and I quote:

[English]

First of all, there is a reference. I have it here and I want to make sure I read it correctly.

He says that he has been encouraged and pleased by the productive dialogue that has been initiated and promoted by the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister of Natural Resources covering a wide range of Metis concerns, including the exoneration of Louis Riel and the appropriate recognition of Riel as a Father of Confederation. The Minister of Foreign Affairs has stated that he wishes this dialogue be about correcting the wrongs of the past with respect to the Metis people. At the unveiling of the Louis Riel statue in Winnipeg on May 12, 1996 he added: “Promises were made to the Metis that were not kept. As long as I am in a position of power I will try to make sure the Metis have full and equal participation in this country”.

The letter from the Metis National Council, written by Gerald Morin, continues: “We have grave concerns about the potential negative impact of the bill. While the goal of the bill appears positive, we are concerned about its potential use as a tool by those who are intent on breaking up Canada. To in any way allow this to occur would be a travesty to the vision of Louis Riel, which was for a strong and united Canada and a homeland where the rights of all people, including French language rights, were assured.”

• (1130)

Members will know that Louis Riel negotiated the terms of admission of Manitoba into Confederation, the Manitoba Act, which provided for certain guarantees for Metis people, including schooling and religious rights as well as recognition of French and

Private Members’ Business

English language rights. The rights of other citizens were also clearly set out.

[Translation]

Such was Louis Riel’s vision of a united country in which all would participate equally.

[English]

Louis Riel was then elected three times by acclamation to the House of Commons.

[Translation]

Riel was an eloquent speaker. He was a staunch protector of the rights of the Metis and, in fact, of all members of the community, aboriginal and non-aboriginal, anglophones and francophones.

[English]

Louis Riel’s fate has long been a heavy burden for his family and for all Metis people. We must find a solution and a way to recognize his importance and the injustices that he faced.

Is this the way to proceed? I do not know. We need a solution that would be supported by all parties and by the Metis people, for this is ultimately, I believe, what we should all want, the rehabilitation of Louis Riel. What does it mean? It means recognizing the fact that he would not have been convicted of treason had he received a trial according to the standards of fairness normally upheld. Clearly we could say that. We could come to some agreement and the Metis people of Canada would agree that is so.

[Translation]

His role in the history of Canada is of such importance that he deserves to be called a Father of Confederation. This is what “clearing” means. This is what Metis people and Riel’s descendants want. Surely, we have the authority here, as a political structure, to do precisely what I just suggested, perhaps in more eloquent terms, and to rehabilitate Mr. Riel, the Father of Manitoba, to be sure, but also a Father of Confederation, of Canada.

[English]

Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to Bill C-297 to revoke the conviction of Louis Riel.

In discussing the merits of this bill, there is one thing to which we can all agree, and that is the important contribution made by Louis Riel to the building of this great nation.

Louis Riel played a key role and was an important contributor to Confederation. Louis Riel had a vision for this country over 100 years ago. He was a man of action, a man who looked to the future. If Mr. Riel were with us today he would say: “Let us look to the future. Let us build a society where the Metis people can take their rightful place in society, standing shoulder to shoulder with all

Private Members' Business

others". He would be urging us to focus our energies on finding solutions to our present day problems and building for a better future.

With that in mind, I would like to spend a few minutes talking about what the federal government is doing today to advance the interests of Metis and off reserve aboriginal people. As many members are aware, the Minister of Natural Resources fulfils the role of federal interlocutor for Metis and non-status Indians in addition to her other ministerial duties. In that role the minister acts as a point of first contact and where necessary as a facilitator between Metis and non-status Indians and the appropriate federal ministers and departments.

• (1135)

In addition to that role, she oversees the federal government's participation in the tripartite self-government process, which is the forum being used to negotiate self-government with Metis and off reserve aboriginal groups within the context of the Canadian Constitution.

As many members are aware, on August 10, 1995 the federal government announced its approach to the implementation of the inherent right and the negotiation of self-government for aboriginal people, including Metis and off reserve aboriginal people. The federal approach contemplates various practical ways of implementing self-government for Metis and off reserve aboriginal people, including the development of self-government institutions providing services, the devolution of programs and services and forms of public government all responsive to the needs of the Metis and of off reserve aboriginal people.

The federal approach has provided a stronger mandate for the tripartite self-government process which will allow for progress to be made on the implementation of self-government.

In that regard, I note that self-government processes are currently under way in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. There have also been some preliminary discussions on the possibility of beginning an urban self-government process in Winnipeg.

As part of the self-government framework announced last August, the federal government also committed to cost share with the provinces the enumeration of Metis and the identification of Indian people living off a land base or off reserve. Since the announcement of the federal approach the federal government has participated in and cost shared the development of a proposal for a Metis enumeration along with the province of Saskatchewan and the Metis Society of Saskatchewan.

I understand the federal government is prepared to cost share this enumeration. Enumeration is very important as the information

provided by an enumeration would prove very valuable in the implementation of self-government for Metis and off reserve aboriginal people.

Before closing, I would like to mention one more important program through which the federal government works with Metis groups in an effort to meet their objectives. For the past several years the federal government has participated in bilateral processes respectively with the Metis National Council and the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples. Like the tripartite self-government process, the bilateral process is also managed from the federal perspective by the Minister for Natural Resources.

The bilateral processes provide a forum for the congress and the council to discuss issues of utmost importance to them in their relationship with federal departments. The bilateral processes generally focus on issues such as self-government, access to program funding and the devolution of programs and services.

In closing, I would like to return to my initial comments about Louis Riel, about the kind of man he was and what he would do in our situation. I believe he would urge us to keep our focus on the future and to continue to build on these self-government initiatives which I have just described.

Louis Riel was a builder, within his community, within his province, within the nation of Canada. Indeed, Louis Riel was a member of Parliament, a man publicly commended by the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba for his assistance to Canada in repelling an American invasion. He was working to build a society where his people could contribute to the important decisions that confront us all in building a better future.

• (1140)

The federal approach to self-government, which I outlined earlier in my speech, of working together with the Metis people and off reserve aboriginal people will finally begin to finish the task that Riel began many years ago.

For many years within society walls have divided the aboriginal and non-aboriginal communities. When we look back in history we see the efforts of Louis Riel and others to tear down those walls and create a society where all people, regardless of race, religion or language worked together to build a great nation.

Today we must remember that legacy and take that message to heart as we continue to build this nation. We must continue with the Canadian values of tolerance, justice, fairness, working together, sharing and generosity to all people. Canada is big enough for all people regardless of the differences. By working together and seeking to understand the tragedies of the past, the divisions that exist will be avoided. We will be able to begin the process of

tearing down the walls and building an inclusive society where all people can feel fully and properly a part of that society.

The federal and provincial governments together with all people within the nation working together will be able to build this great society, a society that Louis Riel had in mind, the society that he fought hard to protect, a society that he wanted to see, a society where all of us could live in shared dignity and mutual respect.

Let us not forget the work of Louis Riel. Let us not forget his vision. Let us not forget the work he did to bring this about. Let us never let go of the dream of a country where Canadian values will be first and foremost in all of our minds. Let us, in all we say and do, honour the memory of a very courageous man, a leader and a true Canadian.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honour this morning to be able to speak about revoking the conviction of Louis David Riel for high treason and restoring his memory here in this House.

I listened to the speech of my colleague, the hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata, who has, in my view, done a good job of laying out for us the life—I was going to say the work—of Louis Riel. I have also just listened to the speech of my Liberal colleague, who, in his turn, has emphasized the important human qualities shown by Louis Riel during his unfortunately all too brief existence.

But, at the same time, I cannot but deplore the fact that the member who should perhaps, of all the members in this House, have the greatest interest in this subject, the member from Manitoba, has not taken the lead in supporting the bill before us with more vigour, resolve and determination.

● (1145)

What is this bill about? I think it would be appropriate at this time to reread it for the benefit of the House and also for the benefit of viewers. This is a bill to revoke the conviction of Louis David Riel.

Louis David Riel, it should be remembered, was a member of the House of Commons for the electoral district of Provencher from 1873 to 1874. He was convicted of high treason on August 1, 1885, sentenced to death, and hanged on November 16, 1885 at Regina, then part of the North West Territories.

The second whereas recalls that, notwithstanding his conviction, Louis David Riel has become a symbol and a hero to successive generations of Canadians who have, through their governments, honoured and commemorated him in specific projects and actions. Finally, the third whereas of this bill points out quite rightly that it is consistent with this recognition that the conviction of Louis David Riel be now revoked.

Private Members' Business

The bill would therefore have Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the other Chamber and of this Chamber, revoke the conviction of Louis David Riel for the offence of high treason, while recognizing that nothing in this Act shall be construed as limiting or reflecting in any manner Her Majesty's royal prerogative of mercy or the *Letters Patent Constituting the Office of Governor General* relating to pardons.

This is not, as you know, the first time this subject has been raised in the House. I would like to point out that, on November 28, 1985, the Liberal member for Hamilton East asked the Conservative government of the day, through the Speaker of this House, to exonerate the victim of the conspiracy of another Conservative government, that victim of course being Louis Riel.

That hon. member, who is still sitting in this House, more or less committed herself in 1985 to supporting the pardon of Louis Riel. Now once again she has the opportunity of putting her good intentions of 11 years ago into deeds. I trust that, even if her seat is not on the line, this time, she will follow up on it.

Just to show how important this case is, and how often it has been brought up in the House, as well as to stress the point that this ought to be the very last time it is brought up in the House—and the only way that can happen is if this bill is passed—may I point out that, in the past, many other people in the House have shared the same concern we have today.

On September 23, 1983, William Yurko, who was then the member for Edmonton East, introduced a bill to grant a pardon to Louis Riel. That bill was not followed up on. He tried again on March 14, 1984.

On June 28, 1984, Les Benjamin, the NDP member for Regina—Lumsdon, called for the conviction of Louis David Riel to be revoked.

● (1150)

On December 13, 1984, Mr. Benjamin tried again, followed on September 16, 1987 by another NDP member who is still among us, the hon. member for Kamloops, who again introduced a bill to revoke the conviction of Louis Riel.

Today we have a bill introduced on November 16, 1994, and here we are nearly two years later. The hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata is now proposing a bill to revoke the conviction of Louis Riel.

Louis Riel was a great man in his day, a man of conviction, a humanist. He held a vision, not only for the Métis people, but for all Canadians from sea to sea. It seems that he was not given the attention he deserved. The tenor of the times precipitated events, and trapped him in a process which, as others have already said, was a mistake on all sides but not, most certainly, an act of treason. What took place was an error.

Private Members' Business

On many occasions over many years, the governments of all of the provinces have examined this issue. Many have adopted resolutions or motions aimed at his rehabilitation. But this House has not yet done what must be done. We find ourselves today with an opportunity to finally correct the course of history.

I trust that the member from Manitoba who referred just now to letting some time pass will instead pick up the torch and be the first to lead all of us in the House to rehabilitate the memory of Louis David Riel.

[English]

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I can understand the sentiments lying behind Bill C-297, an act to revoke the conviction of Louis David Riel.

Perhaps the most recognizable name in all of Canadian history, he was certainly the greatest leader ever produced by the Metis, the people whose history is woven together with that of western Canada. Yet modern historical research has demonstrated that Riel, in spite of his undeniable greatness, was afflicted with tragic flaws. To revoke his conviction more than 100 years after the fact glosses over those flaws in favour of a historically inaccurate portrait of the man and his age.

Riel's greatest failing was his monumental vanity which is illustrated in a curious way in my hon. friend's bill. That bill is entitled "an act to revoke the conviction of Louis David Riel". In fact Riel was not baptised with the middle name David. Rather he adopted that name when he was about 30 years old and he always wrote it in quotation marks.

He used the signature Louis David Riel to express his conviction that he was like the David of the Old Testament, a sacred priest king. Riel also called himself the "prophet of the new world" and "prophet, priest king and infallible pontiff". He claimed to be the divinely inspired founder of a new religion which was to be a sort of higher stage of Roman Catholicism for the new world.

Many of those who knew him thought he had gone insane when he started to issue these revelations. In fact, he was confined to insane asylums in the province of Quebec for almost two years from 1876 to 1878. Whether or not he was insane in the medical sense, he clearly saw himself as a divinely inspired prophet. This self-understanding was central to the movement he led in the Saskatchewan valley in 1885.

He began the uprising by climbing the steps of the mission church at Batoche and proclaiming "Rome has fallen". The governing council of the Metis of Batoche declared Riel to be their official prophet with a right "to direct the priests". Even as the Canadian expeditionary force was advancing on Batoche, Riel and

his council were debating religious innovations such as changing the sabbath from Sunday to Saturday.

• (1155)

As I have said, opinions differ about his sanity. Several psychiatrists have written that he was mentally ill. Contemporary historians tend to see him more as a religious enthusiast and millenarian leader. Either way, little would be served by revoking his conviction in 1996. We can hardly argue that religious enthusiasts are not subject to the law. If we say he should not have been convicted because he was not responsible by reason of insanity, what message are we sending to the Metis? Does it help them if we label their greatest leader a lunatic?

From a historical point of view, there is little doubt that in the context of his own day, Riel was properly convicted of treason. Let me expand on four reasons why I draw this conclusion.

First, there is no doubt that Riel encouraged his followers to rebel against the crown. In addition to the testimony of many eye witnesses, we have documents in his own hand. Perhaps the most interesting is a short sentence that he wrote in French: "La justice ordonne de prendre les armes". One of his secretaries, William Henry Jackson, translated it into English: "Justice commands to take up arms", boldly underlining the phrase "to take up arms". These and similar texts will be found in the five volume set *The Collected Writings of Louis David Riel* published by the University of Alberta Press and edited by a team under the direction of the renowned historian George Stanley, who served as lieutenant governor of New Brunswick and who also designed Canada's flag.

There is no legal defence for taking up arms against the sovereign. If the movement is successful, a new legal order is created but if it fails, the instigators will be charged with treason. That is why the great leaders of the American Revolution pledged to each other "their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honour". They knew they were taking a risk that transcended legality and that they would pay the supreme price if they failed. Louis Riel despite his failings had some of that same kind of courage. It does no credit to his memory to come asking for a posthumous pardon.

I could add that my hon. friends in the official opposition may wish to keep all this in mind if they believe, as the Government of Quebec has said, that they can take Quebec out of Canada in defiance of the law and the Constitution.

Second, Riel's motives in fomenting the northwest rebellion were mixed to say the least. Toward the end of 1884 he entered into behind the scenes negotiations with the federal government, volunteering to leave Canada if the government would pay him a large sum of money. He felt he was owed at least \$100,000 as an indemnity for past services to Canada, but offered to leave for \$35,000. He told this to Father Alexis André, Superior of the

Oblate Missionaries at St. Laurent, and to D. H. MacDowall, member of the Northwest Territories Council from the district of Lorne.

According to MacDowall, Riel said that if the government would consider his personal claims against them and pay him a certain amount in settlement of these claims, he would arrange to make his illiterate and unreasoning followers well satisfied with almost any settlement of their claims for land grants the government might be willing to make. Riel turned to violence only after it became clear that the government would not give him any money.

Third, it is often said that taking up arms in the northwest rebellion was the last resort of desperate men. Their peaceful attempts to have their grievances resolved had all been ignored by an uncaring government.

The truth however is very different. The Metis settlers of the Batoche area did have claims to press. Many of them had settled along the banks of the South Saskatchewan River while the survey was going on and they wanted their lots resurveyed from the standard rectangular system to long, narrow river lots. Also, they wanted a distribution of land and scrip for the Metis of the northwest similar to what had been done in Manitoba. The government was in the process of dealing with both claims.

During the winter of 1884-85 the Department of the Interior sent an official to make a special study of the river lot claims along the South Saskatchewan River and the cabinet appointed a commission to enumerate claims for land and scrip across the northwest. It was the news of these measures that prompted Riel to turn to violence. He realized that if the government dealt with the real life grievances of the local people, his own future as a political leader would be over.

Finally, Riel got a fair trial within the context of his own time and place. He was tried before a stipendiary magistrate and a jury of six as required by the Northwest Territories Act. There was no legal mechanism for trying him in any other way.

Wellwishers in Quebec paid for him to be represented by outstanding talented lawyers. One, François-Xavier Lemieux, later became chief justice of the Supreme Court of Quebec. The other, Charles Fitzpatrick, served as chief justice of the Supreme Court of Canada. Riel also had two appeals, to the court of Queen's bench of Manitoba sitting en banc and to the judicial committee of the privy council in London.

• (1200)

Louis Riel was a complex man. In speaking against the bill I have been forced to dwell on the negative side of his character and career. Of course there was a positive side as well. Riel saw that the days of the fur trade and buffalo hunt were coming to an end. He

Private Members' Business

wanted to make a place for the Metis in the new society growing in the west. He saw his people not as aboriginal wards of the crown but as British subjects or American citizens, depending on which side of the 49th parallel they lived.

He wanted them to settle down as independent, self-sufficient farmers, not to be dependent on government handouts. He campaigned vigorously against the whiskey trade that was so debilitating to all native people.

There are some things in Riel's legacy to admire and it is not surprising that the Metis people of today revere his memory, but nothing will be gained by this legislative attempt to rewrite history. Let us leave history to the historians.

As members of Parliament, let us try to live up to the standard that was laid down by former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau when he said, quoting John F. Kennedy: "We will be just in our time". It is hard enough to do that without trying to take on the fruitless task of second guessing the justice of another era.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): We have only two minutes left for private members' business. I will now recognize the hon. member for Québec-Est.

Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec-Est, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Louis Riel question is a very emotional one for me. As I listened to the speech by the hon. member for the Reform Party, I wondered whether he really knows his history, because the judgment made against Louis Riel in 1885 was clearly unjust.

Louis Riel was led before a jury of six anglophones and tried by an anglophone judge in Regina, as Donald Smith drove the last spike for the transcontinental railway. In that same year, French was banned in Manitoba. Louis Riel was, in fact, the victim of a miscarriage of justice that reflected the attitude to francophones at the time. People in Quebec knew that Louis Riel's cause was just and that by the last battle of Batoche, Riel was no longer a sane man.

He was a victim of his own cause, just though it was, and Quebecers and francophones across the country were outraged by the decision made by a jury of six anglophones, negating the rights of Louis Riel. Despite the uproar this caused in Quebec, even John A. Macdonald, the Prime Minister of Canada at the time, said:

[*English*]

"All the dogs in Quebec can bark, but Louis Riel shall hang".

[*Translation*]

John A. Macdonald said that. It was a way to punish the French fact in the west, although the rights of francophones were supposedly guaranteed. I may also point out to my dear colleagues from

Government Orders

western Canada that subsequently the rights of francophones in Manitoba were abolished for one hundred years.

The conviction of Louis Riel was unjust, unacceptable and unpardonable. If people want to reconcile Canada with its francophones, let them adopt, fairly and squarely, a formula to absolve or pardon Louis Riel.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The hour 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.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1205)

[English]

YUKON QUARTZ MINING ACT

The House resumed from October 11 consideration of the motion that Bill C-6, an act to amend the Yukon Quartz Mining Act and the Yukon Placer Mining Act, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak today in support of Bill C-6, which is the result of approximately five years of negotiations in Yukon.

A lot of people have expressed interest in Bill C-6 and many of them either wrote to the House Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs or testified before the committee when it recently held hearings on these proposed changes to the Yukon Quartz Mining Act and the Yukon Placer Mining Act.

I want to begin my remarks today by praising those citizens who took the time and made the effort to communicate their views to all of us on the committee.

Even more, I want to praise the many citizens who volunteered their time and effort over the years of discussion and debate in Yukon as well as the many organizations and businesses which had such a strong commitment to the democratic process as to fund participation in such a decision making process. The give and take of discussion, the responsibility to whatever interest group one is representing and, most of all, the awareness that the YMAC discussions would probably impact the economy of Yukon more than anything other than land claims, were a weighty load for them to carry and they deserve our praise for their efforts.

YMAC stands for Yukon Mining Advisory Committee, the group which hammered out this agreement. It is almost entirely because of its efforts and the compromises which were reached in Yukon that the Reform caucus and I support Bill C-6. To state it simply, Bill C-6 represents a made in Yukon solution to Yukon

problems. I do not want to see it changed to a made in Ottawa solution.

Yukon has a relatively small population, estimated to have grown to 31,452 as of July 1, 1996. Major sectors of that population were involved in the YMAC decision which debated how to change Yukon's mining legislation to accommodate environmental concerns such as ensuring adequate reclamation of mining sites and placing deposits to guarantee that the work is completed.

It was the recommendation of the House standing committee, just as it was the recommendation of the Government of Yukon representatives who testified before the committee, that Bill C-6 be passed as is with no amendments whatsoever. The reason for the importance of not meddling with Bill C-6 lies in the fact that YMAC reached a delicate balance about what should be done to accommodate those environmental and land use concerns surrounding the second most important primary economic generator in the Yukon Territory, mining.

To show how important mining is for those folks in Yukon, one who appeared before the committee kindly sent me figures for the amount of gold from placer mining in Yukon from the first shipments in 1885-86 up to and including 1995, a total of 110 years. The number of fine ounces of gold was 12.6 billion. In dollars which are current for the year when the gold was produced the value of the gold was \$967,789,808,000. That does not mention jobs, personal and business taxes and the numerous spinoffs across the rest of the economy.

If we look at the value of total mineral production in Yukon, not just placer gold, only in the recent decade from 1985 to 1995 we see a value of \$3.4 billion, according to the 1995 Yukon review. This is despite the fact that 1993 and 1994 were very bad years and that 1995 barely returned to the level of 1986 for total mineral production.

Mining means big money in Yukon in economic terms. Mining is called a primary economic generator. That means that it is not a spinoff from employment elsewhere as would be true, for example, of housing construction.

Unfortunately, according to research supplied by the Library of Parliament, the biggest primary economic generator for Yukon is transfer payments from the federal government. As a percentage of provincial revenue, Yukon Territory received 58.3 per cent of its estimated income for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1996 from general purpose federal transfers plus an additional 12.8 per cent from specific purpose federal transfers for a total of 71.1 per cent of all Yukon government income.

• (1210)

By comparison, my province of British Columbia for the same period received 12.6 per cent of its income from specific purpose federal transfers and nothing whatsoever for general purpose transfers.

Government Orders

By raising 87.4 per cent of its revenue from internal sources B.C. was second by two-tenths of a per cent to the province of Alberta. Sadly, Yukon falls far behind and I hope that is something that can turn around in the future.

To see for myself and to deal directly with the people most involved in this legislation, this past summer I travelled around Yukon. I talked with many people there about Bill C-6 as well as other federal concerns. There is a lot of anxiety in Yukon in view of its huge dependence on Ottawa as to whether, in our present times of severe fiscal constraint, it will mean that the Government of Yukon as well as Yukon Indian bands have to stand on their own two feet financially.

A great many people in Yukon told me in no uncertain terms that the only hope Yukon has of becoming more financially independent from these federal transfers is the industry of mining. Many people said they were afraid that Bill C-6 would damage the Yukon mining industry, especially the vulnerable placer mining, where many claims are worked in the short northern summers by dad and mom and perhaps an adult child or a couple of hired helpers.

To see what the Yukon government revenue is like we might want to glance at the budget from last year. The 1995-96 budget estimated the territorial revenue would include \$35.4 million from personal income tax, \$10.3 million from corporate income tax and \$7.1 million from fuel tax for a total of \$52.8 million from its total revenue of \$497.8 million.

I have supplied my hon. colleagues with some statistical data so that they can understand the profound concern in Yukon about whether these proposed changes from Bill C-6 are going to create an administrative tangle that will seriously damage the Yukon mining industry.

This legislation will be accompanied by many pages of new regulations and by a brand new process of obtaining permits for mineral exploration as well as getting a new mine into production. I raised these concerns during the departmental briefing provided last spring for the Reform Party by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. It told me it was taking every precaution to ensure that Bill C-6 will not have a negative impact on Yukon mining.

At the time I was inclined to believe those assurances from the department but that was prior to a shocking event which took place August 8 with regard to what could become Canada's first diamond mine in Yukon's neighbour, the Northwest Territories.

To put what happened into perspective, my colleagues should be aware that in looking at provincial and territorial income, at the bottom of the heap in so far as paying for its own well-being stands the depressed economy of the Northwest Territories which received 72.2 per cent of its 1995 income from general purpose federal

transfers, plus 10.7 per cent for specific purpose transfers for a total of 82.9 per cent of the income of the Northwest Territories coming from federal transfers. That is a tragic number and I ask my hon. colleagues to bear in mind as well the 71.1 per cent for Yukon as a percentage for territorial income provided by federal government transfers.

In both Yukon and the Northwest Territories jurisdiction over natural resources remains with the federal government although the northern accord gives the Northwest Territories more control over its energy resources. That gives Ottawa enormous control over the lives and activities of people in both territories. It is a profoundly serious responsibility which rests especially on the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

How has that minister discharged that enormous responsibility in the Northwest Territories? He has single handedly sent a very bad message to the international mining community. This is what happened. The BHP project has already invested about \$200 million in trying to open Canada's first diamond mine in the Northwest Territories. BHP Diamonds plans to employ a yearly average of 830 people across the 25-year life of its project and 1,000 people during the construction. Two out of every three will very likely be northerners and one out of every three at least will be aboriginal.

• (1215)

My colleagues will remember the figures I supplied to them earlier. Currently the federal government provides 82.9 per cent of the revenue of the Northwest Territories through general transfers and specific purpose transfers. By contrast, the Northwest Territories had a total 1995-96 estimated revenue of \$1.2 billion of which only \$92.9 million came from personal and corporate income taxes. If it were not for well paid government employees paying taxes, the Northwest Territories would have very little revenue of any kind today.

Against the backdrop of that information I quote from an October 7 Calgary *Sun* article regarding the BHP diamond project: "During the exploration phase, 60 per cent of BHP's workforce were northerners and 25 per cent were aboriginal. That is a welcome change from NWT's dependence on government jobs or welfare and should the final project go ahead, the private sector will flourish in the Arctic.

"The company has also trudged through the most excruciating and whimsical regulatory hurdles in the western world. It passed the arduous and intrusive federal environmental assessment review panel, a two-year trial. BHP's proposal is the only mining project except for uranium mines to ever complete such an investigation. BHP's environmental impact statement is eight volumes long and weighs 64 pounds. It went through the enviro-extremist wringer".

Government Orders

The columnist then went on to describe in his own terms what happened on August 8 when it was supposed to be announced that BHP had passed the environmental review board. Instead: ““The federal government will negotiate a binding environmental agreement with the company,” Irwin announced to a startled BHP. They had after all met every existing requirement”.

The columnist again attributed a direct quote to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development: “The agreement will cover all of those issues not normally part of license terms and conditions”.

The columnist then imagined the following comment from the minister: ““Forget the law”, said Irwin. ‘I am the law. Sure you passed all our tests and paid all our fees but I want more’”. Then again the columnist attributed a direct quote to the minister: “I will be assessing progress on the environmental and benefits agreement before signing the water licence for the project”. The columnist pointed out that the benefits agreement was voluntary in the first place.

I understand that due to unsettled land claims, BHP embarked on the remarkable project of negotiating four separate voluntary socioeconomic agreements or so-called impact benefits agreements, also known as IBAs with the Treaty 11 Dogribs, the Treaty 8 Yellowknives Dene, the Metis and the Inuit of Kugluktuk.

In view of Yukon land claims and Yukon self-government legislation, Bills C-33 and C-34, passed in the first session of the 35th Parliament, we can all see the handwriting on the wall with the BHP project. We can see what a major mining development in the Yukon will quite possibly have to go through before the Government of Canada allows the brave would be developers to invest their dollars in Canada’s north.

That columnist in the Calgary *Sun* referred to the deadline imposed for all these additional totally unprecedented conditions being thrust on BHP as “Irwin’s 60-day temper tantrum”. I wish this issue was that simple.

The columnist went on to raise some of the fundamental questions to which the BHP experience must inevitably lead the international mining community. What comes next? What other gimmicks can the minister of Indian affairs invent to gum up the works for this private investment group which has already sunk about \$200 million into trying to start Canada’s first diamond mine?

The columnist raised a question with which I cannot help but agree: “If the major spin-offs went to Montreal instead of Edmonton, do you think Irwin’s personal agenda would be allowed to get in the way?”

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I have allowed the member to repeatedly mention one of our other colleagues by his name. I would ask his co-operation.

• (1220)

Although these come from quotes, we cannot in the House do indirectly that we cannot do directly. I would ask his co-operation as much as possible to make the change to the appropriate portfolio the minister carries and try to avoid the member’s name.

Mr. Stinson: Mr. Speaker, I will try. The writer finishes his article by asking: “How long will BHP and other potential investors stand for Canada’s anti-business bias?”

Let us be very clear about what has happened here. An international company, in partnership with a group of Canadians, has explored an area of the Northwest Territories. They have complied with every existing Canadian law. They plan to invest nearly \$6 billion in a region of Canada that has been beset by tragically high unemployment and which basically exists on gifts from the rest of Canada.

The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development apparently wants to forget that part of his responsibilities stated in his title, namely that he is responsible for northern development. Instead, I believe the outrageous situation with the BHP diamond project will do serious damage to Canada’s international reputation as a good place to invest mining exploration dollars.

Canada has already lost its market share of those exploration dollars due to the whimsical, complex and disorganized regulatory climate for mining in Canada, despite the fact that the mining industry has been very willing to enforce high standards for environmental protection. The problem is not the protection of the environment. The problem appears to be a federal government more concerned about protecting the jobs of bureaucrats on the government payroll rather than protecting the environment.

The BHP diamond project passed the toughest environmental review. Nevertheless and with no advance notice or negotiation, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development imposed additional conditions which are delaying the start of construction as the northern winter closes in.

The last time I spoke to the minister no end was in sight. He ran roughshod over the investors involved. Is BHP’s experience the norm of what international mining companies must face if they intend to invest in Canada?

When we look at Bill C-6, the anxiety which was already felt about whether it would have a negative impact on Yukon mining has been intensified by the minister’s inexcusable conduct regarding mining in the Northwest Territories.

I believe we can use the example of what the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has imposed on the BHP

Government Orders

diamond project in the Northwest Territories to demonstrate what an anti-business mentality must permeate the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the very people responsible for development in the north, if they are capable of doing such a thing to a serious and responsible mining investment group.

As a career mining man myself, I want to assure my hon. colleagues that the biggest reason why Canada has been losing its market share of international mining investment dollars is the regulatory boondoggles such as those just imposed on the BHP diamond project by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. At this point the damage has been done. It is my profound hope that the minister will act far differently regarding Yukon mining and that Bill C-6 will not become another serious blow to mining in Canada.

During committee hearings on Bill C-6, Mr. Harlan Meade, vice-president of Westmin Resources Limited, a strong voice for improving the entire Canadian mining regulatory framework, pointed out one other significant problem with Bill C-6. That problem is the terrible delay between the time when the legislation was needed many years ago, the long duration of the YMAC talks followed by literally years since the Liberal government took power while little or nothing was done.

As Mr. Meade told our committee: "The failure to move quickly to provide regulations sufficient to fulfil the public's desire for environmental standards for exploration is contributing to the public perception of problems being encountered in the Yukon by the exploration industry".

He points out the value of encouraging voluntary compliance and says: "For several years now the larger companies have been voluntarily conducting their exploration to standards similar to those that exist in other jurisdictions, including reclamation activities". He and many other people from the Yukon have emphasized the importance of widespread consultations regarding the regulations which will accompany Bill C-6, although they are not part of it. Industry must be involved in such consultations because industry is best at knowing how to achieve the desired environmental protection with a minimum of cost either to industry or to the government.

• (1225)

Due to Mr. Meade's former employment as vice-president of environment for the Westmin Company as well as his long time involvement with other environment and land use issues, I believe my colleagues should give special heed to his opinions. Governments, overloaded with senior administrators and pencil pushers, have a lot to learn about the time it takes to fully consult with the public in order to put forward the best possible legislation which can be willingly supported by the people to whom it applies.

In conclusion, I urge my hon. colleagues to learn from the mistakes of the past regarding the environmental regulations of mining and to pass Bill C-6 without amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): We will now proceed to the next stage of debate on Bill C-6 where members will have up to a maximum of 20-minute interventions subject to 10 minutes of questions or comments.

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am tempted to enter into debate with the former speaker, but I will restrict my comments to the legislation under consideration, Bill C-6, an act to amend the Yukon Quartz Mining Act and the Yukon Placer Mining Act.

It should be noted that the Yukon Quartz Mining Act was first brought forward in 1924 and the Yukon Placer Mining Act in 1906. They have been virtually unchanged since that time. I think everyone is in agreement, while they may not be in agreement with some of the details of this bill, that there is need for change. That is the reason I am supporting this bill.

In 1924 and 1906 the bills basically provided administrative direction, dispersal of federal lands for the use of mining and mineral rights and the collection of royalties. There were really no environmental regulations at all at that time, quite understandably given the era.

It is very important to say at the beginning that there are environmental and other regulations related to mining in the Yukon, but these amendments are restricted to exploration activities for which there has not been environmental regulation. When one looks at the number of pieces of legislation both federal and territorial that apply to mining in the Yukon, no one should be left with the thought that there has been no environmental regulation. In fact 14 pieces of federal and territorial legislation are currently on the books that relate to mining activity in the Yukon. This is of itself a problem which I will address a bit later.

As has been pointed out by other speakers on mining in the Yukon, the quartz mining and hard rock mining are basically larger companies but the placer mining is very often small family operations, some larger than others. Mining is the largest private sector employer and largest private sector income generator in the Yukon. Therefore it is a very important industry to everyone in the Yukon because of the spin-off effects of the jobs created and the taxes collected. To all of us who want to see greater economic development in the Yukon, it is very important that mining continue to be an essential part of the economy.

At the same time we live in a territory that is almost the size of Sweden which is really in many ways and to many people the last wilderness frontier. Many other industries are based on the wilder-

Government Orders

ness from outfitting, to trail guiding, trapping and so on. They also rely on land use in the Yukon.

I want to address specifically some of the issues and not so much the content of this legislation. Previous speakers have talked quite a bit about the content. Essentially the legislation addresses certain environmental issues related to exploration that have not been covered by existing pieces of legislation.

• (1230)

I am empathetic with those in the industry who say that we have an extremely complicated process to facilitate mining in the Yukon and they are right. I strongly believe there should be good regulations and good environmental controls, but I also feel it should not be such a cumbersome process for those who wish to do exploration or who wish to proceed further.

As I mentioned earlier, there are 14 pieces of legislation which affect mining in the Yukon. As came out quite clearly during the committee hearings on this bill, those pieces of legislation in and of themselves are often incompatible and at odds with each other. That is clearly unacceptable and must be addressed. It is not addressed by this legislation and continues to be an outstanding issue.

Essentially the bill contains four classes. Under each class there are different requirements for notifying the public of the kind of work the company will be doing. Each of the four classes has different requirements.

There is not opposition to the entire bill but there is a concern with respect to a lack of requirements in certain classes. For example, under a class I licence for developing exploration it is not necessary to give notification to any public body. When a company does exploration there may not be intrusive harm to the environment but there usually is some. They may be taking in a Caterpillar; they may be going by river; they may have to cut down trees and so on. A real issue for a lot of groups was that there should be a notification requirement for all of the four classes.

A good aspect of the legislation is that it does allow time for implementation. For example, in the quartz mining amendments there is a six-month transition period for implementation. For placer mining there is a 12-month implementation period. The current operating conditions obviously would apply during those periods.

Another positive element of the bill is that a full review of the regulations will have to take place after two seasons of implementation. That is particularly important because it is not always possible to foresee the long term effects of some aspects of legislation or regulations. Certainly no one wants to see the industry regulated out of business.

I can say that in the 10 years I have been the member of Parliament for Yukon and have worked with the mining industry,

there has been a real desire on behalf of the industry to see that there are good environmental practices. There have been many advances.

The Yukon Mining Advisory Committee was established in 1990 by the previous government to bring together representatives of industry, the conservation groups and the First Nations to formulate amendments to these two acts. It was very tough to find a consensus in this diverse group which has differing interests on these issues. It is fair to say that after two years of meeting, in 1992 the Yukon Mining Advisory Committee worked hard to reach a consensus. The mining community gave up something and other groups gave up something. They came up with a fairly good consensus on what could be done in the immediate term. It was not seen necessarily as a long term objective.

Other jurisdictions could learn from this. The process of the mining advisory committee was exceedingly good. It was an attempt to sit down face to face to come to grips with difficult issues. The resulting report was positive. The problem was that in the intervening time, from 1992 to 1996, there was a change in government which again changed the mandate. There was certainly a lag when the committee was not as active as it had been. Also in 1995 the land claims and self-government agreements came into force through this Parliament. There were certain requirements under those agreements which had not been met in the mining advisory committee process.

• (1235)

The lesson to be learned is that the YMAC process is an extremely good one to use. However, we cannot have a process of consensus making and then have a lag of three to four years and expect the consensus will hold together. That is essentially what happened with this issue. It is not the fault of anyone in particular but we and other jurisdictions could learn from this process.

I would like to raise a few things about the legislation which were raised as concerns in the committee. Although I am supporting passage of the bill, these are issues which will have to be dealt with down the line.

We should understand that these proposed amendments do not really conform with the Whitehorse mining initiative which was set in 1994. The proposed legislation does not make our mining legislation as strong as that of the NWT, British Columbia or Alaska. It is a true compromise but certainly by Canadian standards it does not come up to that of our neighbours in the Northwest Territories.

Another concern which needs to be addressed is that it does not meet all the objectives of the Whitehorse mining initiative. Again, that came after the 1992 consensus and is another example of why this gap between the process of consensus making and implementation created a real problem.

Government Orders

I mentioned earlier the concern about notification on class I. That is a general concern of a number of groups.

Security and security deposits. Everyone in Canada can understand that there have been huge costs to the Canadian taxpayer in terms of environmental clean-up of various mining sites, and this is quite true in the Yukon. People want to see adequate security provisions. This legislation basically states that security will be determined on a case by case basis. It has been suggested that this is not sufficient but should simply be required as a cost of doing business.

I am somewhat empathetic to those, particularly small operators, who say that this would be very difficult to fulfil. This section of the act will have to be watched really closely in terms of the implementation I spoke about earlier.

Another issue as a result of the time gap is a very serious concern which was raised by the Council of Yukon First Nations. Under the land claims and self-government agreements there is a very clear clause that the federal government must consult with the First Nations in terms of any legislation it is bringing forward. This came up around Bill C-68, the firearms legislation, where the four groups including the Council for Yukon First Nations who have constitutionally entrenched agreements, according to their view which they substantiated, had not been properly consulted. It is equally true with this bill.

These agreements came into place after the 1992 consensus. We have an adjustment here to a new political dynamic which in respect of this legislation I would have to say was not met. It must be addressed by the federal government.

Wildlife habitat is an issue of great concern. Between the territorial and federal government there is a bit of contention about who is responsible for the preservation of wildlife habitat. To make the point, CPAWS, the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society unbeknownst to most Yukoners did staking in some very sensitive wildlife habitat areas. Of course, it did not have to notify anyone because that was not in the law. The society did it not because it was going to mine, but to point out that wildlife habitat areas are not protected under this legislation. It has not been sorted out whether the federal or territorial government is going to take responsibility for this. It is an outstanding concern.

• (1240)

Another concern is competing land use. Historically, under mining legislation there is what is called the free entry system. In other words someone can stake and mine with free entry into any lands. There was an incident in Whitehorse recently in green space behind a residential area and people were fairly upset. The free entry system is not part of this legislation. I will not dwell on it, but

it is an issue with regard to competing land use between outfitters, wilderness guides and trappers that people did raise which needs to be discussed at length.

Many people see this piece of legislation as better than nothing. As much as anything it points out what we have to do in the future.

Mining is important and it needs to be supported. We need to streamline the regulations and process. The involvement of all stakeholders in the regulations would be a very important step on behalf of the federal government to perhaps bring together some of these concerns in a constructive way.

The federal government has put forward a proposal to the Yukon for the devolution of northern affairs programs by 1998 and that includes mining. We see that within two years, should these amendments pass today, there will have to be a comprehensive review of mining legislation by the territorial government if it is to assume responsibility for mining as a territorial responsibility. The YMAC process illustrated the usefulness of that kind of body of consensus making but also the faults if one does not follow up with action immediately.

The real challenge within the next two years will be for the federal and territorial governments to work together to consolidate some of these pieces of legislation to make sure that mining legislation conforms to the Whitehorse mining initiative, and to ensure we can have a viable industry but also an industry which respects environmental standards and regulations.

I will conclude by simply saying that this is a step in the right direction. It will require a lot of further work but it will take us one step toward better mining legislation in the Yukon.

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the member for Yukon for her balanced and thoughtful approach as usual and for the opportunity she gave us to better understand the implications of mining in her riding. I wish I could say the same for the member for Okanagan—Shuswap who is still struggling after three years in Parliament to learn the basic rules of debate in this House.

The debate on Bill C-6 can legitimately take place against the background of the leadership council accord document, namely the Whitehorse mining initiative dated November 1994, and signed by a number of outstanding citizens and politicians including our Minister of Natural Resources. In the document we find some very interesting statements which deserve to be put on record in connection with this second reading debate. On page 14:

The environmental impact of mining can be minimized by: careful exploration; mine design and operation, including risk assessment; and appropriate management policies, programs and procedures. Prevention of post-closure impacts requires effective site reclamation and monitoring. Voluntary programs emphasizing—

Government Orders

• (1245)

On the same page:

Environmentally responsible mining exploration, development, operations and public policies are predicated on maintaining a healthy environment and, on closure, returning mine sites and affected areas to viable, and, wherever practicable, self-sustaining ecosystems that are compatible with a healthy environment and with human activities.

This is beautiful stuff on page 14. There are also other very interesting and meaningful paragraphs on page 16. Time does not allow me to read them all.

Under planning and environmental assessment, the following principle is espoused:

Environmental assessment is an essential tool for identifying potential environmental impacts of proposed projects, determining their acceptability, and evaluating potential mitigation and remediation measures, thus enabling economic activity to proceed while safeguarding the health of the environment.

Among the goals is to ensure that government policies and programs adequately incorporate environmental considerations.

This is music to the ears of anyone who is concerned with sustainable development because this is the essence of good sustainable development policy processes. It is a very recent document as I mentioned, dating back less than two years.

Coming to the bill, an act to amend the Yukon Quartz Mining Act and the Yukon Placer Mining Act, this bill establishes an environmental management regime for mining activities conducted in the Yukon Territory.

This bill amends the Yukon Quartz Mining Act and the Yukon Placer Mining Act to provide an environmental management framework. This is a much needed initiative. The member for Yukon already referred to it in positive terms.

It is desired if we in Canada are to make environmentally sustaining mining processes a reality. It must be noted that to this point Yukon is the only jurisdiction in North America that has not regulated the impacts of mineral exploration and development.

Until now, experience has taught us that mineral development can result in habitat loss, the leaching of acids into soil and water, creating sedimentation in rivers and streams, adding to water pollution and other erosion problems to name a few.

We all appreciate that mining is an important factor in the Canadian economy but it must be achieved through a well regulated industry which safeguards the environment, human health and wildlife and which takes into consideration the justified claims and goals of our native people. Again, the member for Yukon made reference to that.

I am told that each day in Canada the mining industry generates approximately 1 million tonnes of waste rock and 950,000 tonnes of tailings, totalling some 650 million tonnes of waste a year.

At present there are approximately 6,000 abandoned tailing sites in Canada. Some of these contain 185 million tonnes of uranium mine tailings considered to be low level radioactive. Others contain an estimated 875 million tonnes of rock and tailings capable of allowing acid to leach into the soil and water.

The clean-up costs of all these abandoned tailing sites is estimated at \$6 billion I am told, a cost which presently is likely to be borne by the public at large, Canadian taxpayers, if and when required.

Some of us are concerned that certain activities described in the bill as class one activities require no approval or notice, and therefore the level of activity approved under class one exploration programs could cause significant environmental damage, especially in environmentally sensitive areas and heritage sites.

The potential impact of these class one activities is significant when one considers that there are over 40,000 mineral claims in Yukon.

• (1250)

Imagine the cumulative environmental impact of these claims if not properly regulated. It could have a far reaching impact on the environmentally sensitive northern ecosystem, but as a general rule it should be a concern regardless of whether the ecosystem is particularly sensitive. That sector has a long way to go in operating within a regime that is now becoming more and more accepted in the southern latitudes.

In order to provide a regulatory framework in Yukon or anywhere else in Canada capable of ensuring environmentally sustainable mining, the government should seriously consider the following suggestions. First, it should provide an environmental protection regime that is as strong as any in North America and not weaker than that.

Second, it should ensure that mineral rights are not granted without considering competing land use values. I will address that issue a little later.

Third, it should regulate all stages of mineral exploration and development.

Fourth, it should ensure that sufficient funds are set aside to cover the full costs of mine reclamation, namely the good old polluter pays principle.

Fifth, it should ensure effective inspection, monitoring and enforcement of mineral activities including provisions for citizen enforcement.

Sixth, it should provide for special control measures for ecologically and culturally sensitive areas.

Seventh, it should ensure that penalties for failing to meet regulatory requirements are strong enough to act as a real deterrent.

I will spend a couple of minutes discussing the free entry system. In Canada and throughout North America there has been a pattern over the decades to have a so called free entry system which permits the mineral operator to enter lands where minerals are in the hands of the crown. It obliges the government to grant exploration and development rights if the miner, the applicant, applies for them.

The free entry system was developed in the 19th century to encourage the extraction of mineral resources. While this approach may have been suitable and understandable when Yukon was considered a wild frontier to be tamed, it is certainly no longer appropriate today. Elevating the importance of mineral extraction above all the other resources has led to other problems.

Provinces such as Alberta, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and other countries such as Australia have eliminated the free entry system. Other jurisdictions in Canada are currently moving away from the free entry system.

Under the free entry system, the right to stake a claim and mine cannot be refused on public lands unless the lands have been closed entirely from staking. This fails to give consideration or protection to other land users, which is a very serious matter. This fact is recognized in the Whitehorse mining accord which I mentioned earlier. The need to consider other land uses is also stressed: "No aspect of social, economic and environmental sustainability can be pursued in isolation or be the subject of an inclusive focus without detrimentally affecting other aspects".

It seems the Government of Canada has a responsibility to all members of the public when regulating the uses of public lands. It basically boils down to that. Under the free entry system it could be said that the government essentially abdicates its responsibility to regulate whether mining activity will occur at a particular site.

• (1255)

I would submit that the free entry system is still a fundamental weakness of mining in the mining regulatory system in Yukon.

In short, the free entry system assumes mineral development is the most important interest in public land and once a mineral claim is staked there can be no consideration of importance of other uses of public lands. This flaw undermines the effectiveness of good, sound, long term land planning. This method requires the government's attention. I would hope that it will be possible to do so if not in committee in the examination of the bill then on another occasion.

The automatic right to mine on public lands should be replaced by a system where the government has the discretion to permit the

Government Orders

production and development of crown minerals as in the case with other natural resources such as timber, gas or oil, or even if necessary deny their particular use for reasons related to the larger public interest.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to participate in this debate.

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the previous speaker for his well thought out comments. I really do not have much disagreement with him at all.

I would just like to make a couple of points and perhaps ask a question. The first comment is around the class one and the fact that there is no necessity for public notification. I think that is an issue that causes a lot of people, including me, some uneasiness. I would add, however, that when one stakes a claim under class one one has to register that claim so that it is registered with the mining recorder. There is that kind of notice at least. However, I still think it is an outstanding issue.

As I said in my remarks, the issues around quartz and placer mining certainly are not completed by this legislation. There is much left to do.

The hon. member mentioned reclamation. I agree that is a huge problem. In one instance in Yukon, a venus mine was closed down. The owners have long since disappeared and have probably become some other company. The estimated cost to the Canadian taxpayer is about \$800,000 for the clean-up of the arsenic leaching tailings. This is very costly and it is something we do have to be concerned about.

I wondered if the hon. member would support the suggestion that has been made, which is not in this legislation, but for future consideration that 1 per cent of royalties from mining be put toward reclamation.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I am glad for the correction that the member for Yukon made in connection with class one procedures. As for the suggestion of the 1 per cent royalty, it is a policy approach that commands attention and certainly requires serious consideration.

Quite frankly, I cannot think of a better alternative in order to ensure that the corporate and collective benefit that may derive from certain economic activity, in this case a mining activity, also is put in a position to restore the quality of the environment as it existed before. There may be alternative approaches which I am not aware of but this approach certainly is one I will look at very carefully.

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

Some hon. members: Question.

Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.)

* * *

• (1300)

NUNAVUT WATERS ACT

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.) moved that Bill C-51, an act respecting the water resources of Nunavut, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Bernard Patry (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House on Bill C-51, the Nunavut Waters Act. I am pleased to bring this legislation before the House so that we can establish a modern water management regime in the eastern Arctic that has a solid legislative and regulatory basis.

Bill C-51 is important for a number of reasons. First and foremost, it represents a major step forward in fulfilling the government's obligation under the Nunavut land claims agreement. As my hon. colleagues are aware, our commitment to fully implement land claims agreements was clearly stated in the red book. This is an ongoing process that will require the continued attention and support of the House.

Section 13 of the Nunavut land claims agreement requires that a special board be established with powers over the regulation, management and use of waters in the settlement area. The agreement also requires that this board be established through a statute. This is the primary purpose of Bill C-51.

However this proposed legislation does more than fulfil a lawful commitment under the Nunavut land claims agreement. It also advances the government's policy of fostering the political development of northern Canada by supporting the decision making in the north by northerners.

[*Translation*]

As the Nunavut water board begins to play its role, local participation in the decision making process will increase. The new regime will result in a significant decrease in the number of applications for water use licences requiring ministerial approval as compared to that under the former Northern Inland Waters Act.

By establishing a viable, affordable and efficient form of government in Nunavut, the bill will allow the Inuit to effectively practise self-government in the eastern Arctic. Without passing any new law, under powers given in the land claim agreement, the

Nunavut water board was established on July 9, 1996, on the third anniversary of the coming into force of the agreement.

As it stands now, the Nunavut water board has all the powers described in section 13 of the land claims agreement, but the latter did not give any details regarding the board's responsibilities. In view of the regulatory nature of the board, its role and jurisdiction were to be laid out in the bill before us today.

[*English*]

In order to ensure that the regulation and licensing of water use in Nunavut has a clear basis in law, we must proceed with this legislation. Bill C-51 will establish a fair, efficient and comprehensive water licensing system. In so doing, it will enhance the prospects for economic development and job creation in Nunavut while respecting the rights and benefits flowing from the Nunavut land claims agreement with the Inuit.

In the interests of good and efficient government the proposed legislation extends the jurisdiction of the Nunavut water board beyond the settlement area to encompass the entire Nunavut region, except for national parks. In this regard Bill C-51 exceeds the requirements of the Nunavut land claims agreement but creates a uniform management regime.

• (1305)

It is critical that we have a uniform water management regime throughout Nunavut. A single regime will be more cost effective, consistent and easier to manage, and will meet the government's commitment to industry to streamline the licensing process. I want to assure my hon. colleagues that we are not establishing a completely new system of water management with this legislation. Bill C-51 is modelled on the Northwest Territories Waters Act and its predecessor, the Northern Inland Waters Act, with a few modifications to reflect the requirements of the Nunavut land claims agreement.

The Nunavut water board will have responsibilities and powers equivalent to those currently held by the Northwest Territories water board, which are essentially the authority to license the use of water and the deposit of waste. Licences will not be required to use water for domestic purposes, for emergency purposes such as fighting fires or controlling floods, or in national parks.

[*Translation*]

Bill C-51 sets clear rules for issuing, renewing, amending or cancelling water use licences. These rules give the industry added certainty and will protect the environment in the eastern Arctic. Also, they will ensure that the licensing process takes into account the interests of all the water users.

The Nunavut water board will have a wide range of powers to carry out its mandate, including holding public consultations with regard to licence applications. In some cases, such as applications

Government Orders

for permission to expropriate, the board will be obliged to hold public hearings.

In such a case, the board will have to form a panel made up of some of its members and will have to give advance notice of the hearing. It will also have to publish notice of its decisions.

The board will have the power to impose strict conditions for the issuance of licences. The maximum proposed penalty for offences is a \$100,000 fine, one year imprisonment or both. Similar provisions exist in other similar water management systems elsewhere in Canada.

Furthermore, I am happy to inform the House that the board will have the authority to order the compensation of consumers adversely affected by licensees' activities. It will also have the power to order a licensee to deposit a security with the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

[*English*]

Bill C-51 will clearly place a great deal of decision making authority into the hands northerners and in particular the Inuit of Nunavut. At the same time, in a fashion similar to the Northwest Territories Waters Act and the Northern Inland Waters Act, the governor in council will retain the authority to make water management regulations. However, in certain instances, as specified in Bill C-51, the recommendation of the federal minister will be subject to the concurrence of the board.

In the interests of effective planning, the water board will be expected to work closely with the Nunavut planning commission and the Nunavut impact review board. Legislation covering these two boards will be introduced in the near future.

As mentioned earlier, there are important provisions in the legislation that reflect the letter and spirit of the Nunavut land claims agreement. Specifically, the Nunavut water board will not be allowed to issue, renew or amend a water use or waste deposit licence that may substantially affect waters that are on or flow through Inuit owned land unless a compensation package is in place.

To ensure a smooth transition from the current water licensing regime, all licences issued under the Northwest Territories Waters Act will continue to be valid after promulgation of Bill C-51. Hearings that had begun under the Northwest Territories Waters Act before the Nunavut board was established will continue until a decision is reached. If hearings for an application had not commenced when the Nunavut water board was established the application will be addressed by the Nunavut water board under the provisions of the new legislation.

• (1310)

This legislation also contains a clause that will validate decisions made by the Nunavut water board before Bill C-51 comes into effect, as long as those decisions would have been valid under the Nunavut Waters Act.

[*Translation*]

As the members of the House know, in the eastern Arctic, we are concerned about the impact of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement on the other Inuit who have traditionally occupied and used the land in the region affected by the settlement of land claims.

I am happy to say that Bill C-51 does take these concerns into account, with respect to water. The proposed Nunavut Waters Act includes provisions allowing the representatives of the Makivik Corporation to sit on the board whenever it studies activities affecting areas, in Nunavut, which the Inuit of Quebec use in equal proportion.

The Inuit of Northern Quebec will also be fully represented before the board when it will examine issues concerning the islands and the maritime regions traditionally used by these aboriginal people. Some First Nations will also be represented before the board when the issues at hand affect the regions they have traditionally occupied and used and are still using.

[*English*]

Negotiations with the Nunavut Tungavik Incorporated to establish this board have proven to be extremely complex. We have fundamentally different views on how the new water management regime should be implemented. Essentially, NTI is of the opinion that the Nunavut water board should be the final authority on the issuance and enforcement of all water licences in Nunavut and that there should be no ongoing role for the responsible minister or for the governor in council.

We believe it is the responsibility of elected governments, not appointed boards, to establish an appropriate balance between economic development and environmental protection. This principle of accountability is at the very heart of our system of democratic government.

There is concern that NTI's position would give the Nunavut water board more authority on water matters than a future elected Nunavut government when the responsibility for water management is transferred to the territories. This is clearly not the situation in any other jurisdiction in Canada and it would not be an acceptable situation in Nunavut. Unfortunately, it has become evident that we cannot reach a consensus with NTI on this matter. In the interests of good government and to eliminate regulatory uncertainty in Nunavut, we have decided to proceed with Bill C-51 which fulfils our legal obligation and is fully consistent with the Nunavut land claims agreement.

Government Orders

Let me reiterate that the regime we are establishing in Nunavut is very similar to the regime already in place and working well in the Northwest Territories. This regime has recently been strengthened, modernized and streamlined based on extensive and positive consultations with key stakeholders in the north and in particular with the aboriginal peoples.

Bill C-51 ensures that more decisions that affect the people, waters and environment of Nunavut will be made in Iqaluit, Rankin Inlet, Cambridge Bay and other eastern Arctic communities as opposed to in Yellowknife or Ottawa.

I believe this is a logical step forward in the political development of the north. I believe that it is an important step toward the creation of a new territorial government in Nunavut. I am therefore seeking the support of hon. members from both sides of the House in referring this bill to committee for review.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today on the bill before us respecting the water resources of Nunavut. As usual, I will briefly put things in perspective for my colleagues and also for the people who are presently watching us.

When I took on the role of Indian affairs critic and when I read words such as "Nunavut, Nunavik", I was all confused. I think people wonder where Nunavut and Nunavik are. It is important to put these things in perspective before dealing with the content and provisions of the bill as such.

• (1315)

Finally, it may now be said that Nunavut is a territory where Inuit people are everywhere. It is a huge territory north of Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba, almost 4,000 kilometres long. It is inhabited mostly by Inuit people, although there are also Dene and Metis people in the western part.

If we look at the whole of the territory north of the 60th parallel, starting with the west, we see a new division of the Canadian map. We know there are already Canadian provinces. We know there are also two territories that are the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. We have a tendency to divide them according to the Inuit influences and traditions.

If I start with the far west, this territory is called Inuvialuit. An initial agreement on self-government was signed here at the time with the Inuit people from the northwestern part of the country.

Immediately after that comes Nunavut. Here too, within a few months of our last federal election an agreement on self-government was signed. This is probably the first Inuit territory in Canada. Inuvialuit is a small territory, while Nunavut starts

immediately north of Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec, and stretches on across almost all of the rest of Canada.

Discussions are being held on self-government for Nunavik, the same as for Inuvialuit and Nunavut. It is the northern part of Quebec, which was transferred like the other territories in 1912. These territories are under discussion now. I know the Inuit and Cree people are discussing these territories. Quebec may be partitioned. But I will not get into this. Today we are dealing with the water resources of Nunavut.

I simply want to tell you that northern Quebec will always remain in Quebec, unless Quebec itself decides to let it go, which I doubt very much. I wanted mostly to locate Nunavut in relation to Nunavik and Inuvialuit. There is also a small Inuit section of Labrador, where discussions on self-government are bogged down.

I have had the pleasure of visiting these four regions. There are land claims involved. There are demands for self-government in Labrador. Newfoundland seems to have a hard time negotiating with the Inuit who live there.

So Nunavut represents most of the land occupied by the Inuit. This territory will be formally established on April 1, 1999. What does Nunavut mean in Inuktitut? It means "Notre monde" in French and "Our Land" in English. It means that these people have lived in this part of the continent for over 10,000 years. Traces of a presence dating back 10,000 years have been found in the Nunavut territory.

The Inuit world is extremely interesting. As I said, I had the pleasure to travel there several times. There is an example I often use when making speeches, as I did last week in my riding, when people in a classroom asked me about the Inuit, their territory and traditions. A part of their culture that is especially rich is the Inuktitut language. I do not know much about Inuktitut, but I know they have 50 words to describe snow. When we talk about snow, whether it is melting, wet, solid or icy, we only have one word for it: snow. But they have 50 words for it. The region has a very rich Inuit culture, and the language itself is very interesting.

These people signed a self-government agreement in 1993, as I said just a few months before the federal election. The Inuit had been working toward self-government for 20 years. I will give you a little historical overview in a moment.

People wonder why the Inuit did not start earlier. Since they have occupied the land for over 10,000 years, 20 years seems like a very short time. I think everyone will agree that 20 years is a rather short period of time.

• (1320)

But native people and Inuit people do not share our concept of property. Our culture finds its roots in Great Britain and France and with it comes a need to mark boundaries, to insist that the property we plan to buy be properly surveyed, be given a proper legal

description. We white people have one way of seeing the ownership of property that is completely different from the way the Inuit and native communities see it.

In fact, when they first came here, the Europeans were surprised to see that these people had almost no conception of what property was. For them, the land was there and it was to be shared by everyone, and not divided up into individual pieces of property.

The Inuit—and I can vouch for this having visited them—are a family-based people. They are often on the move, leading a nomadic life. With a population density of one person per 1,000 square kilometres, the likelihood of encountering another human being is quite slim. The concept of property is therefore foreign to them. All that land, this whole area of the continent belongs to their peoples and to whoever decides to live there.

When the self-government agreement was finally signed in 1993 after 20 years of negotiations, it was described at the time as an agreement under section 35 of the Canadian Constitution, which, as you know, recognizes treaties entered into with the Inuit, Métis and Indians, as defined in the Indian Act.

Of course, this self-government agreement being covered by section 35 of the Constitution, any disagreement on the interpretation of the agreement may eventually end up before the appropriate courts.

The Nunavut planning commission was established to oversee a transition period of six years, from 1993 to 1999, when the transfer of powers will be complete.

These people are already at work and they have set their priorities. Not surprisingly, water is listed as a priority. And so are impact assessments because there have been some mishaps in Nunavut and in the Yukon as well. Just the other day, we debated Bill C-6, consideration of which was concluded this morning and whose purpose is to regulate to some extent, through environmental standards, land use.

There have been cases of abuse in that respect in Nunavut. That is why their number one priority is to try to clean up mining operations. There are mines that have caused considerable pollution and the committee was concerned about that. It was also concerned about waters because ridiculous ideas about water use come up every now and then. Some can be quite surprising. Take for instance the Americans who were keen to build pipelines to carry, no, not gas, but water.

Indeed, water does have a real value there, because, even if some traces of pollution have been noted for some time now, it is still purer than our ground water supply here.

Government Orders

So we are sometimes tempted to misuse these waters, and I think the bill before us today is quite consistent with the work of the board watching over the list of priorities, that is water cleanup and impact studies.

The bill is also interesting in this regard, because it provides that impact studies will not be limited to the environment, but will extend to caribou sanctuaries and Inuit communities. We will thus have a board with slightly broader powers which, before granting any operating licences, will be in a position to say: "We want to know the impact this will have on our caribou". It is important, because caribou is a traditional source of food for the Inuit, and everybody knows that this animal is very sensitive to environmental changes.

We will have an act to respect Inuit traditions and to examine carefully the impact of water use not only on the Inuit, but also on animal populations.

• (1325)

Finally, the Nunavut planning commission, the very same commission, will also be in charge of zoning and urban planning, because there is some urban development. Everybody thinks of Iqaluit, the capital. It must be remembered that the Inuit decided that the capital of Nunavut would be Iqaluit, while the present capital of the Northwest Territories is Yellowknife. So, the Inuit said: "The government functions that you agreed to hand over to us will be carried out in our capital", and there was a discussion to determine whether it would be Rankin Inlet or Iqaluit. Through a referendum, the people finally chose Iqaluit as their capital.

These are more like villages. The capital, Iqaluit, with 3,600 inhabitants, it is not a major urban centre. I went there and found that it takes maybe an hour to cover all the streets. Nevertheless, people are concerned about zoning and urbanization and they want to make sure their community develops adequately while respecting the environment.

Earlier, I said a few words about the location. Nunavut covers 1.9 million square kilometres, or one-tenth of Canada. It is larger than three quarters of Greenland and it is six times the size of Germany.

Nunavut extends from the 60th to the 85th parallel. It is bordered by Arviat in the south, Coppermine in the west, Alert Bay, which is known because it is a military base in Canada's far north, is the northern border, and Iqaluit, on Baffin Island, in the east. The small island of Sanikiluaq, in the Hudson Bay, is also part of the territory. This is interesting, given that mining operations were once conducted on this island.

We often wonder why the Indian affairs department deals with this issue. The explanation is the same as for Bill C-6, which dealt with quartz and gold mining in the Yukon. The department for which I am the official opposition critic is called the Department of

Government Orders

Indian Affairs and Northern Development. This means it is responsible for everything north of the 60th parallel. This also explains why bills such as this one often come under the jurisdiction of the Indian affairs department.

Nunavut has a population of about 22,000, including an overwhelming majority of 17,500 Inuit. Earlier, I mentioned some figures about the number of people in relation to the size of the territory. A quick calculation shows that 1,900,000 square kilometres for 22,000 inhabitants represents a little less than one inhabitant per 1,000 square kilometres. This is probably one of the least populous parts of the planet, which does not mean however that just anything should be allowed to go on in that region. The legislation we have before us is to develop a very important resource of Nunavut, its waters. Even though its population is small, the time has come now for Nunavut to have a little more control over its waters.

Nunavut has 22,000 inhabitants, including 17,000 Inuit. In the four large regions I mentioned at the beginning of my speech, the Inuit population totals 25,000 people. Iqaluit, the capital of Nunavut, is a city of 3,600 people, some 2,000 kilometres away from Ottawa. Iqaluit has 20 kilometres of roads. These figures show how isolated it is. I will tell you more about this later.

I was elected as the member for Saint-Jean in October of 1993. Since there were 205 new members, the Prime Minister decided at that time that the new Parliament would not start sitting before the following February. My leader at the time having confirmed me in my role of official critic, the first trip I made in that capacity was to Iqaluit.

• (1330)

I spent two days in Iqaluit. Since I knew nothing about Iqaluit, I spent the first day walking around and talking with people. I met some interesting people. Since Iqaluit is a small town of 3,600 people, it does not take long to see it all, to walk down every street. As it was quite cold, I had to walk fast. During my first trip, the temperature was 30 degrees below zero, and during my second trip, it was even colder.

The first time, I walked around and talked to people. The native issue is fascinating, because one has to see the living conditions of the people firsthand. Things are quite different in native communities. They are also different in Metis communities, in Inuit communities and even from one Inuit community to another. Just like I said a while ago, there are four regions, and each one of them is different.

One realizes that subsistence hunting and fishing are extremely important to them. The first matter I had to discuss with the Inuit concerned their economy, and how they can make a living in an economy where they have no choice but to hunt and fish to provide

half of their food. Among other things, I noticed that a loaf of bread costs \$3 in Iqaluit, and the price of two litres of milk is \$7. These people's wages are half the national average, and groceries cost twice what we pay here.

These people have a hard time making ends meet, and their only option is to turn to nature by hunting and fishing in their traditional way. Naturally, water is important in that regard. During part of the year, the water flows freely, and the thawing of streams is a wonderful thing to see, but they have harsh winters, and they need snowmobiles to go hunting and fishing. Snowmobiles are a necessity.

I made my second trip to Iqaluit for hearings on social program reform, and many people told us how important water is to them. That is why this bill comes as no surprise to me today. They are concerned about water quality. However, there was not much flowing water when I was there. As I was saying, the temperature was 30 below during my first trip and 40 below during the second one. When we tried to leave, we could not. The plane's engine froze. We had to go back to the hotel and wait for another plane from Montreal to pick us up. It took a whole day.

When the second plane landed, they left the engine running to avoid any further problem, since the engine on the first plane froze in the bitter cold, as I was saying.

There are also some interesting issues in terms of economic development. I talked earlier about the progress being made in commercial hunting and fishing. They have stores up there that specialize in the marketing of caribou, seal and whale meat, for instance. The industry exists, but is not allowed to ship outside Nunavut. I think discussions are under way to find ways to allow Canadians and Quebecers to have the opportunity to enjoy these delicacies. People up there would like to export caribou or seal meat, as these species are not threatened with extinction. It would be very profitable for them to be able to sell these products.

Then there is the transportation industry. Air Cri provides passenger air service to several communities. Actually, almost every community is accessible only by air. Air Cri is crucial to the economy. They are also taking control of several hotel facilities.

There is also the federal contribution pursuant to the Nunavut agreement. The federal government has agreed to pay them \$1.1 billion over 14 years, a very attractive contribution indeed.

• (1335)

They will be able to use this money for economic development. In fact, Nunavut and Nunavik encourage economic development programs especially in the business sectors I mentioned earlier.

There is a profusion of new public and professional agencies. Since the agreement was signed in 1993, people are beginning to

receive money and to ensure sustainable development. And I think that this legislation is in keeping with sustainable development.

Moreover, three new national parks will be established. Also, there will be a mining resources evaluation program. I must point out that mining requires a lot of water. This legislation will correct certain oversights.

Before speaking about the bill, I want to explain the background of the Nunavut agreement, which was signed in 1993 and which led directly to this legislation. As I said, the Northwest Territories were established in 1912 out of the northern parts of Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec. After 1950, the Northwest Territories were governed by an appointed commissioner and an elected territorial council, which was not really very representative. It was only around 1975 that the council began to be representative.

In 1966, the federal government set up the Carrothers commission, which advised it on a greater distinct representation in the centre and in the east. Before that, these subdivisions did not exist and there was only one vast Northwest territory. People asked that the territory be subdivided so that it could be more representative.

In 1967, the federal government transferred the management of nearly all programs to the Government of the Northwest Territories, the legislative assembly of which is in Yellowknife. I visited the Northwest Territories legislature, and it is obvious that this institution was inspired by Inuit tradition.

It a fairly recent structure, having been built about ten years ago, I would say, and it is quite nice. Part of the structure looks like igloos, it is difficult to describe. In Inuit tradition, the circle is omnipresent, whereas our Parliament is laid out to show the difference between the government benches and the opposition benches. We face each other. Over there, everybody sits in a circle. I find that very interesting.

We can see that the Northwest Territories have been heavily influenced by Inuit culture, as well as Dene and Métis culture. There are many Dene and Métis in the western part of the Nunavut. The circle is very important for these people.

In 1976, a Inuit group, Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, of which Mrs. Kuptana is president—this organization still exists and it is quite dynamic—suggested the federal cabinet establish a territory separating the west, the center and the east of the Territories.

In 1981, a new approach was suggested, that is the creation of a new government composed principally of Dene and Métis, but this plan never was adopted. In 1982, a referendum was conducted on the idea of dividing the territory. The question was: “Do you think Northwest Territories should be divided?” The participation rate was 53 per cent, and 56 per cent of those who voted said yes. I must say that organizing an election or a referendum in the Nunavut is almost a miracle. To begin with, even before the election or the referendum, informing the people of every village takes weeks. It

Government Orders

is absolutely extraordinary to see a 53 per cent participation rate. People from Nunavut often have to travel 200 to 300 kilometres by snowmobile to vote in a referendum or an election. Under those circumstances, people who exercise the vote are real heroes of democracy. I think that people who travel 300 kilometres by snowmobile to vote deserve our appreciation.

The government recognized the referendum on certain conditions. Of course, there are several political parties in Northwest Territories. One of the conditions was that all parties accept the division, and they did. Second, all parties had to accept the division of powers between the territories and local governments.

● (1340)

Some specific fields like education and health were transferred to Inuit people even though the government of the Northwest Territories had jurisdiction over them. So, there were agreements to effectively divide powers and to ensure viability of all of the Northwest Territories after the separation. I think that, by now, we can consider that it has been proven that all the territories are viable.

In 1992, there were a second referendum on separation into four regions and 54 percent of the voters said yes. As I said earlier, the Nunavut agreement was signed in May of 1993, just a few months before the last federal elections, in October.

The bill is on water resources of Nunavut. It was read the first time on June 14 1996. It implements the water management provisions of the Nunavut agreement. Pursuant to chapter 13 of the land claims agreement between the Inuit and the federal government, a commission or a board was to be formed to settle the issues concerning waters. This is why we are studying legislation, which, in some ways, is very similar to many others, whose aim is to implement clauses of the Nunavut agreement.

Some of us have a few minor concerns regarding the members appointed by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I have here a breakdown of the members of the Nunavut Water Board. Four members are appointed by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development on the recommendation of an independent development organization; two members are appointed directly by the minister; two members are also appointed by the minister but on the recommendation of a minister from the Northwest Territories; and the chairperson is appointed by the Indian affairs department on the recommendation of the other members.

I think the Indian affairs department and minister have too much control over this process. At this stage, we have not yet completed our consultations and we do not yet know if we will ask for amendments to these provisions. We obviously agree with the substance of the legislation, but on the issue of the establishment of the board, I think the government should have given more

Government Orders

autonomy to local groups instead of leaving it all up to the Indian affairs department.

This new legislation is similar to the one that already exists in the Northwest Territories—because there is one—under the jurisdiction of the territorial legislative assembly. Its primary function is to license uses of water and deposits of waste.

Interestingly, this bill provides for public hearings and, in line with the Nunavut agreement, shows great respect for the Inuit. This is important to us because I think that, when we talk about water in Nunavut, we have to talk about Inuit traditions and culture.

I just want to mention four paragraphs that have attracted my attention. Public hearings are allowed and their conduct is governed by certain administrative rules which recognize the importance of the culture, customs and knowledge of the Inuit. For instance, the testimony and contribution of some experts is acknowledged during public hearings on issues such as the use of waters in Nunavut but the role of the Inuit, who are probably the best experts on water quality, will also be recognized. This provision will truly allow them to influence proceedings.

Before holding public hearings on a request concerning water the NWB must take whatever steps are necessary to inform the public that hearings will be held, namely by giving notice, circulating information and setting the day, hour and place of the hearings.

This goes back to what I was saying earlier because these people live in such vast areas that if they decide, for instance, to come to a public hearing, they must be notified weeks ahead because traveling 200 or 300 kilometres on a snowmobile is not an easy thing. It requires some planning and this is why I was saying earlier that these people are the heroes of democracy, because they travel hundreds of kilometres for a hearing, an election or a referendum. This is why it is important, and the bill makes adequate provision for it.

• (1345)

If the public receives, within a reasonable time frame before the beginning of hearings, the information transmitted to the NWB on requests about water, the Nunavut water board will hear testimony and advice from experts and will spread this information on the largest possible scale.

The interesting aspect of public hearings is that the NWB holds such hearings in the communities that are the most directly affected. No matter the community, no matter how isolated it is, if there are problems in a far northern community, the NWB will have to hold public hearings locally so that people do not have to travel

long distances. In that respect, this bill is quite consistent with the Nunavut agreement as such, and, this is, I think, worth mentioning.

Requirements will be prescribed by law for such purposes as issuing, renewing or amending a license in respect of a use of waters or a deposit of waste that may substantially alter the quality, quantity or rate of flow of waters through Inuit-owned land, unless an agreement has been reached between the parties concerned.

From now on, people who worked in mines or elsewhere will have to comply with the regulations, and a public hearing will be held as soon as it is felt that their activity may substantially alter the quality, quantity or rate of flow of waters. Through the Board, the Inuit will have more control over development projects and the environmental impact of those economic development projects.

The Board will also perform those other functions described earlier by my colleague. It will be required to work closely with the Nunavut Planning Commission and the Nunavut Impact Review Board. These Commissions come directly under the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement signed in 1993. They will ensure compliance with environmental standards and will oversee social and economic impact. This is also interesting, because it broadens the mandate somewhat further.

There is something about the bill that has been said many times before: it does not apply to shipping. I know it is hard to include the whole area of sea and air traffic in the North. I was an environmentalist before I got into politics and I believe everybody remembers the mess of the *Exxon Valdez* in Alaska. That is why I wonder if the bill could not have had a larger scope and include shipping.

I do not understand why we are told that shipping is not affected. That means that ships, oil tankers and others, may carry on. Of course, ships are governed by other laws, but not necessarily ones that come under the jurisdiction of the Northwest Territories' legislative assembly or of the capital, Iqaluit, which is Nunavut's capital, where the Inuit are. We will examine the possibility of adding some clarification.

I spoke a moment ago about the Board's membership. We lament the extent of the Department's control over appointments. Even though, for instance, several organizations are invited to submit recommendations, the minister has the final say on appointments.

The bill suggests that public hearings be held for some big projects. Not only will there be hearings for existing projects, which could involve stricter water management rules, but from now on, anything that could affect water quality, quantity or flow-rate will have to be submitted to the Board. That is important for us.

As for possible recourse, the independent developer is naturally entitled to ask the competent jurisdiction to decide if someone has

Government Orders

a right to use Nunavut's water. They will make regulations, and if these regulations are contravened, recourse will naturally be had to the courts.

Therefore, the bill, as such, is completely consistent with the agreement, where this took 20 years. I told you earlier that there were 20 years of negotiations, although they were preceded by several hundreds of years of joint occupation of the area by Inuit and whites. It is therefore in line with the Nunavut agreement.

• (1350)

The management provisions, as I said, are being implemented with the greatest respect for the Inuit, with compensation, recourse as an option, and the real possibility for them to hold hearings, to examine fully any development projects. It merely gives official expression to the act, the Nunavut provisions.

We will naturally vote in favour of the bill, although the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, to which this bill will be referred later on, will be looking at the possibility of perhaps going a little bit further with respect to navigation or to control by the Inuit of their board.

We feel that the Nunavut Inuit government has the competence and abilities required to make appointments and also to be responsible for this board. I think that it will demonstrate confidence in the Inuit. I have confidence in the international experts on the quality, quantity and flow of water, but the Inuit, who have been living there for 10,000 years, perhaps can be trusted when it comes to controlling the waters.

Therefore, with respect to Bill C-51, we will be looking at the possibility of making small changes. As for the merits of this bill, the Bloc Quebecois is completely in favour of this legislation, and when it has been passed, we will be wishing the Inuit the best of luck with the management of the quality, quantity and flow of their waters in Nunavut.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I stand today to oppose Bill C-51 for three reasons. The first is that I support good government, namely, government which provides a necessary service, is cost effective and is accountable to the people who pay for it. The second is that the government's process has been faulty.

The third and most serious reason is that the original legislation creating Nunavut ought to be declared unconstitutional on the grounds that it creates what amounts to another province without meeting the 1982 constitutional requirement that at least seven provincial legislatures representing 50 per cent of Canada's population have to consent to Nunavut's creation. The provinces have never been asked.

With regard to the need for good government, this new illegal province of Nunavut, which of course is not a province officially but will have the administrative and governmental trappings of a province, has a land mass about twice as big as the legal province

of Ontario. Its population at 22,000 is less than the area population of Cranbrook, B.C. where I have my constituency office.

Canadians often complain about the fact that the Atlantic provinces are so small, but even the beautiful but tiny province of Prince Edward Island has a population of 130,000, about six times the population of the new illegal province of Nunavut. My hon. colleagues will therefore understand if I state my firm belief that having so much government for Nunavut is over governing at its worst.

Specifically the Nunavut Water Board's eight appointed members plus a chair for a population of 22,000 is part of the excessive bureaucracy of an additional 930 civil service jobs cited by a Coopers & Lybrand report of December 1992 on establishing Nunavut, plus 705 public service jobs to be transferred from Yellowknife. The entire Northwest Territories Water Board currently consists of from four to nine members and Nunavut has half the land and less than half the population. However, the various groups of northern peoples apparently said they wanted additional board members in order to guarantee representation for different population groups, including the Inuit of Nunavut and the Inuit of northern Quebec.

I can understand somebody wanting something. There are things I would like myself, for example, a big ranch on prime land maybe with a herd of fallow deer, or all of the waterfront of a small lake in central British Columbia. There are two things that keep me from having that big ranch or lake. First, nobody is going to give it to me just because I want it. No, if I am going to have the ranch or lake, I am going to have to pay for them. The second thing that stops me is that I would have to look after them because nobody is going to look after them for me just because it is something I would like.

Neither of those conditions applies to the Nunavut Water Board. Somebody else is going to pay for it and somebody else is going to have to look after it. Mr. Speaker, it is no surprise that the somebody is you and me and all the other taxpayers of Canada.

• (1355)

With such a small population and such a huge land mass, it is perhaps not surprising that the Northwest Territories is at the bottom of the heap compared with all other provinces and the Yukon in so far as paying their own way is concerned. I make mention of that not that it is the fault of the people who are in the Northwest Territories, I simply mention it as a fact.

According to research supplied by the Library of Parliament, for the 1995-96 budget year it is estimated that the Northwest Territories received 72.2 per cent of its income from general purpose federal government transfers of funds plus 10.7 per cent from specific purpose federal government transfer of funds for a total of 82.9 per cent of the income of the Government of the Northwest Territories coming from federal transfers. Let me repeat that astounding number: 82.9 per cent of the income of the Government of the Northwest Territories for the fiscal year 1995-96 came from federal government transfers.

S. O. 31

If this were to provide the necessities of life, many Canadians would probably go along with such a staggering figure, but when a lot of those funds go to employ bureaucrats who seem to be thicker on the ground than the caribou, Canadian taxpayers lose patience. Maybe the Ottawa mandarins have led such sheltered lives that they do not realize that civil servants are not a necessity of life. Taxpayers want the number of civil servants kept to a minimum, just the minimum required to provide essential services. Instead, all too often taxpayers find themselves funding such ridiculous bureaucracies as the water board consisting of eight members plus a chairperson to serve the 22,000 people of Nunavut.

Good government has to do with having the people elect some leaders who are responsible to ensure that public services are provided at a cost the people can afford, by the level closest to the people and best able to perform the service efficiently. Instead, the Nunavut Water Board is appointed by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development who in turn was appointed—surprise—by the Prime Minister after being elected by the people of Sault Ste. Marie, which the last time I looked on the map was a long way from Nunavut.

The Speaker: My dear colleague, you still have quite a bit of time left in your discourse.

[*Translation*]

It being nearly 2 p.m., we will now proceed to statements by members.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

NATIONAL AIDS STRATEGY

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, AIDS is a scourge that has affected the lives of families all across this country.

One of my former students has contracted this terrible disease from a heterosexual partner who has already died because of AIDS. Recently she was awarded the Ovation Award for Activism by the Toronto People with AIDS Foundation.

Like many Canadians, my constituents appreciate the effort the government has made through the National AIDS Strategy to combat the disease through research, treatment and education.

Canada has made a substantial and recognized contribution in fighting AIDS. I was pleased to see the response to the petition I presented on the AIDS strategy. It states that the Minister of Health is participating in active discussions in various sectors concerning the federal role with regard to HIV-AIDS.

I urge the Minister of Health and the entire government to secure continuing funding for the AIDS strategy before the program runs out in March 1998.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE TRAVELS OF ALAIN BOURBEAU AND JEAN-PHILIPPE BOURGEOIS

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honour the courage and determination of two young men from my riding, who made the 6,000-kilometre journey from Calgary to Drummondville by canoe.

Alain Bourbeau and Jean-Philippe Bourgeois made a trip that has not been made since the 18th century. These two coureurs des bois set off from Calgary this past May 7 for a five-month trip along the route of the fur trade.

This was an adventure which brought them both closer to nature and to the essentials of life. As one of them so aptly put it: a life that is not lived in search of a dream is not worth living. This phrase describes not only their present day exploit, but the exploits of all Quebecers involved in past exploration and discovery in the vast reaches of North America.

I would like to send this message to Alain and Jean-Philippe: thank you for this example of perseverance and courage. Your accomplishment is worthy of our total admiration.

* * *

[*English*]

REFORM PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal 747 has hit turbulence. The seatbelt signs are flashing and the Prime Minister has called for an emergency landing.

● (1400)

The GST engine has backfired. The engine of accountability is sputtering and black smoke clouds the Prime Minister's vision. The gauges show that engine three is overheating with political rhetoric. Canadians fear the fourth engine will not be strong enough to

save them from a crash landing as experienced by the Tories in 1993.

It is therefore encouraging to see Canadians clamouring to board the Reform jumbo jet into the 21st century. It offers full service, prosperity and a clear vision of a new and better Canada. Reform's message of political accountability will ensure that all the engines on its jumbo jet operate at maximum efficiency and power.

Canadians who want to venture securely into the 21st century can now board with Reform at gate 97.

* * *

YOUTH INTERNSHIP

Mr. Andy Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to attend the recent open house reception and information night hosted by the Youth Internship Canada program in school district 17 in Oromocto, New Brunswick. The federal government is providing more than \$100,000 for this important initiative.

The youth internship program provides students and employers with opportunities to work together by developing skills and knowledge that can lead to employment. Students participate in on the job and in class training which will be applied directly to specific jobs.

In preparing the students for work readiness, they will be taught basic employability skills along with anger management and social skills training. The program is designed to include special needs students, youth at risk, learning disabled and native students.

I applaud the federal government for funding this innovative program and I congratulate all the students, teachers and businesses involved.

* * *

SMALL BUSINESS

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Small Business Week in Canada. Canadians know that small business is the engine of our nation, the place where job creation has been phenomenal.

I am particularly pleased to be able to highlight four Burlington business leaders who made the Ontario top 100 entrepreneurs list. Ray Simmons is CEO of CRS Robotics, a leading developer of human scale robots and robot systems. Ian Hopkins heads up Magic Wand Carpet Cleaning, a company he plans to franchise across North America. Archie Bennett is president of Zeton Inc. which designs and manufactures small computer controlled pilot plants. Kevin Milne's company is Mars Metal, a specialty casting and keel company.

Each of these individuals credits their team of employees and good customer relations as the keys for their success in the

S. O. 31

marketplace. This government salutes their success and the success of the entire small business sector in Canada.

We commit to ensuring that more individuals get the chance to be entrepreneurs and to Canada becoming an evermore successful trading nation.

* * *

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, October is Women's History Month, this year's opportunity to celebrate the contributions of the women who laboured to shape our nation.

[Translation]

This very special month affords us the opportunity to celebrate past and present contributions by the women who have helped shape our country and to encourage future generations of women to continue to contribute to the enrichment of our country.

[English]

Too often the achievements of Canadian women have been denied the prominence they deserve in our recorded history. Women's History Month unearths the roots of Canadian accomplishment and identifies the fingerprints of women who toiled to make the difference.

This year's celebration coincides with the annual commemoration of the Persons Case of 1929, a legal and political battle to have all Canadian women considered as persons under the British North America Act.

[Translation]

I call most strongly upon all of my colleagues in the House of Commons to celebrate the contributions women have made to Canada and to take part during October in the activities of Women's History Month.

* * *

THE CONGRÈS INTERNATIONAL FRANCOPHONE SUR LA PME

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on October 23, 24 and 25, Trois-Rivières will host the 3rd international francophone symposium on small and medium businesses. This year, the theme will be strategy and growth for small and medium businesses.

Over 120 researchers from 11 countries will discuss issues such as strategic direction, growth, financing, industrial policy and the role of small and medium businesses in regional development.

The fact that this international event will take place in Trois-Rivières confirms the reputation of the Groupe de recherche en économie et gestion de la PME, at the Université du Québec in Trois-Rivières, as a major stakeholder, not only in the field of

S. O. 31

research, but also in the development of various small and medium business strategies.

I want to thank and to congratulate Jocelyn Perreault and André Joyal, both professors with the department of management and economic sciences, for their remarkable work, as well as Pierre-André Julien, holder of the Bombardier chair at the Université du Québec in Trois-Rivières, for his outstanding role.

* * *

● (1405)

[English]

LIGHTHOUSES

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last month on Canada's west coast, just out of Bella Bella, a light keeper reported a downed float plane and initiated an immediate response which allowed the pilot to be saved by a search and rescue team.

And, last week's storm is being called the worst to hit the west coast in 35 years.

In fact, the media reported: "Coast guard officials were breathing a sigh of relief that no sailors were killed during a powerful storm that hit the west coast".

Their relief, I am sure, stems from the 100 per cent failure of four newly automated light stations in B.C.

Speaking to our lighthouse experts, besides lacking crucial up to date local conditions, critical pieces of information appear to be missing from the automated data. One is visibility, another is sea state and a third is alerting the coast guard. None of these can be judged adequately by a machine.

And further, as the destaffing program is completed, Canadians will have to purchase their navigational information from a U.S. satellite at whatever price the U.S. government wishes to charge.

* * *

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Ms. Colleen Beaumier (Brampton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, October marks the 67th anniversary of the Persons Case.

It was in 1929 that the British judicial committee of the privy council declared that women are persons under the terms of what was then called the British North America Act. The decision was delivered in response to a dispute over whether section 24 of the BNA act permitted women to be appointed to the other House.

In striking down an earlier decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, the privy council called the exclusion of women from public office "a relic of days more barbarous than ours".

This decision went a long way in combating the sentiment expressed by a British court in 1876 that "women are persons in matters of pains and penalties but are not persons in matters of rights and privileges".

Members from all parties should note that there are more women in this Parliament than in any other previous Canadian Parliament. I would ask all members to join me in commemorating the Persons Case and to recognize it as a watershed event—

The Speaker: The hon. member for York North.

* * *

TORONTO

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (York North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer congratulations to the 4.5 million residents of the greater Toronto area whose city was today chosen by *Fortune* magazine as the number one international best city for work and family. *Fortune* has recognized that the greater Toronto area has expanded tremendously while retaining its high quality of life.

The survey evaluated factors such as incidence of crime, quality of schooling and cleanliness. Overall commuting times, access to health care and the rate of taxation were all considered in creating the list. Building on past strengths in areas such as financial services and the automotive industry, and exploring growth sectors like telecommunications and biotechnology and the entertainment industry all contribute to our strengths.

The federal government intends to continue to work with other levels of government and industry in our area to promote growth and opportunity for our citizens. Programs such as technology partnerships Canada, the Canadian television and cable production fund and the program for export market development, not to mention lower real borrowing costs, all contribute to the future health of the local and national economy.

Once again, congratulations to the residents of the greater Toronto area on their designation as the number one international city for work and family.

* * *

EAST TIMOR

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week the Nobel committee focused attention on the villainous situation in East Timor when it awarded the Nobel peace prize to Bishop Belo and José Ramos-Horta, brave fighters for human rights and freedom in that small forgotten country.

Prior to 1974 East Timor was a Portuguese colony but became independent at that time when Portugal withdrew. Immediately afterwards in 1975 Indonesia invaded its neighbour and annexed its territory. Since this invasion one-third of this country's population has been killed, resulting in the worst genocide on a per capita basis since the Holocaust. At the Dili massacre in 1991, 200 people,

peaceful demonstrators, were killed by Indonesian soldiers. Despite two UN resolutions condemning this invasion and requesting the withdrawal of Indonesian troops, 20 years have passed and nothing has happened.

I urge Canada and other governments to make a greater effort to support the Nobel winners and the—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Wild Rose.

* * *

• (1410)

JUSTICE

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the dangerous offender status is reserved for Canada's worst criminals, those who are deemed likely to continue repeating their pattern of violent crimes.

Why is it that we have yet another case of a repeat dangerous offender out on parole?

As revealed this past weekend, George Harvey Miln was classified a dangerous offender in 1980 after being convicted of sexually assaulting three teenage boys in Kelowna, B.C. the previous year.

In the early 1970s he was convicted of similar crimes in Toronto.

Subsequently, Miln was allowed to apply for parole every year. In 1993 he was deemed rehabilitated and released.

Lo and behold, Miln decided to revert to his old ways by seducing two teenagers this past August with beer, drugs and pornographic magazines before sexually assaulting them.

Are these not the same crimes for which he was sent to prison indefinitely in 1980? Here we go again, a special parole board deciding who it feels is rehabilitated.

Miln committed crimes in the 1970s, 1980s and now in the 1990s. If that is not repeating a pattern of violent crime, I do not know what is.

* * *

[Translation]

JOB CREATION IN QUEBEC

Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a poll showed last week that, in the opinion of managers of small and medium businesses, the constitutional issue is the major obstacle to job creation in Quebec.

Quebec entrepreneurs are prepared to create jobs and to promote the province's economic recovery, as requested last year by our Prime Minister, and more recently by Quebec's premier Lucien Bouchard. However, the efforts made will not be truly successful as

S. O. 31

long as the PQ and the Bloc Quebecois continue to threaten sovereignty.

The 310 leaders of small and medium businesses who took part in the poll are right, and it is time the PQ and the Bloc realize it. If we are to create good, lasting jobs in sufficient numbers to truly promote Quebec's economic recovery, we must put an end to the political uncertainty generated by separatist threats.

* * *

[English]

JENNIFER HALE

Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today and inform the House of a great accomplishment by a young promising dancer named Jennifer Hale.

Jennifer has been accepted to the Royal Academy of Dancing in London, England. This academy accepts only 15 students per year worldwide.

Jennifer is 18 years old and is from Lindsay, Ontario. She has been studying ballet, highland, modern and jazz dancing at the Lindsay Dance Studio for 10 years.

I would like members to join with me in congratulating Jennifer for her fine accomplishments and wishing her all the best with her future studies and endeavours.

* * *

[Translation]

POVERTY

Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on October 17, community and social groups across the country, including Montreal, marked the International Day for the Eradication of Poverty. They demonstrated against increased poverty.

The Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops took this opportunity to remind the federal government that its cuts to social programs are making the living conditions of the Canadian people, especially women and children, significantly worse.

They also condemned the government's failure to introduce a real action plan to eliminate poverty in this country. The figures speak for themselves: one in five Canadian children lives in poverty.

I hope the government will take immediate action to stop the growing impoverishment of Canadians and Quebecers.

* * *

[English]

LIBERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, here are the top 10 contradictions of the Liberal government.

Oral Questions

10. The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs advertises a Liberal fundraiser on privy council office letterhead, says he was wrong, then takes it all back again.

9. It takes secret ethical guidelines to hold cabinet ministers publicly accountable.

8. The term distinct society means nothing in the west but everything in Quebec.

7. The term red book promise and the ever present GST.

6. Democracy and the Liberal constituency nomination process.

5. The head of the standing committee on defence is a peacenik.

4. We will not lower taxes, Canadians, because the Liberal government feels it knows better than you do how to spend your own money.

3. Fourteen Senate appointments after promising in 1990 that after two years a Liberal government will elect the Senate.

2. Our millionaire Prime Minister imagines that he is hanging out with the homeless.

And the top contradiction of the Liberal government:

1. The Minister of Health apparently smokes cigars.

* * *

• (1415)

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: Colleagues, in a small departure from our usual procedure, I wish to draw to your attention the presence in the gallery of the recipients of the 1996 Governor General's Awards in commemoration of the Persons Case. I will introduce the five women who are here and we will then receive them as we usually do in the House of Commons: Gladys Cook, Dr. Katie Cooke, Mary Eberts, Dr. Margaret Gillett, Jeannette Marcoux.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

POVERTY

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last week the Prime Minister championed the cause of the homeless. He told everyone in Canada that he was aware of their problem, that he was very sensitive to the problem and that he saw people like these every day and talked to them.

My question is as follows: Will the Prime Minister admit that his government's record, which shows that it has concentrated far more on reducing the federal deficit than on dealing with the

problems of those who live in poverty, is a clear indication that the Prime Minister is far more inclined to listen to those who are prepared to pay \$1,000 for a Liberal Party fund-raising dinner than to the homeless and the poor of this country?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the speeches I made last week, I made it clear to Canadians that there are social problems that remain to be dealt with in this country and that as soon as we have achieved our objectives—and I am glad to see that the Minister of Finance is well ahead of the forecasts he made a few years ago and that we will have a balanced budget a few years from now—and I told the business people I met that before concentrating exclusively on tax cuts like the Reform Party is doing, we had to remember that we still had problems to deal with, that there were poor people in our society. That is what I told business people in Toronto and Winnipeg, and I told them that was our priority.

In the course of my life I have met people who live on the street. I met some of them and talked to them, and that is why we want Canadian society to function properly and why we want a government that is in good shape, so that we can really look after their problems. That is our abiding concern.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister keeps saying that there are still problems in this country, as if he had started to deal with the problems of the poor. However, that is not the case. The number of poor people and poor children has increased steadily since 1993, when his party came to power.

Does the Prime Minister realize that by cutting the Canada social transfer, money that is used for health care, education and social assistance, he is aggravating the problems of the poor by forcing provincial governments to reduce funding for measures that are intended to support people who are in need? Will he at least admit that?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, despite the cuts we had to make, in his February budget the Minister of Finance directed \$250 million more towards helping the poor through a system of tax rebates for their benefit.

• (1420)

I agree we have made cuts, but clearly, if the hon. member looks into this he will realize that when you take federal transfers to provincial governments—in his case, to the Government of Quebec—since we came to power we have not reduced our transfer payments. Some transfers have gone down, but equalization payments have gone up, so that today Quebec receives about the same amount it received when we came to power.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister just misspoke himself. The poor, the people we are talking about, do not pay income tax. That is what I am trying to explain to the Prime Minister. We cannot use fiscal measures to help those

Oral Questions

who are in need because they do not have enough money to pay income tax. And that is a fact.

One of the measures introduced by this government was employment insurance reform. Will the Prime Minister admit that as a result of this reform, his government has forced thousands of unemployed workers, tens of thousands of unemployed workers, to go on welfare? Does the Prime Minister think this is the kind of measure that will help the neediest in our society?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to answer the first part of his question, I would like to say that even people who do not pay income tax receive tax credits. In other words, if they do not have to pay taxes and they are entitled to tax credits, the government sends them the money to which they are entitled. If I am not mistaken, the same applies to the GST. These are amounts that are paid directly to them by the government.

I repeat that we have tried to put our finances in order, and today, we enjoy the benefits of this policy because interest rates are at their lowest levels since 1958. Last week, a political leader said that reducing interest rates was a priority. I am referring to the Premier of Quebec, Mr. Bouchard.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development. But first, I would like to say, to follow up on what has just been said, that the unemployment rate has gone up, again.

On October 9, the Minister of Human Resources Development said he wanted to assure all Canadians that the employment insurance program had become a more active measure or insurance program. He stated that a total of \$800 million will be injected into this program every year.

According to a departmental document, however, not only is this \$800 million investment not assured, but making this investment possible will require recovering a further \$365 million per year, and the measures planned to recover the amounts collected by people who cheat the system will not be enough. As a result, a special recipient assistance services will be established.

Will the minister admit that this \$800 million will not be available for active measures unless an extra \$365 million is recovered every year?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I will say is that the new employment insurance program makes work more attractive and is designed to encourage unemployed Canadians to go back to work,

and that we want to help them through active measures. I think this is very important.

The envelopes I was referring to last week represent an \$800 million improvement over what would have been the case had no changes been made to the employment legislation. By the year 2000, if the calculations are correct and they will be, approximately \$2.7 billion in active measures will be available to unemployed Canadians who want to find jobs and re-enter the labour force.

This is therefore \$800 million more than what would have been available otherwise.

• (1425)

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, not only is this not \$800 million more, but the question I just asked the minister was this: Does he or does he not admit that, according to his own officials, in order for this \$800 million to be generated, an extra \$365 million will have to be drawn from the system every year by going after people who cheat the system—and in cases of real fraud, we agree—but also through a proactive approach in which all recipients may well be treated like potential abusers?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that, when we talk about recovering certain sums, the labour market is very different today from what it was 15 or 20 years ago. We will do our best to break away from the past and deal with the current situation.

Very often, businesses use employment insurance to alter the labour market playing field. They are the ones we intend to go after, not those individuals who are eligible for benefits and whom we want to help. We have compassion for these individuals and want to help them re-enter the labour force.

But we will not let employment insurance become a tool in the hands of businesses to be used to alter the labour market playing field. In a word, we are against fraud but in favour of showing compassion for those who truly need assistance.

* * *

[English]

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last week the Prime Minister said not to read his lips but to read his record. That record is pretty dreadful.

There are 1.4 million unemployed Canadians, two to three million who are underemployed, 500,000 who have given up looking for work. One in four Canadians is worried about losing his or her job. There are record bankruptcies, record levels of personal debt, plummeting personal incomes, record taxation levels and a list of broken promises as long as your arm. It is a record to be

Oral Questions

ashamed of. The government has not learned the lesson that taxes, taxes, taxes kill jobs, jobs, jobs.

When is the government going to stop breaking the backs of tax worried Canadians and start shrinking government and lowering taxes? That is what creates jobs.

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, given this new found interest in jobs perhaps I should remind the hon. member what his leader said in 1993. In Penticton, Reform leader Preston Manning said it would take up to three years before any job creation would occur under his party's economic plan.

In fact, he acknowledged that his zero in three plan could actually cost more jobs in the interim and then he went on when asked a further question he said: "What is the alternative?" The alternative was the government that was elected. It has seen the private sector create close to 700,000 new jobs. That is 700,000 more jobs than the Reform Party would have created.

The Speaker: Colleagues, I would remind members to please not use each other's name in the House. Use a title or riding.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised the finance minister is still fighting the last election.

Since the government has taken power the average family has lost \$3,000 of annual spending power because of tax increases. Under the Reform's tax cut proposals a single income family of four with an income of \$30,000 will pay 89 per cent less in federal tax. The Reform plan offers low and middle income Canadians real tax relief.

Will the finance minister stop the attack on Canadian families and announce today that it is time to give Canadians a pay raise after years of Liberal-Tory national pay cuts?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us understand what the Reform Party recommended in its document last week. In its \$2,000 tax reduction, a one earner couple with two children and an income of \$15,000 by its numbers would save \$420.

The same one earner couple with two children and an income of \$100,000 would save \$3,200 a year and more that made a capital gain.

• (1430)

That is progressivity according to the Reform Party. This is a tax cut for the wealthiest Canadians and it is done in order to pay for the gutting of the basic social programs that protect the middle class in this country.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister has a lot of gall when he talks about tax relief for high income Canadians.

Using Reform's tax cut proposal, according to a StatsCanada econometric model that we had run this morning, over a million low income Canadians would no longer have to pay taxes. That would leave money in their pockets where it is desperately needed instead of in the pockets of bureaucrats and high-flying politicians where it is usually wasted.

When is the government going to realize that its rinky-dink, make work, job creation programs are not the way to help Canadians and that cutting the size of government and giving Canadians real tax relief is?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party likes to think it has done something new. Essentially it is recommending that we rob the poor to pay the rich.

For anybody who wants to understand what the government has done, let me quote Carl Weinberg of High Frequency Economics, the American expert on what has happened in this country. He said that you can now price Canadian securities on the basis of domestic economic fundamentals rather than slavishly marking up U.S. yields. That is what happened. He said it is a whole new world.

He goes on to say that what is happening in Canada right now is one of the boldest experiments in macroeconomics that has ever been undertaken. It is a sea change in the way we will have to think about this country.

The Speaker: Now that we are back in shape, we have to close in a little bit on the questions and the answers.

* * *

[Translation]

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this is only Monday. On March 19, the heritage minister returned DMX's license to the CRTC because the proposed Canadian and French content of the company's audio programming was clearly insufficient. However, on October 11, the minister granted the license to DMX, even though the situation was still essentially the same.

Since DMX's proposal is basically the same in October as it was in March, can the heritage minister explain what made her change her mind and grant a license to DMX?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the answer is the same as the one I gave before recess, about a week ago. The reason is that, thanks to our intervention, the two companies involved have increased their Canadian content by 25 per cent.

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister's reputation for calculating speaks for itself. How can the heritage minister intimate that DMX increased its Canadian content, considering that 17 of the 35 channels DMX intends to

offer will be programmed in the United States, where no Canadian content requirement applies? Do the calculation and tell me about it.

The Speaker: Dear colleagues, you must always address the Chair.

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the calculation is as follows. The CRTC requires a 30 per cent Canadian content from Canadian cable operators. DMX and Power raised their Canadian content to 40 per cent. The difference between 30 and 40 per cent represents the 25 per cent increase I told you about a week ago.

* * *

• (1435)

[English]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the new Minister of Human Resources Development.

The government's latest billion dollar tax grab is a payroll tax on part time employment. Why has the government imposed a new tax on part time employment that will hurt those Canadians least able to afford it: small business, working mothers and university students working their way through school?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the unemployment situation in a new way. We want to make sure there is an ethic of work in this country. We want to make sure that every hour counts.

Five hundred thousand workers now benefit from unemployment insurance, which we now call employment insurance. They are now covered by this scheme because part time workers are included in it.

This is part of the new labour market we are in where many people work only part time. We wanted to cover them and this is the reason we are doing it.

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the minister says that every hour counts. So does every dollar. The government will collect between \$1 billion and \$1.5 billion before it pays out any benefits with this new tax.

Taxing part time employment results in increased labour costs and with any kind of logic the net result is fewer jobs.

Given the government has a \$5 billion surplus in the UI fund, why will the government not give an immediate 28 per cent to 30 per cent reduction in the UI tax rate as recommended by the Reform Party and the Canadian Federation of Independent Busi-

Oral Questions

ness so that businesses can help stimulate the economy, help stimulate job creation and help business create those jobs that the government promised?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when one looks at the Reform Party's suggestion, it would appear it is going to pay for its premium reduction by eliminating a great deal of the benefit that arises from the program.

These are the questions one should really address: Is it true that the Reform Party would eliminate sickness benefits? Is it true that the Reform Party would eliminate maternity benefits? Is it true that what the Reform Party would do with unemployment insurance is to put Canadians out on their own and effectively pay for that premium cut by cutting off those Canadians who are most in need of the help it provides?

* * *

[Translation]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec-Est, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the Commission nationale des parents francophones released a study on the funding of official languages programs. This study shows that the federal government clearly favours the anglophone minority in Quebec at the expense of the francophone minority in Canada.

Can the Minister of Canadian Heritage confirm that, according to her own figures, 1 million francophones outside Quebec receive only 36 per cent of the budget allocated to the official languages teaching program, compared to 64 per cent for the 636,000 anglophones in Quebec?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see that the hon. member, who learned such good French in his hometown of Penetanguishene, now admits that there are 1 million francophones outside Quebec, that they are not paraplegics in wheelchairs in any way, shape or form, and that they are not about to disappear.

Second, I am also happy to admit that, since the inception of the bilingualism and biculturalism commission, the federal government has invested \$5 billion in this area. Ever since we came to office and even today, for every dollar spent on providing services to anglophones in Quebec, two dollars are spent on francophones in the rest of Canada.

Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec-Est, BQ): Mr. Speaker, saying that the minister is "like" a snowblower is not the same as saying she "is" a snowblower. When I spoke about francophones outside Quebec, I did not mean that they were paraplegics in wheelchairs, but that, compared to anglophones, they are put at

Oral Questions

somewhat of a disadvantage by this government, especially since the minister cannot even answer such a simple question.

So I ask the question again, because she probably wants to correct such a deplorable situation in this so-called bilingual country.

• (1440)

Can she do it? She suggested some action plans at a press conference. So I am asking her, since we know what federal action plans to save francophones are worth, if the federal government has ways of forcing the provinces to better fulfil their constitutional obligations to francophones?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I gave a specific answer. At this time, for every dollar spent on minority schools in Quebec, two dollars are spent outside.

The figures quoted by the Comité national des parents francophones reflect the fact that there used to be many more English language school boards in Quebec because that province's education policies supported minorities, which was not the case in some other provinces in the 1980s.

Today, thanks to federal policies, there is a French language school board in every province, except Ontario. That is why the figures show the way things should have been in the early 1980s, but unfortunately were not.

* * *

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Herb Grubel (Capilano—Howe Sound, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last week the Prime Minister announced his fiscal policy for the near future. Higher taxes will be used to balance the budget. Higher tax revenues will be used to increase spending. It is obvious that the Prime Minister only listens to old fashioned Liberals who get their jollies out of spending other people's money.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Why does he fail to grasp that Canadians have a fundamental right to keep the money they earn and to spend it in the way they like rather than having it spent for them by the Liberal caucus?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I could not believe it when I read somewhere last week that the Reform Party is going to spend money. Remember they said they were to spend more money for—

Mr. Abbott: We are putting back what you took away.

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice): Fine, I do not disagree with that.

We said that the goal of this government is to stay the course and to go to zero cash requirements and zero deficit as quickly as

possible. We are not there yet and already the Reform Party is trying to spend the money we are saving.

I said that when we are at zero there are problems in our society that have to be managed where the federal government has to play a role. We are not there just to have an across the board tax cut; that when a person pays \$100,000 of tax he will receive \$10,000 of benefits is not the way we will do things. We will target our tax cuts and spending to make sure that those in society who have less can have the chance that they deserve.

Mr. Herb Grubel (Capilano—Howe Sound, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has clearly defined the battleground for the next election. There is one group of people that will want to increase spending of the people's money. There is another party which will give it back to the people who have earned it.

Trevor McLean, a small business owner in my riding in a recent letter said: "Over-regulation and overtaxing small business have a multiple negative impact on our economy—. They cause enormous disincentives for jobs, business failure and investment".

Why does the Minister of Finance listen only to bureaucrats and in his economic update offers no hope to small business and the desperate unemployed Canadians who would find jobs if taxes and regulations were cut?

• (1445)

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has listened to the vast majority of economists in this country. They have said very clearly that a tax cut at this particular time would be inappropriate. They have said that a broad base tax cut at this time would not only be inappropriate but would undoubtedly lead to higher taxes later.

I simply ask Reformers to listen to what John McCallum of the Royal Bank said last week. He said that as a result of the actions of this government we are going to see a steadily declining debt to GDP ratio. We are going to give this country the possibility of having tax cuts which the Reform Party is unable to provide.

The vast majority of legitimate economists in this country have simply said that what the Reform Party is suggesting is the road to financial ruin and we will not accept it.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADA-ISRAEL FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade.

Canada recently negotiated behind closed doors a free trade agreement with Israel. Given that the Israeli swimwear industry imports its fabric from Europe without paying duty, unlike our companies, this treaty may kill the top of the line swimwear

industry, which is located primarily in Quebec, thus costing hundreds of jobs.

Despite the fact that the official opposition raised this important problem last May, and in light of the present discontent of the swimwear industry, how can the minister explain that he has done nothing to protect this up and coming industry with its job creation potential?

[English]

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been extensive consultations with the industry through the Sector Advisory Group on International Trade as well as directly with the industry itself. In preparation of the free trade agreement with Israel a lot of consultation went on. As a result of that, we responded and said we would give a two and a half year phase out period.

The problem the swimwear industry has is that it has to pay a 19 per cent duty on European fabrics. We have now given the industry the opportunity to address this issue before the Canadian International Trade Tribunal to try and even up the playing field so that within the two and a half years it will be in a position where it will be able to compete fairly. The industry has accepted that so that we do have a level playing field and we are trying to protect jobs in that industry.

[Translation]

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when the minister says he has consulted, I would like to quote him Claude Gilbert's reaction: "When I learned by accident that Ottawa was negotiating with Israel, I was terrified". There was no consultation.

In order to resolve this situation, which may well increase unemployment, primarily in Quebec, will the minister promise today to negotiate access to the European textile market at the earliest opportunity, and in the meantime to impose equivalent tariffs on Israeli products in this sector?

[English]

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I just said we have protected the industry for the next two and a half years by allowing for a phase out. I might also add that all of our other industries will receive immediate access to the Israeli market with absolutely no tariffs at all which is a good advantage for them.

We are protecting that industry by giving it the opportunity to sort this matter out with the Canadian International Trade Tribunal. The industry knows what is involved and knows what to do. There were consultations. We will certainly want to assist it to make sure that we preserve jobs in Canada. Overall this agreement has to preserve and enhance the job opportunities for Canadian industries.

Oral Questions

STATUS OF WOMEN

Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today we are honoured to have with us the award recipients of the 1996 Governor General's Persons Case Awards.

Can the secretary of state please tell us why, after all the accomplishments women have made and for which they have been recognized, do we still need such an award?

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this award recognizes a very important day in 1927, a time when five women from Alberta challenged the fact that women could not go to the Senate because they were not considered to be persons. The Supreme Court of Canada ruled against them. They went to London where it was ruled that women were in fact persons.

We must continue to look at our past if we are going to move forward in the future. Every year five women who have done a great deal to advance equality for women are honoured. This year these women happen to be in the House. I understand that the Speaker has recognized them. They are great women. They have faced many challenges and we must continue to view them as role models in the future.

* * *

• (1450)

ETHICS

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs advertised a Liberal fundraising dinner on privy council office letterhead and sent it out at government expense. First he admitted it was wrong and promised to pay back the money. Then he took it all back and reversed his position.

I have written to the Treasury Board and asked its director of ethics to make a ruling on this, but perhaps the Prime Minister would stand up in the House and comment on the actions of his minister. Will the Prime Minister tell us whether the actions of his minister contravene his secret ethics guidelines?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what the minister did was to advise the press that he was going to make a speech somewhere. It is exactly what the Reform leader, the leader of the Bloc Québécois and others do every week. The press gallery is informed of where we are going. Sometimes they are happy to come, sometimes they are not happy to come, but at least they want to be informed.

Oral Questions

It was not a letter asking people for contributions. It was to say to our friends in the press that the minister was making a speech that night. If they accepted the invitation, I am sure they would have listened to a nice speech and they would have learned a lot.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I guess we could all debate that.

We can see the problems that arise when the Prime Minister does not make his ethics guidelines public. The Minister of National Defence only responded after an access to information request made his dilemma public. The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is confused. His staff is confused. The department is being used for political purposes. Meanwhile the public is kept completely in the dark.

Will the Prime Minister please table the ethics guidelines which he says he has, or are they another imaginary friend that the Prime Minister says he has but which we do not know for sure?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all the facts have been made public. He did what is absolutely normal.

The facts are in front of the public. If the member thinks that the minister broke the guidelines, he should tell his leader that he broke the guidelines. Members of Parliament, including ministers, use their letterhead to inform the press of their whereabouts.

I suppose the hon. member might have done it once in a while. I do not think he does it very often because he knows that if he invites members of the press to listen to him, they will not come.

* * *

[Translation]

ASBESTOS

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

For more than three months, the Liberal government has been showing its irresponsibility by refusing any further involvement in the business of France's banning asbestos. All stakeholders agree that the Canadian government must put more muscle into its response to France on this.

France and Canada both being signatories to the Geneva Convention, including ILO directive 162 on the safe use of asbestos, can the Prime Minister indicate what measures have been taken by his government to remind France of its commitments to the ILO?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have personally written to the Prime Minister of France, and this very morning two of my ministers have met with a delegation here in Ottawa to discuss this problem.

Through the Ministers of International Trade, Foreign Affairs and Health, the Minister of Labour is making representations to the French authorities, and I am convinced that the latter will, once they have an objective view of the situation, acknowledge, as the international labour organizations do, that it is possible to use asbestos safely. We do so in Canada, and I do not see why it would not be possible in France.

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government is busting its britches because it is spending \$500,000, whereas Quebec has already committed more than \$2.7 million, and the previous federal government had even spent nearly \$13 million to help the asbestos industry in the late 1980s.

• (1455)

Is the Liberal government waiting until asbestos is banned everywhere in Europe and some 2,000 Quebec jobs have vanished before it takes any serious steps to save this industry?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are doing everything within our power to maintain the asbestos market. As I have just said, we are making representations at the highest levels possible. We cannot take decisions for the European community, but we are making representations at the highest levels.

It is my opinion that they are ill advised in not using this form of product, which can be used very easily if the necessary precautions are taken to protect the public from possible hazard.

It is, moreover, hard for me to bust my britches; I have a very sturdy belt.

* * *

[English]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, over the summer the heritage minister flew to Toronto and made a big show of a \$200 million TV production fund. She seems to do that when she gives away a lot of taxpayers' money. Just two weeks ago, without a press release, without any fanfare at all, the minister doled out \$5 million for the book publishing industry. We wonder if there is a connection.

We know she cannot responsibly spend the \$200 million in this fiscal year. Where did she get the \$5 million for the book publishing industry? Was it from the TV production fund?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, only a few moments ago his colleague questioned the government in terms of our job creation measures.

The member should underscore to the House that the \$200 million cable television production fund, which is a partnership of

Oral Questions

government and the private sector, will result in the investment of \$650 million and the creation of 30,000 jobs in the fastest growing industry in Canada, that is, the cultural industry.

Rather than decrying the government measures to support cultural industries like the book publishing industry and the emerging television production industry, the Reform Party should engage in a real fresh start and congratulate us.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it was very notable of course that her answer did not contain any answer to the question. She will not answer any specific questions about her spending.

For example, take the \$23 million for the free flags. It could not have come from the Canadian identity branch because it only has \$50 million in total. Flags were only budgeted for \$1 million.

She will not answer specific questions. She refuses to tell us where she got the taxpayers' money from for the flags or for this \$5 million. If it was not from the TV production fund, where was it from?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the member once again mentioned the flag program.

Perhaps the member could speak to his colleague, the member for Simcoe Centre, who has just received a letter from a constituent of his, a member of the Reform Party who along with eight of his colleagues has quit the Reform Party because it refused to support the flag program in the riding of Simcoe Centre.

* * *

ENDANGERED SPECIES

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment.

There is great public concern about the steady extinction of species around the world. In Canada, this concern translates into massive support for legislation to protect endangered species.

Can the Minister of the Environment advise us when we will see the long awaited endangered species legislation in this House?

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me thank the hon. member for Peterborough not only for the question but for his diligent work on this file and others before the environment and sustainable development committee.

As was mentioned last week at the international conservation congress in Montreal, this government for the first time will be putting before the House of Commons federal endangered species

legislation in a couple of weeks. That speaks for the aspirations of Canadians in all parts of the country.

• (1500)

As I said, outside of complaining about the weather, this is the one file that elicits the most passionate response from both young and old alike.

Second, it is important to understand that we want a national framework and not a national patchwork. That is why it is equally important that all the provinces and two territories, along with the federal government, have agreed to a national accord to protect endangered species. The country and Canadians will get a national strategy which they and these species are entitled to.

* * *

LAND CLAIMS AGREEMENTS

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Under the land claims agreements which have been signed by the federal government and entrenched by Parliament, there is a provision that when federal legislation affects the groups which come under those land claims they must be consulted. I have written to his colleague, the Minister of Justice, about this issue as well.

Can the minister tell the House what steps he and the Minister of Justice are taking to define what consultation is because it is causing a lot of confusion. I am afraid it will result in costly law cases if we do not have a definition of consultation under the land claims agreements.

Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is a good question.

As the hon. member is aware and is still celebrating, the Yukon is now represented by a new government and three of the members are aboriginal. They are very concerned that there be consultation with First Nations. I have talked to the new leader of the Yukon and I am prepared to sit down with him and develop a more proactive scheme than we had under the former government.

* * *

PRESENCE IN THE GALLERY

The Speaker: I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of Hon. Stan Shumacher, my brother Speaker from the Legislative Assembly of Alberta.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

*Routine Proceedings***HOUSE OF COMMONS**

The Speaker: Colleagues, one of our own has been away a little while. I refer to the dean of the House of Commons—I can use his name—the Hon. Herb Gray. Please make him welcome.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Lyle Vanclief (Prince Edward—Hastings, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the second report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food, which deals with Bill C-34, the Agricultural Marketing Programs Act. I am proud to report this bill with several amendments.

* * *

• (1505)

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-63, an act to amend the Canada Elections Act and the Referendum Act.

The Speaker: Herb, before you begin, in the name of all of your colleagues here we missed you. Welcome home.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, the good wishes are very much appreciated. I will not say more than that, except that I am deeply touched by the good wishes, not only of members of the House but by people from all over our wonderful country.

I am really rising in connection with the question of when shall the bill be read a second time. I wish to rise on a point of order. Therefore, I am at your disposal in that regard.

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

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I wish to inform the House that it is my intention to propose that this bill be referred to committee before second reading pursuant to Standing Order 73(1).

* * *

PETITIONS

TAXATION

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present today. The first deals with taxation of the family and comes from Victoria, B.C.

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

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

LABELLING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition on labelling of alcoholic beverages comes from Stittsville, Ontario.

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

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

JUSTICE

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to table a petition containing 76 signatures on behalf of petitioners in the community of Terrace in my riding.

The petition reads as follows: We the undersigned citizens of Canada draw the attention of the House to the following: whereas, the majority of Canadians believe that the justice system in Canada is not fair and the system does not demand that criminals pay for their crimes and, whereas we would like to see an end to plea bargaining and life sentences, therefore, your petitioners pray and request that Parliament recognize the need for change within the justice system to work to put the rights of the victim ahead of those of the criminal.

• (1510)

PROFITS FROM CRIME

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by 86 of my constituents who pray that Parliament enact Bill C-205, introduced by the hon. member for Scarborough West, at the earliest opportunity to provide in Canadian law that no criminal profits from committing a crime.

[Translation]

THE SENATE

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my fellow citizens, I am happy to introduce a petition which reads as follows:

“We the undersigned citizens of Canada wish to draw the attention of the House of Commons to the following. Whereas the Senate consists of unelected members who are not accountable for their actions; whereas the annual budget of the Senate is \$43 million; whereas the Senate refuses to be accountable for its expenditures to committees of the House of Commons; whereas the Senate does not fulfil its mandate to represent the regions; whereas the Senate duplicates the work done by members of the House of Commons; whereas it is necessary to ensure modern parliamentary institutions; and whereas the House is presently debating a motion proposing the abolition of the Senate; therefore, yours petitioners ask that Parliament take steps to abolish the Senate”.

[English]

PROFITS FROM CRIME

Mr. Murray Calder (Wellington—Grey—Dufferin—Simcoe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present six petitions. Three of these petitions call on the Government of Canada to provide in Canadian law that no criminal profits from committing a crime.

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Mr. Murray Calder (Wellington—Grey—Dufferin—Simcoe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present two petitions that call on the Government of Canada to proceed with amendments to the Criminal Code to ensure that persons convicted of impaired driving causing death carries a minimum sentence of seven years and a maximum of fourteen years.

LAND MINES

Mr. Murray Calder (Wellington—Grey—Dufferin—Simcoe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the last petition calls on the Government of Canada to legislate a comprehensive ban on the production, export,

Routine Proceedings

trade or transfer of anti-personnel mines and to advocate strongly a worldwide ban on land mines.

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present a petition from people living in Victoria—Haliburton.

The petitioners humbly pray and call on the Parliament of Canada assembled to enact legislation to ensure that Canada remains one country, undivided, from coast to coast to coast.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Question No. 56 will be answered today.

[Text]

Question No. 56—**Mr. Wells:**

Have any tenders been awarded in the past 12 months by Public Works Canada where any condition or provision provided for in the tender document was waived and the contract awarded despite the non-compliance with this provision or condition?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): It is Public Works and Government Services Canada, PWGSC, policy that bids be evaluated solely against the criteria set out in the tender document. In addition, all contracts issued are subject to compliance audit. In two recent audits of contracting, in both headquarters and the regions, and based upon a random selection of files, no cases were identified in which mandatory bid evaluation criteria were waived.

However, suppliers who believe that PWGSC has failed to comply with the stipulated criteria in a tender have recourse to the Canadian International Trade Tribunal, CITT. Over the past 12 months, approximately 60,000 contracts have been awarded. During this time the CITT has found that on two occasions, PWGSC through error did not conduct the evaluation according to the criteria set out in the bid solicitation.

PWGSC strives continually to ensure that errors of this nature are not repeated. Systems and procedures are constantly evaluated and “lessons learned” maintained in order to improve our performance in this regard.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 14 could be made an Order for Return, the return would be tabled immediately.

Government Orders

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 14—**Mr. White (North Vancouver):**

With respect to the Squamish Indian Band in North Vancouver, what has the Federal Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development determined to be (a) the total number of Band members living on the Reserve, (b) the total amount of funding provided to the Band in each of the years from 1990 through 1995 from all federal government sources including, but not limited to, transfers and grants for any purpose, government leases of land from the Band, housing costs, education and training, special purpose funding, and (c) income from the Park Royal South Shopping Centre lease collected on behalf of the Band?

Return tabled.

[English]

Mr. Zed: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Zed: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have not had an opportunity to consult with the other parties, but if the House gives its consent could we revert to presenting reports from committees?

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 38th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the associate membership of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

If the House gives its consent, I move that the 38th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1515)

[English]

NUNAVUT WATERS ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-51, an act respecting the water resources of Nunavut, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: Just before question period the hon. member for Kootenay East had the floor. It is around 35 minutes that he still has left.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, members will be happy to know that after the first five minutes I am already half way through my speech which does not change the fact that we are going to be opposing this bill for three fundamental reasons. Just before the break we were dealing with reason number one which is that it represents bad government.

Good government has to do with having people elect some leaders who are responsible to ensure that public services are provided at a cost people can afford by the level closest to the people best able to perform the service efficiently.

Instead, the Nunavut water board is appointed by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development who in turn was appointed by the Prime Minister after being elected by the people of Sault Ste. Marie, a long way from Nunavut. Its costs will be paid by the people of Canada who have no say whatsoever about the board; all we get to do is pay for it.

Regarding my second reason for opposing Bill C-51, namely the process the government used, the government has been ridiculously slow. The Nunavut land claims agreement passed in 1993. It required the federal government to establish three major governing institutions, including the Nunavut water board within three years, by July 9, 1996, or the board members would be appointed and proceed as though the legislation had been passed. This Nunavut water board has been up and running for several months without the limits imposed on it by legislation.

We are all aware that Bill C-51 was tabled so late last spring, on June 14, that there is no way it could have passed before the July deadline. It was totally irresponsible of the government to delay its consultations about the Nunavut water board with both industry and northern residents until August 1995. Because it was a foregone conclusion that especially given the great distances and the severe climate of the Northwest Territories it would simply not be possible to receive widespread public input and draw suitable legislation to get through Parliament before the July deadline, this government should have started the necessary consultations very shortly after it took power three years ago.

Government Orders

Were the officials in the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development so lax in their duties that they failed to make the fact known to their minister or did the minister simply not care? Clearly the Liberal government is totally unfamiliar with the process of thoroughly consulting with the people of Canada's north. Despite a lot of fine talk, the federal government has been run by unaccountable bureaucrats both in the south and especially in the north who, plain and simple, do not realize that it takes time for people to provide input.

The result is that this legislation was not brought to Parliament with enough time for proper debate before the July 1996 deadline.

Another defective part of the government's process is that it has repeatedly refused to provide a briefing to our caucus critic and other members of the Reform caucus despite our repeated requests ever since Bill C-51 was tabled last June. Only on the morning of Friday, October 11 this year when Bill C-51 was quite possibly to be debated that same day did the government offer to brief the Reform caucus on Bill C-51. Clearly once again the government is treating this House with contempt.

Parliament is not a rubber stamp and the Reform Party is doing everything possible to thwart the Liberals' efforts to depreciate this Parliament and the democratic process in Canada. That fact should probably be raised as a question of parliamentary privilege because the lack of a departmental briefing on legislation proposed by the government makes it extremely difficult for my colleagues and me to perform our proper role of holding the government accountable and providing our own thorough input about the content and likely effects across Canada of legislation that the government is proposing.

• (1520)

However, this government does make it a practice to trample on the rights of parliamentarians, which means trampling on the rights of the voters who elected us. Now we must proceed with consideration of Bill C-51, even without a departmental briefing.

This enactment creates the Nunavut water board to license uses of waters or deposits of waste on other water users. The board must also establish agreements providing appropriate compensation for any loss or damage due to changes. The board must work closely with the Nunavut planning commission and has input on all Nunavut land use plans involving water, which is to say that this Nunavut water board will have a remarkable influence once it is in place within the new illegal province of Nunavut with its sweeping powers. The powers are so great that Parliament had to add a special clause to ensure nothing in the original Nunavut bill gave this illegal province greater powers than those enjoyed by the legal provinces. That clause is subsection (2) of section 23 of the Nunavut Act, which should never have been allowed to pass this House in the first place.

This is my final point of objection and certainly the most serious. It was raised in the book *Our Home or Native Land?*, written by constitutional scholar and lawyer Mel Smith of Victoria, B.C. Mr. Smith wrote that perhaps the only way out of the terrible waste and

over government of the Nunavut deal would be to declare the entire issue unconstitutional. I quote page 22 of his book:

Since 1982, the Canadian Constitution requires that the establishment of new provinces requires the approval of not only Parliament but also at least seven provincial legislatures having 50 per cent of the population of Canada. If this new territory is not tantamount to establishing a new province without the consent of the other provinces and therefore subverting the constitutional requirement, then I do not know what a new province would look like. If it looks like a duck, quacks like a duck and walks like a duck, the chances are it's a duck.

Therefore I ask my hon. colleagues, very few of whom were elected to Parliament when it passed legislation to create the vast new bureaucracy called Nunavut, to join me in opposing Bill C-51, the Nunavut waters act, not only because it represents bad government and was advanced by a bad process but because the original Nunavut legislation should be declared unconstitutional.

The Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

The Speaker: As requested, we will delay the vote until later this day when the other votes are being taken.

* * *

• (1525)

[Translation]

ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNALS (REMEDIAL AND DISCIPLINARY MEASURES) ACT

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved that Bill C-49, an act to authorize remedial and disciplinary measures in relation to members of certain administrative tribunals, to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, be read the second time and referred to committee.

Government Orders

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to address Bill C-49, the Administrative Tribunals (Remedial and Disciplinary Measures) Act. This bill illustrates once again our government's commitment to fulfill the promises it made to Canadians.

The bill is part of an integrated and consistent effort to promote sound public management and economic growth. It is also a major component of our goal to restore the confidence of Canadians in their national institutions.

We must continue to build this confidence by displaying openness, honesty and integrity, while also managing our finances in a responsible way. Members of this House are aware of the results of the program review, this fundamental analysis of all federal departments, programs and activities.

Members will also remember that last year we discussed Bill C-65, the first legislation on government organization, before eventually passing it. This legislation stemmed from a review of all the federal government's boards, agencies, commissions and advisory bodies. It was the first omnibus bill designed to eliminate redundant organizations and to streamline the operations of federal organizations and boards, so as to improve effectiveness and the quality of services provided to Canadians.

The legislation before us today is the second omnibus bill to implement the decisions I announced in February of last year in the final report stemming from the agency review. The bill also seeks to implement other changes deemed necessary following the review, while increasing administrative accountability and uniformity for 30 organizations by winding up seven organizations and restructuring or downsizing 13 others.

[English]

Last year's act eliminated 150 governor in council positions, wound up 9 organizations and downsized 16 others. The bill before us will wind up 7 organizations and eliminate a further 271 governor in council positions for savings each year of about \$2.5 million.

I am also happy to report that as a result of the agency review over 400 other governor in council positions are being eliminated by order in council, by separate legislation and administratively.

In total, the review will see the wind-up of over 80 organizations and the elimination of over 800 governor in council positions.

I suggest to all hon. members that these results, while not insignificant in themselves, are indicative of a much larger issue. When we start thinking hard about getting government right, as we promised we would do, when we take some clear decisions about putting the government's affairs in order, the pay-offs to taxpayers and all Canadians can be very substantial indeed.

When I say pay-offs I do not simply mean saving tax dollars, important as that may be. Like most major western democracies

facing severe financial pressures, Canada has been seriously rethinking the role of government in the modern state.

How do we restore the hope and confidence of Canadians in their future? How do we reconnect citizens with their government so they can see that government is immediately relevant to their daily lives?

Government itself is critical in answering both questions.

● (1530)

How then do we reshape the federal government so that it focuses on the things that only government can do or can do best? Canadians repeatedly told us that they have had enough of big government. The message was clear and simple. Government is too big, it is too costly and it is not close enough to the people it serves.

To give Canadians the government and economic opportunities they expect and deserve, we have provided leadership in reducing the deficit, rethinking the whole role of the federal government, reforming our social security system, making federalism more efficient and streamlining government agencies.

Clearly the bill before us is an integral part of this government's coherent and wide ranging program of government renewal.

[Translation]

Program review was another key feature of our strategy to promote job creation and economic growth. This was the most comprehensive review of governmental programs and services in two generations.

The purpose was to reduce government operations to a bare minimum, a core of essential services, in an orderly fashion. And this is exactly our approach in pursuing the three program review objectives: first, to reduce the public administration function of federal programs and services, resulting in a leaner and more effective federal government providing high priority programs to Canadians; second, to modernize Canadian federalism, enabling our government to ensure the provision of programs and services only when the federal government is the most appropriate level of government to do so; and third, to help the government meet its financial targets.

This essentially entails reviewing all of the federal government's responsibilities and determining which of these Canadians can afford. Now that positive results are starting to show, I am sure that the distinguished members of this House will agree that we made a wise decision in taking measured steps. The review was not just another bureaucracy bashing initiative. Neither did it reflect the latest fad in management styles. And it definitely was not an absurd slash and burn exercise.

In the past, many studies were conducted on behalf of the federal government by the Lambert Commission in 1979, by the Nielsen

Government Orders

Task Force in 1986 and as part of the Public Service 2000 initiative in 1990. We are strongly encouraged to eliminate waste and inefficiency within the public service, especially during election campaigns. It is obvious however that the review should not result only in little squares being moved around on public service organization charts.

Why is this review different? Simply because our government has the political will to act and enough imagination to take whatever action is required. This review focuses on the main problems we are facing, namely the need to reduce government spending and improve the economy in order to promote job creation.

Another distinctive feature is that this review involved every minister and department. Departments are now setting aside their secondary responsibilities and merging so that similar programs and services can be grouped in a single portfolio. They are eliminating costly overlap and duplication and using new technologies to reduce the cost of providing services while raising standards. Finally, they are funding necessary programs through cost recovery and user fees.

[*English*]

I began by suggesting that Bill C-49 is an integral part of our well thought out program of government renewal, of getting government right. It is the second omnibus bill to implement decisions stemming from the review of agencies helping to simplify government by eliminating unnecessary or inactive organizations and streamlining others.

• (1535)

The 1994 budget launched this review and its major work is now virtually completed. We have no set targets. Rather, we wanted to identify sensible and practical changes to make government work better.

Ministers reviewed the various agencies within their portfolios and recommendations for change were made in consultation with the agencies themselves and with the Canadians they serve. For example, the changes range from eliminating a single governor in council position on the International Boundary Commission to reducing the governor in council positions on the Canada Pension Plan Review Tribunal from 400 to 300 members.

Other amendments relate to accountability, standardization and administrative efficiency. These affect 30 organizations.

Members will notice that the bill improve the governance of agencies, boards and commissions in two main ways. First, governor in council appointments have been reduced to the minimum number necessary for efficient operation. Second, accountability has been improved in several ways.

One example is the phrase "remedial and disciplinary measures" in the bill's title. This refers to the fact that several statutes

do not provide clear mechanisms for those rare cases where it might be necessary to undertake remedial or disciplinary measures with regard to a member of an administrative tribunal appointed during good behaviour. The bill now brings in consistent provisions.

The bill's provisions clarify the complex accountability of persons appointed during good behaviour on the one hand and during pleasure on the other. Persons appointed during good behaviour may be removed only for cause. This applies to appointees of agencies at arm's length where independence and impartiality are important. An example is the National Parole Board.

Where appointments to serve during good behaviour are not justified by the need for independence and impartiality, the bill amends tenure to serving during pleasure. This means that appointees may be removed at the discretion of the governor in council.

Finally, to clarify accountability, consistent appointment mechanisms are being introduced for the chairpersons of administrative tribunals.

[*Translation*]

I think this bill illustrates on a reduced scale our preferred formula for rethinking the government's role. Until the basic questions are raised, the temptation is to go on as before. On the other hand, some are now saying about government that what has not been reviewed does not deserve to survive.

We are rapidly moving toward some radical changes aimed at reducing the size of the federal government so that it can focus on national roles, responsibilities and priorities and provide the services important to Canadians at a cost everyone can afford.

[*English*]

Programs and services must focus even more on client needs, not on jurisdictional hair splitting or administrative needs. I believe that national confidence in government can be restored if it is involved in activities that properly belong to it.

Government in today's world cannot be static. I see a constant and continuing rethinking about how we can do better. The results will be a more responsive, service oriented and leaner government. It will mean more sensible federal priorities concentrated on the major social and economic issues. As clients, Canadians want services that are speedy, accessible, reliable and responsive.

• (1540)

As citizens, Canadians want services that guarantee health and safety, public security, fairness and equity and economic well-being. As taxpayers, Canadians want a government that is efficient and cost effective. In other words, Canadians want a competent government with political imagination, leadership and courage. That is exactly what this government will continue to deliver.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this legislation is about administrative tribunals and the dissolution of certain federal agencies.

As Treasury Board critic for the official opposition, I will first address the real financial impact of Bill C-49 and then I will look more closely at its administrative and political impact.

The minister tells us that all these dissolutions and reorganizations contained in Bill C-49 and in a similar bill adopted by Parliament in June 1995 will result in savings of about \$10 million a year.

What is the use of all these changes which, according to the minister, may help us save some \$10 million a year when we know that, in spite of their red book promises, the Liberals have let the public debt grow and have not addressed the problem of chronic unemployment. Ten million dollars is just a drop in the ocean of debt created by the Liberals. Canada's debt is growing by more than \$100 million a day, which is ten times more a day than Bill C-49 and the other bill adopted in June 1995 will help us save in a year.

Since 1961, the federal debt has increased twenty-six-fold, and the Liberals have been in power during 26 of those 35 years. We know who is responsible for this huge debt.

In its annual brief presented to federal parliamentarians in December 1995, the Conseil du patronat du Québec asked the federal government to set right then a higher deficit reduction target than the one it is supposed to meet in March 1997, which is \$24.3 billion. Reducing the deficit to \$20 billion by March 31, 1997 should be a minimum target according to the Conseil du patronat du Québec, which invites the federal government to re-examine seriously its spending rather than increase direct or indirect taxes paid by Canadians.

And a bill such as Bill C-49 will not lead to a serious examination and considerable reduction of federal spending. The deficit reduction targets are too low and efforts to stop the growth of our debt are insufficient.

Bill C-49, just like the last budget tabled by the Minister of Finance, means the end of the government's efforts to put our fiscal house in order. The impact of the budget measures on the deficit will be non-existent this year and will total only \$200 million next year. Can you imagine an impact of \$200 million over a two-year period on an annual budget of over \$160 billion. This is ridiculous.

The President of the Treasury Board and the Minister of Finance are still trying to make us believe that deficit reduction remains one of the major concerns of cabinet, by regularly bombarding us with statistics on the debt as a percentage of the GDP and by comparing Canada to countries with the worst record concerning deficit

reduction. Let me remind the minister that there is no glory in making such comparisons.

In the briefing notes released by the Treasury Board, it is written in black and white that the two stages of the agency review will only account for \$10 million in savings. The Liberals have come up with very little after making such a big show of the program review, which has not amounted to much. It is, indeed, very disappointing.

As I said earlier, the President of the Treasury Board and minister responsible for this program review has been making a lot of fuss these past two years, by bringing forth some very impressive figures: 45,000 jobs cut in the civil service, and more cuts right and left.

• (1545)

In fact, we should let the figures speak for themselves. If it were not for the estimated increase in revenue of \$100 million this year and \$245 million next year, the budget re-allocation made by the minister in charge of the Treasury Board would have resulted in an operational deficit of \$134 million for this year and of \$92 million for next year.

Why cut so many jobs and affect so many workers and their families if just to re-allocate funds to so-called priorities? Not only is this exercise bound to result in no gain or even worse a deficit, but a slower economic growth than what was forecast could mean an even higher deficit in the upcoming years.

The government does not keep its word. Furthermore, it wants us to believe that it exceeds its own objectives. Fiscally speaking, Bill C-49 is nothing but a smokescreen to hide the fact that the Liberals are not able to reduce the deficit.

All the accumulated effects of this year's budget will have an impact of only \$1.9 billion by 1999. Do not forget that the predicted impact of the 1994 budget was \$45 billion over 5 years and that of the 1995 budget was \$43 billion over 4 years. According to the predictions, this year's budget will have a nominal impact of \$1.9 billion on the debt, which will have increased by \$110 billion by the end of this Liberal government's mandate.

The government is dragging its feet and continuing to estimate the impact of its actions over several years because they are generally laughable when taken individually each year. And the best example of this is Bill C-49 tabled by the minister responsible for the Treasury Board.

All the important decisions concerning cuts and reductions in spending were taken in the 1994 and 1995 budgets. Why then propose an administrative overhaul, which will have no real impact on government management? In practice, the finance minister always tables deferred budgets to avoid the backlash of unpopular decisions.

Cuts undertaken in past years coming into effect in 1996 and 1997 will continue to reduce government expenditures without the need for the government to make some new unpopular decisions this year and as it approaches the deadline of the elections planned for next year.

Meanwhile, the President of the Treasury Board is proceeding with a few administrative and symbolic changes to show that the government is still bent on improving public finances. This is an election-oriented strategy and the people is not fooled by it.

With regard to the political and administrative impact of Bill C-49, we can say without fear of error that the President of the Treasury Board set out some fine principles in the backgrounder we received recently from his officials, but, in fact, this piece of legislation is backward looking when it comes to the administrative tools it is proposing and shamefully partisan in its objectives.

The Treasury Board's backgrounder talks about streamlining disciplinary measures taken by administrative tribunals, streamlining the process of appointing chairpersons to administrative tribunals, winding up 7 federal agencies and revamping or downsizing 13 others, as well as standardizing terminology and pay, and several other changes. All these are fine principles indeed, but what is Bill C-49 really hiding?

Let us take a closer look at the administrative and political consequences of this piece of legislation. Bill C-49 makes significant changes in the way administrative tribunals operate. Several of my Bloc colleagues will take the floor shortly, as critics, to tell you about the particular impact of Bill C-49 on each one of the 19 administrative tribunals involved.

• (1550)

I ask the House for unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That, when Bill C-49, an act to authorize remedial and disciplinary measures in relation to members of certain administrative tribunals, to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, has been concurred in by the Liberal majority at second reading, it be referred to every standing committee of the House connected with an administrative tribunal affected by the said bill.

The Speaker: Dear colleague, if I am not mistaken, you are asking for unanimous consent of the House on a motion.

Mr. Bélisle: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: In my opinion, this amendment is not admissible at this point. We will go on. To obtain unanimous consent, the motion must be admissible and I do not think it is. So you may continue with your speech.

Government Orders

Mr. Bélisle: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Even though they are not as well-known as superior courts, the administrative tribunals have major impacts on the daily life of Canadians and Quebecers. Their rulings often have serious consequences for the citizens and the country.

In fact, the increased importance of administrative tribunals in recent years is common knowledge. They have become popular decision-making venues where the citizens regularly face the government to assert their rights.

For more than 25 years now, a debate on these administrative tribunals has been going on in Quebec. A project for the reform of administrative tribunals has even been submitted to the Quebec National Assembly. Fundamental questions like the independence and the impartiality of the judges of those tribunals are being discussed there.

Although they are being debated at the Quebec government level, these issues are also relevant at the federal level. Bill C-49 could have solved the fundamental problem of partisan appointments of members of the administrative tribunals. But the federal government chose to return to a not so glorious past in that area instead of modernizing the appointment process as Quebec is about to do.

At a time when the public is so cynical about politicians, the President of the Treasury Board is implementing even more partisan rules, which give political authorities increased control over the administrative tribunals.

• (1555)

The bill establishes a new mechanism to remove from office people appointed to administrative tribunals by the governor in council. This is in clause 3 of the bill. Also, after certain procedures, the governor in council will have the power to remove these people from office for cause, as specified in the bill.

Only after receiving an inquiry report, will the minister have the power to make a recommendation "to suspend the member without pay, remove the member from office or impose any other disciplinary measure or any remedial measure". This is in clause 14 of the bill. The minister's recommendations are entirely at his discretion, regardless of the content of the inquiry report.

Chairpersons of administrative tribunals will now all be designated instead of being appointed. Such a change makes the chairperson very vulnerable to political pressures by the government, which can simply designate a new chairman when it sees fit. These new measures can even further undermine the credibility of administrative tribunals and, moreover, make them even more

Government Orders

dependent on political authority. It is unacceptable to introduce measures that seriously attack the independence and impartiality of administrative tribunals. It really flies in the face of the transparency people want from a modern and progressive government.

Unfortunately, federal administrative tribunals are constantly the object of Liberal patronage. This was true under Trudeau, and it is still true under the present Prime Minister.

The President of the Treasury Board refuses to discuss these important issues because he wants to maintain the power of ministers to appoint the members of administrative tribunals. Any reform of administrative tribunals should start with the arbitrary nature of the process for appointing and renewing the mandates of administrative judges. In 1996, political patronage in a quasi-judiciary process should no longer exist in a modern democracy like ours.

Bill C-49 is a direct attack on the independence and impartiality of judges. The Liberal government is fully prepared to ignore principles that should underlie the work of administrative tribunals. With the sword of Damocles that he wants to suspend above the heads of members of administrative tribunals, the President of the Treasury Board may vitiate the entire judicial process of administrative tribunals. In so doing he is subordinating the judiciary to political considerations.

The president of the Quebec Bar Association was very clear about this when she said, and I quote: "The lack of job security may have an unexpected psychological impact on the decisions of a person who may be more concerned about pleasing the government than rendering a fair judgment". This quote was taken from *Le Soleil* of July 8, 1995.

Members of administrative tribunals might even be reluctant to develop jurisprudence that would be favourable to the individual, so as not to penalize the State.

The Liberals, with their base partisan manoeuvring, are attacking the very foundations of a modern democracy. The separation of powers has long been a part of Canadian and Quebec democracy, and the minister would do well to drop Bill C-49 if he does not want to go down in history as the man for whom the development and modernization of institutions is a backdoor proposition.

This government bill is totally unacceptable. It is a direct attack on the impartiality and independence of members of administrative tribunals. These two principles are seen as fundamental to a democratic society, principles that the government prefers to ignore in favour of maintaining its power to make partisan appointments to administrative tribunals.

• (1600)

These appointments are a way to reward friends of the party who may not always have the qualifications to exercise such important duties. The Liberals are simply perpetuating the patronage system with which they are so familiar and which has been their trademark as a government for a long time.

I hope the Minister responsible for the Treasury Board will listen to reason and withdraw this retrograde and backward looking bill. The minister will have a chance to redeem himself by supporting my amendment to Bill C-49, which is as follows:

"this House declines to give second reading to Bill C-49, An Act to authorize remedial and disciplinary measures in relation to members of certain administrative tribunals, to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, because the principle of the said Bill does not allow for the possibility for any parliamentary mechanism governing the appointment or revocation of the appointment of members of administrative tribunals."

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The amendment is in order.

[English]

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, perhaps you can clarify whether we are talking about the amendment. Is debate only on the amendment or can we still talk about the bill, since it is the intention of the amendment to postpone the bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Let me put it in these terms. Technically we are debating the amendment. Of course the original motion is always relevant. I will leave that to your interpretation.

• (1605)

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the advice. I also appreciate the motion by my colleague from the Bloc that says we should not be debating this bill. We in the Reform Party do not agree with the contents of the bill either.

If I can endorse the feelings of my colleague from the Bloc perhaps I can give my feelings on Bill C-49 and why this bill should be voted down and out. I do not think the government has achieved very much other than some grandiose statements from the President of the Treasury Board in introducing the bill. It was a wonderful speech but when it is analysed he did not have much to say.

One point that did strike me as being very important was the statement that 271 positions had been eliminated. Attached to that was the statement that \$2.5 million would be saved. When we look at the 271 positions that are being eliminated we find that these are 271 vacant positions. The minister gave no explanation of how he was saving \$2.5 million by eliminating positions that are sitting vacant and were not costing taxpayers anything. I wonder how this

Government Orders

is going to move the Liberal agenda forward or is it just more smoke and mirrors of the type that we have become accustomed to over the last three years in this House.

Unfortunately, I have drawn the conclusion that it is very likely in the realm of smoke and mirrors than an actual advancement of policy which is why I think the Bloc's amendment is in order.

Patronage has always run long and deep and lies close to the heart of members of the Liberal Party. That is why when the President of the Treasury Board is touting this as a great new advancement I am somewhat sceptical. I looked at some of the points he made, such as keeping promises to Canadians, which I will talk more about later. The major component of the objective of this exercise is to improve the confidence of Canadians in the exercise of government. We are talking more government and more spending.

Reformers have asked the Minister of Finance to cut spending but the spending of this government has not changed in three years. Interest costs on the deficit have more than offset any decreases the Minister of Finance has been able to make elsewhere. The actual cost of government is just as much today as it was three years ago except that Canadians are getting less for their money as it is used to pay interest and given to bankers, lenders, foreign investors and all the people who really do not need the taxpayers' money.

I listened to the Minister of Finance during question period today. He was really getting quite hot and bothered by the Reform Party's plan. He tried to defend his own but I did not hear him defend how he taxes Canadians, especially poor Canadians and young Canadians who are looking for jobs. The money is transferred to foreign investors, bankers, money lenders and so on who are rich beyond all imagination. This is just because the government cannot get its spending act together. These are the types of things for which Canadians want answers.

Now the President of the Treasury Board stands up in the House and gives us a wonderful speech. However, when it is analysed he has not said anything. There will be 271 positions eliminated. Is that not a wonderful piece of work? When we look underneath we find these are vacant positions. He has not axed one single person out of the patronage pork barrel. Did he tell us that? No. Did he tell Canadians that? No. Did he admit that this was just smoke and mirrors? No. This was presented as wonderful leadership by the government.

The philosophy of appointments by the Liberal Party is questionable at best. Merit is certainly not a consideration. When I say merit I again come back to the President of the Treasury Board. He is the minister in charge of the department that is the employer of the civil service. We are trying to introduce merit into the civil service to recognize the people who work harder and do a better job, who deserve more pay and to be advanced up the ladder faster.

Yet we have Bill C-49 which contains 100 pages or so and not one single mention of merit in it.

• (1610)

The President of the Treasury Board is promoting merit but supports a bill that completely bypasses merit and favours partisanship. The minister has a mandate to renew the civil service which he has accomplished through job cuts and the restructuring of departments. Yet Bill C-49 offers no such review of appointments or an overhaul of the appointment process.

The government has eliminated 45,000 jobs in the civil service. Not all of them are legitimate eliminations. There are lots of smoke and mirrors too. However, the point is there is some serious downsizing in the civil service. But no, the government cannot touch the patronage jobs. It can eliminate the jobs that are sitting vacant, but will not go after its friends.

The bill goes on to restructure words. Fisherman is eliminated and replaced by fisher. The President of the Treasury Board promotes neutrality, accountability and integrity within the civil service but does not feel that these qualities should apply to Liberal colleagues when they are appointed to the plum patronage posts. Smoke and mirrors. As the House will see, Liberal Party claims about how much it has done to improve the patronage system is really bogus.

Let me remind my hon. colleagues on the other side of their party's boasts some three years ago in the red book. On page 92 it states: "A Liberal government will make competence and diversity the criteria for federal appointments". I read in the paper this morning that with the Liberal convention coming up this weekend they are going to publish a document telling us how many of these promises they have met. Bill C-49 does not even have the word competence in it yet it deals with patronage appointments by the hundreds.

I wonder how the crafters of this document are going to tell us how they achieved their promises in the red book. I am sure they will be able to point to one particular appointment where just by chance perhaps the guy actually has some qualifications as well as being a member of the Liberal Party and hence the promise has been fulfilled.

Let us remember that a Liberal government will make competence and diversity the criteria for federal appointments. However in the bill there is not a mention.

How strange is it that the best candidate all too often turns out to be a Liberal? For example, the current Minister of National Defence appointed Marian Robinson, a long time Liberal staffer to the National Transportation Agency with a per diem of \$500 a day without even interviewing her to determine her competency or expertise in the field. However, being a good Liberal and working for the minister deserves an appointment courtesy of the taxpayer.

Government Orders

How about all of these appointments to the Senate in the last three years? Many of them came from that side of the House. Not one of them was not beholden and committed to the Liberal Party.

I have a book here that I got from the Library. It is called *Federal cabinet appointments handbook: A compendium of Governor in Council appointments*. You can see how thick it is, Mr. Speaker. If the number of pages are counted it might be embarrassing. There are a number of pages for each chapter. It is full of the names of people, hundreds and thousands of people, each and every one of them enjoying the largesse of the taxpayer in order to do some political appointment job. There are lists of names under the Department of Health, the Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse, the Medical Council of Canada, Medical Research Council, National Advisory Council on Aging, Patented Medicines Price Review Board.

Let us move to a different chapter. Under the Renewable Resources Board, the chairperson is picked by the governor in council with remuneration at \$200 to \$275 a day. Renewable Resource Board, in Sahtu in the Northwest Territories, per diem \$160 to \$250 a day. Under the Department of Industry there is the National Economic Development Board, remuneration to be fixed by the minister but it does not tell us how much.

• (1615)

There is the Business Development Bank of Canada and pages of names. Remuneration is \$200 to \$300 a day with an annual retainer of \$4,000 to \$5,000. This one is up. As soon as we put a bank in there I guess it deserves more. This is getting expensive.

There is the Canadian Space Agency, the Canadian Tourism Commission, the Copyright Board. There is Edmonton Northlands, in my hometown. There are two people on there. Remuneration is fixed by the organization. Directors who are public servants serve without remuneration but they look to be local people who have served for pleasure.

On and on it goes with hundreds of names, thousands of people, millions of dollars and no accountability.

Going back to the government, the Prime Minister in his acceptance speech in 1993 vowed that Liberals were elected to serve the people of Canada and not to serve themselves. Is that not a wonderful statement? The Liberals were elected to serve the people of Canada, not to serve themselves yet when we look at all these patronage appointments it is rather interesting.

I have a copy of the Monday, October 14, 1996 edition of the *Hill Times*. It contains part one of the Liberal patronage appointments. I put the emphasis on part one.

Let us take a look at Gerald Allbright who was appointed to the Saskatchewan Court of Queen's Bench. Party: Liberal. Background: a well known Liberal supporter.

Gary Anstey. Position: Minister of Fisheries, that is the previous minister, Brian Tobin, who is now the premier of Newfoundland. He was appointed as executive assistant. Party: Liberal. He worked for another member of Parliament and later resigned from Mr. Tobin's office temporarily until cleared of financial wrongdoings. A little shaky there.

There is Claire Brouillet, a staffer in the Minister of Transport's office. She was an unsuccessful candidate in Terrebonne in 1993 so she got a political patronage plum rather than being in this House. Talk about political patronage.

There is Richard Campbell, Director, Marine Atlantic. Party: Liberal. He was the campaign manager for Lawrence MacAulay. It carries on.

There is Moses Coady, a lobbyist. He is a former aide to Liberal Allan MacEachen and is seeking infrastructure dollars. Well there you are.

There is Dorothy Davey, vice-chair, Immigration and Refugee Board, Liberal.

That is from part one. I could go on forever. Wait until next week's edition with part two.

I go back to the Prime Minister's point that in his words "Liberals were elected to serve the people of Canada, not to serve themselves". Bill C-49 does not do very much about that. The Prime Minister quickly forgot his promise when he appointed his longtime ally, Mr. André Ouellet to Canada Post with a salary of \$160,000 a year, or when he appointed the sister of the Minister of National Defence to the bench at \$140,000 a year, or the brother of the member for Gander—Grand Falls to the board of the Bank of Canada at \$300 a day.

Members may have recalled in the *Globe and Mail* a couple of weeks ago when we were giving the government such a hard time about its code of ethics which the Prime Minister refuses to divulge. The *Globe and Mail* had a little article which said that the perception of influence has to be avoided as well as actual influence.

The perception must be avoided yet there are people who sit next to the Prime Minister in this House, who move out of this House into a \$160,000 a year job. Relatives and friends of the Minister of National Defence move into \$140,000 jobs. A brother of the member for Grand Falls moves to the Bank of Canada. The perception is downright awful.

Canadians are sick and tired of this type of perception where friends and who you know is more important than what you know. Merit is what Canadians like. Canadians have no problem with the

Government Orders

fact that they have to compete and work hard today to get ahead in this world. When I gave this country 25 years or more, it is what I most appreciated about this country. It was not who you are or who you know, but what you can do and accomplish that will get you ahead. That whole way of Canadian life has been thrown in the garbage can and people are losing faith.

• (1620)

We wonder why people are losing faith in their politicians when there are these types of appointments, friends and relatives and connections right across the board. There are books in the Library of Parliament which contain names upon names upon names.

Agencies, boards and tribunals were once an important forum for alternative decision making. In most cases they have become another arm of the bureaucracy, laden with people in an environment where political loyalties rather than merit are the criteria for decision making. We see organizations whose functions overlap and duplicate the work of the non-partisan bureaucracy, but where else would we be able to help our friends?

Before I look at the bill in detail, I would like to briefly discuss the history of agencies and administrative tribunals in Canada. Agencies predate the Confederation of Canada. In 1851 the Board of Railway Commissioners was created. Even back then the independence of the agency subsequently came into question when in 1888 the agency was criticized because its members spent most of their time in Ottawa, served only on a part time basis, lacked expertise and were becoming subject to the daily political wrangling in Ottawa. What is new?

It seems that very little has changed over the last 130 years. Since that time both the Glassco and the Lambert commissions have questioned patronage practices and agency accountability. But once again nothing has been done and Bill C-49 continues that tradition. The President of the Treasury Board has made grandiose statements about change, updating, revamping and eliminating positions but really when we look at it, nothing has changed.

Clearly we have a problem with the government's vision of the roles of agencies and tribunals. The government has lost its focus and the lure of patronage has become too great to implement meaningful changes. Even where the independence of an agency should be respected by cabinet, it is overlooked.

The National Parole Board is a perfect example. How often have we talked in the House about the problems, the mistakes, the incompetence of the National Parole Board that has allowed people to walk our streets and commit violent and horrendous crimes where the innocent suffer? Tragically, families are ruined all because the National Parole Board gets its act wrong. Of course it is staffed by friends of the government.

The former chair of the parole board stated that the National Parole Board had become a haven for dangerously inexperienced appointees. I am sure he used the word dangerously advisedly because criminals are turned back out on to the streets and what happens? They commit another murder, another rape, another violent crime when they should be behind bars. These appointees have no training yet we literally put them in charge of keeping the doors locked on our violent offenders. That job should be given to competent, trained people who know how to make the proper decisions rather than to friends of the government.

Political agencies have corrupted the day to day duties of the agencies. When I say corrupt I am not talking about illegalities but the whole concept of agencies as an expression of the public will by people who are competent and able to do so has been totally corrupted by the fact that they are seen as a place to reward friends and family. That is the corruption I speak of.

That is why politicians are held in such low regard. This government has every opportunity to do something about it. It promised to do something about it in the red book. The Prime Minister promised to do something about it in his acceptance speech yet three years later it is the same old story.

• (1625)

Bill C-49 for all its hype changes things such as "chairman" to "chair" but does not change the fact that the National Transportation Agency is currently staffed by well connected former Liberal MPs. Bill C-49 changes the term "fishermen" to "fisher" and the term "salary" to "remuneration", but these changes do not renew confidence in the appointment process. They are politically correct changes for a politically incorrect practice.

Bill C-49 will reorganize the Immigration and Refugee Board, but that does not change the fact that Pierre Trudeau's former executive assistant is on the board, along with the defeated Liberal MP Gary McCauley. We are paying these people \$80,000 a year.

Let the truth be known. The cost cutting, the 271 positions and the whole exercise being proposed by the President of the Treasury Board has no teeth. The bill for all its fanfare saves no money and offers no innovation. The only innovation is the use of common sense that we would propose. Why were these appointments not eliminated a long time ago? Why did he wait and take the great glory of doing it all at once when the positions have been sitting empty for a long time?

I have some serious problems with the bill again with what I perceive to be the smoke and mirrors concept. Clause 5 of the bill proposes that the minister will have to wait for a request by the chair of a tribunal or agency in order to investigate or apply any disciplinary measures to a member if the chair feels there is cause.

Government Orders

One could argue that the chair is right there and aware of what is happening to the members and therefore it is only appropriate that the chair should advise the minister if he perceives any impropriety. That is a good argument, but there is nothing in the bill which causes the chair to report to the minister if he is the one who is accused of impropriety. There is no mechanism to deal with that.

The bill also allows the minister to hide behind the chair if the chair does not report to the minister an impropriety of his colleagues. Clause 5 allows the minister to hide behind the chair. That is the type of innuendo which we see built into legislation. If there is a problem down the road with any member of any agency, the minister can say: "I have not had a report from the chair. My hands are tied". Nothing will be done. These innuendoes in the legislation will ensure the smoke and mirrors game which the government is so fond and capable of playing.

I do not recall the minister talking about this aspect of the bill. The CBC and the CRTC for many Canadians are the bastions of Canadian culture. The CBC is Canadian owned. It is paid for by the taxpayers. It promotes Canadian culture. The CRTC regulates our broadcast industry to ensure that Canadian content rules are followed. Those are laudatory goals. Bill C-49 allows us to appoint non-Canadians to the boards. I scratch my head. I shake my head. Are we now going to say that boards such as the CBC and the CRTC no longer require Canadian citizens?

The only way individuals cannot have Canadian citizenship is if they have not been in the country for three years. They have landed immigrant status but they have not been here long enough and therefore they cannot apply for Canadian citizenship but they can sit on the board of the CBC or the CRTC.

Even if an individual has been here for three years, they must be sufficiently committed to Canada to say: "I want to be a Canadian. I want to be known as being a Canadian. I want to stand up and be proud of the country that has adopted me and I want to take out Canadian citizenship because I am proud of this country and I want to support this country". No, we do not want these people on the board. We only want landed immigrants.

● (1630)

Bill C-49 says that our Canadian culture, which this government and many other governments before it have spent hundreds of millions of dollars promoting, can be run by non-Canadians. The hypocrisy is beyond belief, that this government, which has just gone through a referendum and almost lost the country through its incompetence, should now turn around and give us in Bill C-49 these bastions of Canadian culture no longer requiring Canadian

citizenships. It boggles my mind. I find it quite incomprehensible. I have no idea what this government is trying to achieve.

If anybody doubts my word, take a look at clause 38 on page 11 regarding the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation:

A person is not eligible to be appointed or to continue as a director if the person is not a Canadian citizen who is ordinarily resident in Canada or a permanent resident within the meaning of the Immigration Act or if, directly or indirectly, as owner, shareholder—

My point is the government has opened it up now to include non-Canadians, and that is not just the CBC but the CRTC and other organizations. You do not have to be a Canadian to sit on the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

These are things in the bill that the minister made no mention of at all. There are all kinds of little things that have been slipped into this bill that I find rather offensive and I would have thought the minister would have spoken out clearly on them.

I am also looking at the page on the Race Relations Foundation, clause 68. In clause 68.(1)(a) the objectives of the foundation are to undertake research and collect data to develop a national information base in order to "eliminate racism and racial discrimination", a laudable objective again.

However, now the government has changed the act. Rather than trying to help eliminate racism and racial discrimination it has moved it into the pejorative to eliminate racism and racial discrimination. I would suggest this is an oxymoron. As long as we continue to undertake research and collect data on the number of people of various colours, sex, racial origin and so on that we have in this country, we will guarantee the continuation of racism and racial discrimination. That has been foisted and fostered and counted by the bureaucrats and agencies of this government.

I could go on at length. There are many situations in here that I would like to bring up, which we will do at committee. That is flavour of the types of issues that deserve to be properly aired.

In his speech the minister said that they want to rethink government, reach people the best way possible, that people do not like big government, they want government that is close to the people it serves. The minister should have been talking about decentralization and delegation rather than political appointments and so on.

I support the Bloc's amendment. This type of bill is not laudable, as the minister would have us believe. This bill is not going to advance government, as the minister would have us believe. It is not going to reduce patronage, as we would believe. It is not going to fulfil the red book promises, as the minister would have us believe. Therefore the Bloc's amendment is perfectly in order.

• (1635)

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate on Bill C-49, the administrative tribunals, remedial and disciplinary measures, act.

I would like to comment on the remarks of my hon. colleague from St. Albert. As I understand it, to date this government has made 2,040 GIC appointments to agencies, boards and commissions. Of these, 525 or 25.7 per cent were reappointments. These persons, I understand, were there before November 4, 1993.

This bill is an integral part of the government's approach to getting government right, renewing the federal government and restoring the confidence of all Canadians in our national institutions.

In 1994 a review was conducted of all federal boards, agencies, commissions and advisory bodies as one of several initiatives aimed at reducing the cost of government and improving the efficiency of its operations.

The objectives of the agency review were to simplify government by eliminating unnecessary and inactive organizations, to streamline operations by examining the size of boards and their remuneration of members and to ensure that these bodies were geared to meet the challenges of today and the demands of years ahead.

Bill C-49 is the second omnibus bill that has introduced changes resulting from agency review. Last year, this House approved the first bill, Bill C-65, the government organization act No. 1.

Today's bill will improve the accountability and administrative consistency of 30 organizations. It will amend the statutes governing 13 federal boards, agencies and commissions by restructuring or downsizing them. It will wind down 7 organizations that are no longer necessary. It will eliminate 271 governor in council positions. By these measures, Bill C-49 will save taxpayers some \$2.5 million annually.

Agency review was conducted under the leadership of the President of the Treasury Board. His commitment to cost effective and streamlined government is yet another example of what can be accomplished by a government that is determined to serve Canadians efficiently, honourably and compassionately.

Good government means creating jobs and growth, creating opportunities for every Canadians.

The critical part of the jobs and growth agenda is reshaping government so that it is lean, efficient and sensitive. It must respond to the needs of Canadians, helping all of us adapt to global change and an increasingly competitive marketplace.

Government Orders

The bill reflects our commitment as a government. We promised good government to Canadians and we are delivering on that promise.

I appreciate that a 70 page omnibus bill can be somewhat intimidating at first glance. However, the changes it introduces are quite straightforward and involve twelve types of proposals. Perhaps it would be helpful to hon. members if I commented briefly on each kind.

The first three of the twelve types of proposals deal with accountability requirements for governor in council appointees. These involve changes in tenure, designation of chairperson and remedial and disciplinary measures. These follow from the decisions about the accountability in the final report of the agency review released in February last year by the President of the Treasury Board.

The next three types of proposals concern the appointment authority of winding up agencies and restructuring.

• (1640)

The next five are housekeeping items and the last type of proposal deals with other changes for better management of several agencies.

Accountability is being improved, for instance, by changes in the tenure of some governor in council appointments. The changes will allow the government to manage agencies, boards and commissions more effectively. Members are aware that governor in council appointees serve either during good behaviour or during pleasure. Perhaps serving during good behaviour may be removed from office only for cause, while persons serving during pleasure may be removed at the discretion of the governor in council.

In cases where good behaviour appointees are not justified by a need for independence and impartiality, the bill amends tenure to serving during pleasure. This proposal will affect five agencies, including the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety.

I should add that there are transition clauses in the bill so that the changes will not apply to incumbents.

A related change affects the appointment provisions for the chairpersons of several tribunals. Most chairpersons who are serving during good behaviour have the status of members, which is actually the status that warrants the good behaviour tenure.

For consistency, clarity and accountability, the bill modifies the appointment provisions in six agencies so that a person will be appointed a member first and then will be designated chairperson. As a member, he or she will serve during good behaviour; as a chairperson, he or she will serve during pleasure. The agencies include the Copyright Board and the Civil Aviation Tribunal.

Government Orders

This appointment provision already exists in a number of other administrative tribunals such as the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission and the National Parole Board.

Again, there are transition clauses in the bill so that changes will not apply to incumbents.

Another element of accountability arises on the rare occasion when it might be necessary to discipline or remove a member of an administrative tribunal. Statutory provisions for the discipline of good behaviour appointees already exist for appointees on the Immigration and Refugee Board, the National Parole Board and the Veterans Review and Appeal Board.

Bill C-49 brings in standard provisions for these three organizations and other administrative tribunals.

Contrary to some speculation, standardizing these provisions will not make it easier for the government to remove appointees. One of the standard provisions will ensure that the governor in council has the authority to remove good behaviour appointees from office for cause, as is already the case in most statutes.

The expression "during good behaviour" in itself does not clearly authorize the government to remove the office holder whom it has appointed and who appears to have breached that standard. As the law stands now, the government will likely have to seek assistance from a court.

In order to provide the government clear authority to act on its own, some further legislative provision is needed. Therefore when Parliament states that a public office holder serves during good behaviour, the practice has developed to go on to say that the government can remove him or her for cause. This formula is not new. It can be traced back to the 1903 provisions that created the first federal administrative tribunal, the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Viewed in this context, the reference to the governor in council's authority to remove for cause should not be taken to add any new grounds of removal beyond those already included in the concept of good behaviour. Nor does it allow the government to avoid its duty to act fairly in exercising the removal power.

The changes do not prevent an office holder from securing redress in a court if he or she had been wrongfully dismissed.

• (1645)

As the final report of the agency review noted, it is important for the government to have the authority necessary to match its accountability for managing federal bodies. The bill standardizes the appointment provisions of seven organizations so that they are consistent with normal practice. For example, the National Arts Centre Act is being amended so that the governor in council rather

than the board of trustees appoints the director of the centre. This is important because the government is accountable for the performance of the organization.

The provisions of Bill C-49 wind up seven agencies that are no longer necessary. They range from the Petroleum Monitoring Agency with one governor in council position to the Veterans Land Administration with 32. In all, 49 governor in council appointments will be eliminated.

The bill also restructures or downsizes 13 agencies for a further reduction of 222 governor in council appointments. For example, the Canadian Polar Commission will be reduced from 12 to 7 members. The positions of 50 citizenship court judges will be eliminated. Members of the advisory committee of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation will be elected rather than appointed by the governor in council.

Bill C-49 standardizes remuneration provisions to clarify that full time board members of 13 organizations are entitled to be reimbursed for travel expenses only when they are absent from their place of work. It also changes the word "salary" to "remuneration" for 13 agencies to allow consistent interpretation.

The bill standardizes workers' compensation coverage for governor in council appointees in 19 agencies. Currently these appointees are not covered by the Government Employees Compensation Act in case of injury or disease arising out of their employment. Nor are they covered by the Aeronautics Act in case of flight injury or death as a direct result of a flight undertaken in the course of their duties.

To conform with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and to be consistent with the Immigration Act, the bill amends the provisions of acts affecting nine organizations to permit the appointment of permanent residents as well as Canadian citizens. Limits preventing people over a certain age from serving as appointees are removed from these statutes.

The bill eliminates references to the masculine in the English version of some acts, replacing the term such as "chairman" with the gender neutral term in this case "chairperson".

Bill C-49 introduces other changes for the better management of several agencies. For example, the mandate and financial accountability regime of the Canadian Race Relations Foundation will be clarified. Provision will be made for the Immigration and Refugee Board to hear cases with one member panels. The governor in council will no longer be required to approve salaries of senior officials of the National Film Board.

All these changes, major or minor, reflect the commitment to provide Canadians with good government. Bill C-49 makes sensible changes in a reasonable way, which is the hallmark of our approach to renewing the federal government.

Government Orders

The passage of the second omnibus bill is an important step in achieving agency review goals of eliminating over 800 governor in council positions and saving the Canadian taxpayers about \$10 million each and every year. I invite all hon. members to join me in assuring speedy passage of this much needed legislation.

• (1650)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C-49, an act to authorize remedial and disciplinary measures in relation to members of certain administrative tribunals, to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies and to make consequential amendments to other Acts.

This bill was tabled last June 14 by the President of the Treasury Board and would rationalize federal organizations, boards, commissions and advisory bodies. It affects 46 agencies, of which 7 will be dissolved and 39 restructured or modified.

Bill C-49 provides for major changes in the operation of administrative tribunals. These tribunals, which are often less well known than superior courts, nonetheless have a major impact on the daily lives of Canadians and of Quebecers.

These tribunals often hand down more rulings than superior courts. In addition, their rulings often have very important consequences for citizens and for the Canadian government. In fact, there is no longer any doubt about the importance administrative tribunals have acquired in recent years. They are regularly the site of battles between the government and private citizens seeking rulings on the respect of their rights.

There is currently a bill to reform administrative tribunals before the Quebec national assembly. Questions as important as the independence and impartiality of administrative tribunal judges are now being discussed.

This same problem can also be found at the federal level. Bill C-49 could have provided a solution to the fundamental problem of partisan appointments to administrative tribunals. The Liberals would rather stick their heads in the sand.

In an era when the public is so cynical about politicians, the President of the Treasury Board would have shown honourable courage in tackling the question of political appointments to administrative tribunals. Instead, he introduces even more partisan rules, increasing the control of the political arm over administrative tribunals.

Certain provisions in the bill are of particular interest to me. The bill contains a new mechanism for removing from office persons appointed by the Governor in Council to administrative tribunals. Those appointed may, after certain procedures have been followed,

be removed from their duties for just cause, by the governor in council.

The process set out in the Bill can be initiated by the chairperson of the administrative tribunal by asking the minister concerned whether the members of the tribunal in question ought to be subjected to disciplinary or corrective measures. The chairperson must cite one of the following reasons: incapacity, misconduct, failure to properly execute the office, or incompatibility.

After the request is received, the minister may take one or more of the following steps, at his discretion: obtain information himself, refer the matter for mediation, request an inquiry, and/or take no further measures. In the case of an inquiry, the governor in council may appoint a judge of a superior court to conduct the inquiry.

Then, only after a inquiry report has been submitted, can the minister recommend that the member be removed from office or suspended without pay, or impose any other disciplinary measure or any remedial measure.

• (1655)

The Minister's recommendations are totally at his discretion, regardless of the content of the report.

The bill standardizes the appointment of chairpersons of administrative tribunals. All will henceforth be designated rather than appointed. Such a major modification makes the chairperson highly vulnerable to political pressures from the government, which can quite simply designate a new one, any time it sees fit. I shall speak later of the specific situation of the Immigration and Refugee Board, which is, as we know, the most important administrative tribunal in Canada.

These new measures are likely to undermine the credibility of administrative tribunals still further and, particularly, to make them still more dependent upon political power. Without an in-depth reform of appointments to administrative tribunals, measures that seriously hamper the independence and impartiality of these tribunals should not be introduced.

As we all know, the President of the Treasury Board refuses to deal with this important issue, because he does not want to give up the sacrosanct powers of ministers to appoint the members of administrative tribunals. Any reform of or change to administrative tribunals must tackle the arbitrary way in which administrative tribunal judges are appointed and their mandates renewed. Political patronage in a quasi-judicial process should have no place in a modern democracy like ours.

The *Dictionnaire de droit québécois et canadien* defines administrative tribunal as follows: "a generally autonomous and independent body, which the government has empowered to settle disputes between itself and its citizens".

Government Orders

In 1995, the President of the Quebec Bar Association clearly stated in this regard: "The lack of job security may have unexpected psychological impact on the decisions of a person who may be more concerned about pleasing the government than rendering a fair judgment".

Administrative tribunal members may even be reluctant to set legal precedents favouring citizens at the expense of the government.

I would now like to analyze some provisions of this bill which deal with the Immigration and Refugee Board.

On March 2, 1995, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration announced the introduction of a bill aimed at reducing from two to one the membership of the refugee status determination tribunal of the IRB.

The bill amends section 69.1 in the Immigration Act. This provision provides that two members are usually needed to constitute a quorum at hearings on refugee claims. Except in three particular cases, any split decision by a two-member tribunal is deemed to favour the claimant. Consequently, the claimant needs to convince only one member of the validity of his claim to be recognized as a refugee under the Geneva convention.

This bill will modify this system so that all refugee claims can be heard by a one-commissioner tribunal, except in complex cases in which the chair may assign more than one member.

• (1700)

Let us take a historical look at the make-up of this board. In 1985, at the government's request, Rabbi Gunther Plaut tabled a report on refugee status determination in Canada. The basic condition of this new system was that a high quality hearing be held before a decision maker. Three models were suggested, one of which provided for a hearing before a one-member board, except where a negative determination were made, in which case the board would be made up of three members. It also provided for an appeal, where authorized, to the Federal Court.

In the fall of 1985, the Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration reviewed the Plaut report. The committee did not approve any of the three suggested models and decided on a two-member board hearing. In the case of a split decision, the claim would be approved. It would also be possible to appeal a decision before the Federal Court, if the court agreed to hear the appeal.

The committee felt it was desirable for decisions to be made by two persons. Its rationale was the following: the issue of credibility is paramount in processing refugee status claims, as claimants generally cannot present oral or written evidence in support of their claims. That is why it is better to have two persons determine whether or not the claimant is truthful.

The committee also suggested that a divided decision be viewed as a favourable decision, thereby giving the benefit of the doubt to the claimant, which is in keeping with the policy of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, provided of course that the claimant's story is credible.

This can be a controversial issue. For some, particularly refugee advocacy groups, the current system, which requires a favourable decision by one member only, greatly reduces the risk of a bad decision being made. It also appears that a number of members prefer to share the onus of the decision and thus develop a certain collegiality.

With all due respect for these organizations, I believe that a tribunal made up of only one member will cost less, be easier to set up and, more importantly, will allow the IRB to hear a greater number of cases. This, however, is based on the assumption that the board will have more hearing rooms available.

It is to be noted that the delays and the backlog in the processing of IRB files are considerable and in fact unacceptable. It should also be pointed out that no other tribunal in Canada has an initial decision process similar to the IRB's, not even those hearing criminal cases, where the consequences may be very serious for the accused.

A one-person tribunal may have the effect of making the member more responsible. If the member proved to be unable to make decisions alone, he would not deserve to keep his job. In any case, there should be a review process, in case the member makes an erroneous decision.

When the member for York West was the Liberal Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, he was strongly in favour of an internal review system at the IRB. In November 1993, he said he wanted to amend the refugee determination process, so that unfavourable decisions could be appealed within the Board. The former minister even said that the lack of an appeal process was a flaw.

While I agree with the idea of having one instead of two members hearing a claim, I wonder about the qualifications of some members appointed by this government. The Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration, of which I am a vice-chairperson, reviewed several appointments and reappointments.

• (1705)

In many cases, the appointments are exclusively partisan. In fact, there is only one way to become an IRB commissioner, and that is to have worked at some time or other for the Liberal Party of Canada, or to have friends in the party. And the salary is very interesting: \$86,000 and up annually. The length of service to the party also determines the length of the appointment: one year, two years, three years or four years.

Government Orders

I would like to give a few examples of the patronage appointments of this Liberal government. It should be noted that in the 1993 election campaign the Liberals condemned the political patronage of the Conservatives of the time. The Liberal Party of Canada was going to be a strong advocate of honesty and integrity in government if elected, or so it told us.

But now Mr. Interjit Bal has been made an IRB commissioner. His previous experience included working for the Prime Minister during his leadership campaign and for the Liberal Party of Canada during the 1993 election. He was also chair of the ethno-cultural committee of the Liberal Party of Canada. He was forced to admit to the standing committee examining his appointment that he came into Canada illegally. He was therefore obliged to step down from his duties as commissioner.

I will mention other partisan appointments to the IRB. Auguste Choquette, former Liberal member; Raymonde Folco, former Liberal candidate in the riding of Laval East; Patricia Davey, married to an assistant to former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau; Milagos Eustaquoi, former Liberal Party candidate; Janet Susan Rowsell, who worked for the Minister of Justice.

I was an Unemployment Insurance Commission referee from the union movement. During the Conservative reign, I often criticized the partisan appointments handed out by Brian Mulroney. The present government continues to appoint faithful Liberals, often very incompetent ones, to chair arbitration boards. The same situation can be found in the Bank of Canada, the Senate, the Department of Foreign Affairs, the Canadian Pension Commission, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and so on.

It is very important that the initial hearing of a refugee claim be of the utmost quality, as I have said here in the past. The board members must, therefore, be competent and well informed.

On March 3, 1995, in response to accusations of patronage, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration announced the creation of an advisory committee composed of a chairperson and four members. I have, however, been extremely disappointed with the outcome, for the committee continues to appoint incompetent board members. It is a known fact that there has been no improvement over the way things were before, under the Conservatives.

In closing, I would like to invite the Standing Committee on Government Operations to have the part relating to the IRB examined by the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration, since this is a highly technical matter and our committee has something to say on this. There are organizations which want to come and testify before the committee, and the chairperson of the Standing Committee on Government Operations gave us the particular opportunity to contribute our opinion on Bill C-49.

[English]

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my 20 minute time and my question or comment time with the member for Broadview—Greenwood.

I am extremely pleased to speak on a bill that some might otherwise think is of a technical nature and that is perhaps not as stimulating in its subject matter as some others that are vigorously debated on the floor of this place.

This bill is exceptionally important for a couple of reasons. First, it shows that when this government makes a commitment with respect to what it wants to do once given the mantle of power by the Canadian public, that it is prepared, even if it is not the sexiest or the most flamboyant piece of legislation, to put its money where its mouth is. We are prepared to go forward and do what we told Canadians we would do prior to the last election, rationalize the way the federal government acts in all aspects of its responsibilities between the provinces, the municipalities and, more important, between our boards and our agencies and the people of Canada.

● (1710)

When the Liberals ran in the last election we made a number of commitments and the member for St. Albert from the Reform Party wanted to speak about that. He was trying to speak in an off-handed way about the commitments that this party has made in the red book.

We had a departure at the beginning of the campaign last time in 1993. We said that rather than have different people as spokespersons for our party going around the country saying different things to different audiences, we were going to put it in writing. As the Prime Minister said at the time and again the other day, you do not have to read my lips, read my record, read my red book.

In the red book we made certain commitments. The member for St. Albert did not want to hear this today but later this week with the great Liberal Party, the party that has crafted this fabulous country of ours for most of the last 130 years, at the convention this weekend there will be a book that will probably be put forward. It will indicate the successes and the commitments that we have made and we have kept through the red book on behalf of the people of Canada.

When we deal with restructuring government, we have to recognize that over the past number of years, many times when we thought that we had more resources than what we had, it was okay for governments because traditionally they had a program in a particular area to hold it close and not even want to review it to see

Government Orders

whether there was any modern reason for us to continue with those responsibilities or those programs.

We said to the Canadian public, after those disastrous two terms of the Tory government, the previous administration, that we understood that Canadians wanted a parliamentary system, a Parliament, a legislative body, that was modern, that was responsive, that said what it was going to do and then did it. That is exactly what the Liberal Party has proven over the last three years.

We started off by coming in and we looked at program review; things that were not always easy but things that nevertheless had to be done. We were saddled with an enormous debt and deficit and a government out of control when it came to spending the public purse. That was a right wing Conservative party at the time, subsequently replaced by a smattering of Reform Party MPs who sit across here and natter at us from time to time.

What we set about to do was put a plan in place. We wanted to ensure the Canadian public had confidence, that when the Prime Minister, the ministers at the front bench or the Minister of Finance stood in this place and said these are the programs and these are the targets, they did it with credibility, that the Canadian public and the business community would know that when we said we were going to do something we did it.

The Minister of Finance was appointed by the Prime Minister. In successive budgets we have shown ourselves capable not just in articulating the targets and the programs to reach those targets but in surpassing those targets each and every time that we have been put up to the measure of the test of the public of Canada.

Indeed we have had to do some very difficult things. We have had to go about reinventing government. We had to look at what made sense in the modern context and where the federal government should be, where its programs and responsibilities should be. Perhaps it would be better placed either with the private sector or with other levels of government.

We set out in an unprecedented fashion under the minister responsible for government reorganization and government operations. We set about an unprecedented task of program review. During that program review we looked at each and every area of program delivery of the federal government. Where it made sense we said we will keep it, enhance it. Where it made no sense we decided to look to see first if we should be in that business and second if there was another level of government or another participant in society, the private sector, that could do it better.

We had to shrink the federal public service and that was not an easy thing to do. We had to do it in order to put some fiscal sanity

back into the way we conduct our business as a nation. We did some things that were easier to do. We rationalized things.

We saw, for instance, that we had a number of fleets plying the oceans of this great maritime nation. We had a coast guard fleet. Then we had a fisheries and oceans fleet. I am on the harbour in Halifax. In my riding we had a coast guard base with a fleet and we had a fisheries and oceans base with another fleet.

• (1715)

However, through program review we saw what made sense and consolidated both of the fleets together. It made more sense operationally, and being good guardians of the public purse, it is what we told Canadians we would do if we were given a mandate in 1993. We said we would try to put this country back on the road to fiscal sanity.

We have done a number of other things. We looked at the transportation sector. The former minister of transportation, the Minister of National Defence, had a look at that big monster called the Department of Transport and walked in with a critical view. He asked what the Department of Transport did and why do we continue to do it.

At the end of the day it made sense to get rid of the bureaucracy at the air transport sector. It made sense to allow local airport authorities to be established to make the local decisions so that those airports, the wonderful infrastructure that can create real sustainable jobs, was put in the hands of local authorities who would know best how to manage them.

We went even further than that and looked at some of the subsidies that had been in place for far too long in the transportation sector. Where they did not make sense any longer we eliminated them.

The other thing was to deal with Canada's marine policy. There is a bill currently before a House committee dealing in a wholesome and holistic fashion with every aspect of Canada's national marine transportation policy. For example, the port of Halifax has been saddled for years by a heavy bureaucracy that does not allow it to do what it can do best, which is to use its location to its advantage, to be competitive and create jobs. The government is going to unleash that yoke from around its neck. It is going to ensure that places like the port of Halifax, the port of Vancouver and the port of Montreal are able to do what they do best which is to operate under private sector principles. The government is disengaging and disentangling itself from those operations. That is what we told Canadians we would do.

The substance of this bill is important. A lot of boards and agencies are established by the governor in council. Not only do they give advice but in many cases as in the case of a tribunal, hand down major decisions that have a substantial impact on the lives of many Canadians.

Government Orders

Rather than sit back and say that there are 800 or 1,000 appointments that can be made by governor in council and we are going to keep them because they are there, as was the way it was done in the past, in 1994 we set out to do a complete review of these agencies and boards with the same critical eye that we did program review. We found out which ones made sense, which ones we continue to need in the interest of public policy and which ones should we keep or perhaps streamline or downsize so that they are less of a drag on the taxpayers' wallets.

As a result of that, this bill will wind up seven federal organizations. It will restructure or downsize 13 other organizations. Other amendments relating to accountability and some housekeeping measures will affect 34 other organizations. This bill will eliminate over 271 governor in council appointments and will save the Canadian taxpayer over \$10 million annually.

In the broader course of large federal government expenditures this may not seem like a lot but it was a commitment we made in our campaign leading up to the 1993 election. We are a party that is committed to the details of the promises that we give to our electorate. Indeed, we have come through and we now have a more streamlined system of boards, agencies and tribunals than we have ever had before.

My Reform Party friend from St. Albert stood up and started to list by name individuals, good, solid Canadians who have given up their time to serve on public boards, agencies and tribunals to ensure that there is public input and that we do not have governments administering programs in a vacuum. He mocked those individuals on the floor of the House of Commons. He alluded to whether or not they were Liberals.

The hon. member would do his party a far greater service, instead of taking cheap political shots at individuals who have had the good sense to allow their names to stand and to serve on these agencies and boards, if he would concentrate his efforts on looking at the high calibre of individuals that the government has been able to attract and appoint to those agencies and boards for the greatness of Canada to ensure that the public policy of these boards, agencies and tribunals is executed by those of the highest integrity.

● (1720)

In conclusion, I wish the bill speedy passage. I hope that my friends in the official opposition and in the Reform Party finally recognize that sometimes as a government we have to appoint Liberals. After all, 60 per cent of Canadians claim to support our party.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak in the House of Commons this afternoon on this bill.

I would like to begin by acknowledging the work that my colleague from Dartmouth has been doing over the last few months as the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Trade. Most Canadians will realize that our export numbers have never been this high in Canadian history in terms of percentage increases. All too often Canadians do not realize that members, such as the member for Dartmouth, when they are not here sitting in the House of Commons doing their work, are busy working with small, medium and large industries in all regions of the country, assisting them and signing contracts that lead to the export of Canadian goods and services. The member should be celebrated for the work he has been doing on international trade.

When I listened to the President of the Treasury Board speak earlier in the debate today, I could not argue with him when he spoke about the notion that we must have a smaller, modernized government, and that we must make sure that the overall financial objectives are kept in mind when we are going through the whole program review, or as some people have described it, reinventing government.

In principle, I support all of those objectives. I certainly would support the bill today which is tidying up some agencies and reducing orders in council which will make government more efficient.

However, I am concerned that the pathway of reinventing government is going too fast and in many cases is too dramatic. First is the overall objective of trying to reduce the deficit in a rapid fashion. I have a concern that in the process of doing this we will be dismantling aspects of the Government of Canada that we will live to regret in the not too distant future.

The member for Dartmouth talked about the port of Halifax. In my city of Toronto, the port of Toronto is something that not only serves as an agent for industrial building and policy making, but is also a large symbol of the presence of the Government of Canada in the major market of Toronto.

Fortunately, the bill relating to the harbours of Canada has the flexibility that if in certain regions you want to exempt certain harbours and still have them in the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada, then with enough support it can be done. But my concern is the fact that as we cut, dismantle and offload, we will eventually get to a point where the levers that the government needs from time to time to activate industrial policy will be weakened to a point where they will not be effective.

● (1725)

Even though we are on the right pathway, we had better make sure that we do not cut off our nose to spite our face because some of these instruments are going to be very important for us in the future, especially in the whole area of national unity. The presence of the Government of Canada in every province is something that I

Government Orders

personally believe should be maintained in a very vibrant and active way.

There is another thing I want to mention when we are talking about this bill of reinventing or renewing government. I would like to see the government as it goes through its program review take on the challenge of reviewing the work of the Governor of the Bank of Canada. That was a governor in council agency that many years ago was offloaded from the Government of Canada. It is almost an independent body, other than the fact that the Governor of the Bank of Canada is appointed by the governor in council, the Prime Minister. Of course the Governor of the Bank of Canada routinely meets with the Minister of Finance.

For all intents and purposes the Bank of Canada works almost in an independent fashion from this Parliament. I believe as we are going through program review it would be an interesting exercise if we took a look at just how the Bank of Canada operates.

I for one believe that the relationship between the Bank of Canada and the chartered banks of Canada, the financial institutions of Canada, is an area that needs intense scrutiny, intense review. As we move forward on this pathway of deficit and ultimately debt reduction, if we are not careful we are going to have a repeat of what happened from 1987 to 1988 and the first part of 1992 where the governor, John Crow, essentially put a ratchet on inflation to the point where he just broke the confidence of Canadians. He broke the confidence of small and medium sized businessmen and women in this country. He created a factor of fear that essentially tilted the economy. It is very important that this agency of government be put under the microscope of program review by the Government of Canada.

I want to conclude by saying, as the member for Dartmouth said, there are many good men and women who over the years have served these crown corporations, these agencies of government in a very productive way. When the Conservatives are in power it is a normal natural process that they would promote the friends that helped them get their government elected. It is not any different for a Liberal government or a Reform government or whoever it might be that is given the trust of the people.

Obviously you choose the people to put into strategic and sensitive positions who reflect the views that you have been mandated to implement. It would be a pretty silly experience to put somebody in that did not share your views. With the nature of the human being these people might be tempted from time to time to sabotage your policy objectives.

By and large these people have served these agencies well. I do not think anyone in the community or in the country should feel that these reductions in orders in council or the dismantling of these agencies have anything to do with the quality of service that these men and women have provided on behalf of Canadians over the last number of years.

I am happy to conclude on this note. It is very important, as we continue to go through this program review, because we have been going so hard and so fast, that we not dismantle this place to the point where the national government no longer has instruments that allow it to serve, produce, create or provide the type of role that it needs to make sure of the economy and service to the public that this place has to provide from time to time. Do not shut it down to the point where we lose our effectiveness.

• (1730)

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood for raising the perspective of the angle of policy implementation.

I would like him to comment on competence and accountability, particularly in these senior roles. This was not mentioned by the Reform Party. There were the appointments of Perrin Beatty to the CBC and the Right Hon. Kim Campbell as Consul General to Los Angeles. There have been other examples of non-partisan appointments. The competence and the accountability of those people and their track records are certainly very important. I wonder if the hon. member would like to comment on that.

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Mississauga South for his question.

I have a problem with the appointment to the CBC. I do not have a problem with the individual. I have known Perrin Beatty for many years. He has served Parliament and this country well. I am one of his biggest fans. However, I have a problem with the fact that he would be more sympathetic with the general pathway of cuts that we are on with the CBC. For me, as someone who has been a traditional supporter of the CBC, especially in the outlying regions of Canada, I probably would have lobbied to put somebody in charge of the corporation who held a more traditional view of what the CBC is all about.

I applaud Perrin Beatty as an individual. I believe that as someone who would be sensitive, of course, but sympathetic to a reduction in the presence of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the government could not have chosen a better person.

That is the balancing act that it has to go through. I wish my colleague from Mississauga South had not mentioned the CBC. That is an example of the point which I was trying to make in my remarks.

In a major market like Toronto one could argue that there are so many options in terms of private sector radio and television, et cetera, that maybe we could let the private sector do it. However, remember how this country was built. This country was built by ensuring that the outer regions had a shot at the same quality of service, in all sectors of the economy, as the people in major

markets. One area where the CBC has done a terrific job is in the outlying regions.

I do not know how the CBC will be dismantled. However, we must ensure that we do not begin the process of weakening the galvanizing forces which held all regions of the country together.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate on Bill C-49. It has been mentioned that what started out as a kind of dry, stuffy, sterile debate about patronage appointments, administrative tribunals, the shuffling of papers and so on has evolved into a more serious debate about a vision of Canada.

• (1735)

I have been listening to the speeches from across the way. They are right to applaud the reduction in the number of patronage appointments that this bill allows for, the reduction of 271 positions. That is good.

We like that part of this bill. It is a good start on a messy problem. I like that part of the bill as far as it goes. That is good.

As we get talking about these positions and what they represent, it becomes really a statement of what type of country we are looking for. Is it a country, as the hon. member mentioned earlier, that demands a stronger federal government and stronger federal institutions, large tax dollars that go with it, big government programs that must be administered from a central government in order to keep the government together? That is one argument, for example, the argument of the CBC and the patronage appointment that goes with that.

The hon. member mentioned earlier that he did not like the trend that is happening with the CBC. I think it is fair to say it does not seem to be following on Liberal red book promises. I can see there are some dicey problems there for some Liberal members.

Really the vision is the two visions of Canada. One is the way to keep the country together, the way to keep Canadians happy and the way to give Canadians what they deserve from their federal government is that whole package of a billion dollars for the CBC, a billion dollars for Canadian heritage, a billion dollars for ACOA, a billion dollars for WED, a billion dollars here, a billion dollars there. Pretty soon we are talking real change.

The reason the Reform Party has come out with its fresh start vision of Canada—the debate could be entered into here I would hope—is that we are trying to show a different vision of where the country could go.

The Liberal-Tory vision, whether Perrin Beatty or whoever it is—it does not really much matter because I kind of lump them together—is one vision of Canada that is lots of money, big

Government Orders

programs. I could go down the list. The best way to look after children is a national daycare plan, a red book promise to expand and spend more money.

The Reform Party's vision is that is not the best way. The best way is to leave money in the hands of families to make their own child rearing decisions and leave it with them. Give them considerably more resources, increase their personal exemption, increase the tax credit available for raising children and let parents make the decision on how to raise their children.

We have one vision, a Liberal-Tory vision, and a Reform Party vision. On the CBC, we say when the original mandate of the CBC came through it served a very useful purpose. It was basically the only national communications tool. The only way someone could get from Frobisher Bay to Vancouver Island and points in between was through the CBC. That was all there was. It was basically CBC radio to start. Then it expanded.

We say again now is the time to check the vision of the country. We say that CBC radio is still serving a national unifying force. It is not that expensive. It is very well received by Canadians as is something like CBC "Newsworld". It is relatively cheap and provides a service from coast to coast.

We are saying that right now in Canada with telecommunications being what they are, changing over the last 50 years, we are looking at a different vision. We are saying privatize CBC television. Let it do the job that B.C. TV does, that CTV does and CKBU and all the other channels that compete on the multichannel universe and turn a profit.

In other words, all these things start to sift out the different vision of Canada. I have spoken to members of the Liberal caucus about this. They say, for example, that the way to keep Quebec in the fold, a happy member of the federation, is to have a stronger federal government.

That way it would have so much influence in the country, so much buying power, so much spending power, so much influence on programming and so on that Quebecers just cannot leave. Everything from cradle to grave is covered by the federal government. The federal government is in every area of their lives and they have to stay. We are so pervasive.

• (1740)

The Reform Party's argument is that is a lousy way to keep Quebec and the rest of the country together. We should be concentrating on the areas we do well in at the federal level. The leader of the Reform Party mentioned the other day that it boils down to about 10 or 12 areas that the federal government can focus its attention on. They are important areas like the Criminal Code,

Government Orders

regulating interprovincial trade, international trade, financial institutions, national defence, border patrol, customs and so on.

We can focus our energy on what the national government does best and then for Quebecers, British Columbians and others we should say that much of what is left is in their bailiwick. If Quebecers want to promote the French language and culture in their province because it is a wonderful language, a lovely culture and something we all appreciate as Canadians—but Quebecers are naturally most concerned about that—we will not invade that area of spending. We will leave that with Quebecers. It should be theirs. They should spend money on that as they see fit and we will not intrude. We will not muscle in on their political territory. That can be theirs to manage.

We will not be involved in natural resources. That is a good thing for the province of Quebec to maintain, as it is for British Columbia. We will not tell Quebec how to spend money on cultural events. That is Quebec's bailiwick and other provinces will look after their own.

In this kind of a bill, although it is a small thing, we see the two different visions of Canada. We see one vision that there will be 2,225 patronage appointments left after this bill. And who will they be filled by? They will be filled by good loyal Liberals. There is the odd exception. There is the Perrin Beatty exception and so on, but let us face the facts.

The facts are the longer you are a pedigree in the Liberal Party the more likely you are to be appointed to a good position. As the member for Broadview—Greenwood said earlier, that is the way it has always been done. It does not matter whether it is Liberals or Tories, that is just an accepted way. I am not sure how that is supposed to make Quebecers feel more at home.

I do not know what people from the GTA think about this, but how can they possibly think that the way to build national unity, the way to build national cohesiveness is to dole it out to Liberal hacks?

An hon. member: What are friends for?

Mr. Strahl: A member over there asks what are friends for. Can they not see what it is doing to national unity, for example?

Imagine the Liberals saying to members of the Bloc Quebecois that they have 2,225 appointments to make, that some of them are very technical and require a good deal of expertise, but the crowning criteria for getting the job will be one's pedigree, not necessarily as a Quebecer but as a Liberal. When the BQ members go home imagine what they will do with that. They will say here is the list of appointments.

It is in the latest edition of the *Hill Times*, the paper from Parliament Hill, for members' information. I am sure they have

seen it. There is now a Conservative who is tracking all the appointments. She has a list of about 200 names of people who are long time paid up Liberal members. I am sure Bloc members take that newspaper and say here is the latest dollop of appointments.

They rip that page out and back they go to Quebec saying: "This is what your tax dollars are going for. Your tax dollars are going to supply Liberals with jobs". If you were a voter in Quebec—listen up because when you are a voter in British Columbia the reaction is somewhat the same—you would say: "I thought these were appointments based on merit. I thought this person who was appointed was put there because they are the best person for the job".

I thought that someone who runs Canada Post would have extensive experience in the delivery of mail or delivery services. But who is the head of Canada Post but the former minister of foreign affairs. How did he get that job? Did he fill out the meritorious "I am the best qualified for Canada Post"? No, of course not. He just said: "I have a long pedigree of service to the Liberal Party. What I need is a job within the federal civil service based on my pedigree as a Liberal".

• (1745)

Why was there a furore over the appointment of our current Governor General? The Governor General plays a good role in our community. He lends some stability, some long term historic reference and so on. The problem was that the job was given because of his extensive Liberal pedigree: "I have a long, long list of things I have done for the Prime Minister. I raised money for the Prime Minister. I was part of his campaign for the Liberal Party leadership. I was his buddy". His buddy is the one who gets appointed.

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): What is wrong with that?

Mr. Strahl: What is wrong with it is the respect for the institution. Out in British Columbia the most respected lieutenant governor we have ever had was David Lam. David Lam was respected because he did not have a long political pedigree. He was revered in British Columbia because he was exactly what this government does not understand. He was just a servant of the people, not a servant of the party.

If the Liberals followed that example, they would raise the esteem in all of these positions. Instead what they are doing is unfortunately dragging patronage down through the mud and casting that kind of stuff on to a position which should be above patronage. That is what is unfortunate.

It starts at the top. One of the very top patronage appointments is to the Senate. In 1990 the current Prime Minister said that within two years of the election of a Liberal government, the senators would be elected. That is what the current Prime Minister said in

Government Orders

1990. Of course he was in opposition so it was cheap talk I guess. That is what he promised.

Since the election of the Prime Minister there have been 18 to 20 Liberals appointed to the Senate in a row, one after the other. These were based not on their election to the Senate which was promised, based not on their willingness to represent their regional interests, but based totally on their ties to the Liberal Party.

When I went to the PC convention as an observer what did I find? The same thing as I would think I am going to find this weekend at the Liberal convention when I go as an observer. I like to observe this stuff. The chief fundraiser for the PC party is a senator. The chief campaign manager is a senator. The bagmen for the campaign are senators. The regional co-ordinators for the campaign are all senators. What does this mean? Those who have enough friends in the Senate can run their campaign teams on taxpayers' money which is exactly what they are doing. That is the Tories.

It will be interesting to see what is coming up here at the Liberal convention but it will be the same. This has been going on for so long that they know no other way to run a campaign but to appoint somebody who is their chief fundraiser, in this last case, from Quebec.

What does this do for national unity? The Bloc Quebecois look at that appointment and go back home and say to their constituents: "Look at this. This latest appointment is going to cost you several hundred thousand dollars a year. Who do you think it is? A Liberal hack appointed to the Senate". The people ask: "What were his or her qualifications? Is he or she going to represent Quebec?" The Bloc say: "Absolutely not. They represent the Liberal Party of Canada". It is no wonder the people of Quebec get mad. They have had enough of that. It has been going on for over 100 years and enough is enough. It is time to change the system of patronage appointments.

Just to follow up on another quote or two, the Prime Minister in a speech to the House of Commons in 1991 said: "To meet the hopes and dreams of those who live in the west and in the Atlantic, a reformed Senate is essential. It must be a Senate that is elected, effective and equitable". I sat here in the House and listened to the Prime Minister say: "I will put people in the Senate who represent the Liberal Party of Canada". He said that right from his chair, now that he is in power. It is no wonder that people find patronage appointments to be such a cynical display of government power.

• (1750)

The key appointment of them all from the government side is the person in charge of patronage appointments. When I tell people that, they cannot believe there is someone in charge of patronage appointments.

Penny Collette is in charge of patronage appointments. She is a very capable woman. She is probably very capable at everything she does but the job is kind of odious. Her job is to find the over 2,200 patronage appointments that are available. Then she is to scour the country for every single available Liberal she can find to put them in there. That is the job. In other words, it is not to scour the country for the most capable person, it is to scour the country for the most Liberal of the Liberals and put them in a place. That is Penny Collette's job.

I do not know how that is to build confidence in the government or the confidence from regions of the country that are looking to be represented by what they think are democratic means by fair and democratic systems. People find out instead that all the key positions go on people's pedigrees, their heritage, their political ties.

In Jeffrey Simpson's book about patronage he says: "The long march towards responsible government in British North America was largely the story of the elected representatives' struggle to wrest the right to dispense patronage from the British governors". This fight has been going on a long time. It is always the people at the top saying: "We know best and we know who to appoint and we, the benevolent dictators of the day, know what you deserve, you common folk, better than you know yourselves".

At one time every job in the country was a patronage job. Even the local postmaster was a patronage job. Everything was a patronage job because that is the way the system was run. Thankfully we have moved away from that and you can no longer get a job as a postmaster, I do not think or at least I hope not, because of your ties to the Liberal Party. But at the top where the example is being set, thousands of these jobs are still available.

I was in the maritimes during a couple of the byelections. I went door to door in Labrador. There is a separatism movement quite alive and well in Labrador right now. It is not separation from Canada that they want but separation from Newfoundland. They are fed up with the way Mr. Tobin is running things. There is quite a vibrant separatist movement and you try to calm them down and ask them to be part of Canada, to stay here as part of Canada. It is the same story we give the separatists in Quebec. Canada can be fixed. It can be better.

They would say that they would vote for us and some would give money, but they were afraid to put a sign on their lawn because the patronage system is so insidious in some of these towns that if they put a sign up they would go broke.

An hon. member: That is not true.

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, they say this is not true but listen to what happened.

Government Orders

A month ago the member for St. John's West reportedly demanded of the town council of Placentia, Newfoundland that they had to sell their fire trucks as she told them to for \$5,000 or she would make sure that they did not get a \$350,000 ACOA grant. That was in the papers. That was her communication to the people.

In other words, it is all arm's length, it is all done on merit, it is all above board except that this Liberal says that you do as you are told. I am not making this up. It was in the paper. It is all true: "Either do as you are told or we will make sure doggone it you do not get the \$350,000 grant".

Only two councillors showed up for that meeting and the member for St. John's West felt very badly. She reportedly said that there would be serious repercussions for the town and in her position of MP she deserved more courtesy than was shown to her and doggone it, they were in a heap of trouble. Why? Because they were not Liberal bootlickers. They were told to do as they were told, to jump through the hoops—

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood, Lib.): That is disgusting.

Mr. Strahl: It is true. It was in the paper. It is absolutely true: "Either you do this, sell them for this amount, or else. That is the law. Those are the rules".

• (1755)

I heard from across the way that it was necessary that this system continue, that it would not matter. It would be necessary that Mr. Mulroney's example of appointing his wife's hairdresser to the board of the FBDB, that kind of stuff must continue. I do not think so. It was said that the number of appointees while shrinking, it is still necessary to continue. I do not think so.

An ethical standard should be made and the argument has been made here today on two things: a different vision of Canada or it does not have to be this way. This bill is not the answer to fix a patronage system which I think Canadians find offensive.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will begin by saying to the member for Fraser Valley East that I believe in patronage. I have always believed in it and I am not going to change.

The whole notion by the member from the Reform Party is gimmick politics. He was quoting Jeffrey Simpson. Can anyone imagine Jeffrey Simpson writing for the *Toronto Star*?

We have to understand that the member is suggesting to Canadians that when someone is hired in business or the media that there is no sensitivity as to whether or not that person shares the same values, the same vision, the same policy objectives. The notion that when an employer is hiring someone who is anything

other than sensitive to the direction the employer is heading is just crazy. It is like that in life.

This is a beautiful opportunity to talk about issues in a substantive way. In my earlier remarks I tried to engage the member in a debate on the whole notion of a program review of what goes on with the Bank of Canada. Members of the Reform Party are always talking about a billion dollars here and a billion dollars there. There are a few of us who still believe that we should spend this money to hold the country together.

Why not have a debate on who prints the money. What is money? Who is managing it? Who decides how much is printed? Who decides on its distribution? I wish the Reform Party members would get involved in that debate, then we could really have some excitement around here.

The whole notion of patronage is going to go on as long as man is living, as long as we are social beings.

Does the member not think it would be a worthwhile exercise for all members in the House to engage in a total program review on how the Bank of Canada operates and its links to the financial institutions of this country and the way it controls the flow of currency which is so badly needed in the marketplace today? How about that as a way of reforming or reinventing government?

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question. I always feel a little bad for the member that we generally do not have a committee of the whole. I have always enjoyed the member's ability to debate. He scores some good points. If we could get past some of the stifled formalities in the regular debating system, we could actually have a good debate. The system as it is set up does not lend itself to that very well.

Will patronage be around as long as people are social creatures? To a certain degree I agree with the member. There are roles for patronage appointments that the member I think is trying to advocate and which I would agree with. However, he would also agree for example that the privy council is not one of those places. The privy council raises a group of professional government managers that they select early in the process. I hope it is not on their political pedigree. I do not believe it is in any event. They identify them early in the process. They bring them into the privy council and train them. I have talked to the head of the privy council and this is my understanding. The privy council office trains them, they go back out into another department in another role, they come back into the privy council and train some more. They select these people and find the best that they can get, the best in the system and they rise to the top to become deputy ministers, ADMs and so on.

• (1800)

That is as it should be. It is based on merit. It is based on experience. It is based on a professional civil service that bypasses patronage. There is no room in there for patronage. Otherwise we

Government Orders

would get our civil service working at cross purposes to the government and that system just would not work in a democracy.

Where patronage is necessary and where it does make sense is in political roles. I would not ask the member opposite or the government to find a neutral or an NDP member from some place to write the red book. The government needs people who are politically astute in what they believe in to take that and put it on paper or into television commercials and what have you, try to sell it, get their advertising people. Those are all patronage appointments that are necessary because patronage is for the political process.

I do not mind when a minister or member would naturally have a researcher in their department. I certainly have someone who believes in what I believe in. That is the system that has to work. That is for the political realm.

However, to run a department should not be a political role. As Brian Mulroney did, one should not appoint Mila's hairdresser to the board of FBDB.

An hon. member: He made a great contribution there.

Mr. Strahl: He made a great contribution. He appointed his chauffeur to another patronage position and so on. That should not be why one gets the job. One should get the job because of one's qualifications.

These are two separate things. There is patronage, if we want to call it that. I am talking about the political positions that all political parties have to have. There are researchers, there are communicators and so on who need to be political and necessarily partisan. Why would the member think that would extend to the head of Canada Post, the head of the Atomic Energy Commission? Those are technical jobs that should be outside partisanship.

I agree with the member that there could be a really good discussion on the Canada banking system but, goodness gracious, he is a part of the government. During the review of Canadian financial institutions by all means we should study that. Why not? Let us open it up.

The member for Broadview—Greenwood knows that it is not an easy thing to get his members to agree. He could ask the parliamentary secretary who spent about a billion years in and among that feted swamp why he does not encourage that debate here in the House of Commons.

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member's speech was a very partisan speech. The role of the opposition is to deliver blows that would tenderize a turtle and this member has delivered blows that would probably tenderize a can of Spam.

In any event, it is unfortunate that the discussion on the bill has reverted to partisanship. I think he has painted all members of

Parliament with the same brush. I would like to suggest to him that we all get opportunities to refer people who want jobs.

As one member of Parliament I can say I do not endorse anyone who wants to apply for any kind of an appointment for one very simple reason. If I do not know that person personally, if I do not have the credentials down to make a reference I will not make that reference because it will be a reflection on me.

I would like the member at least to acknowledge that the performance and the accountability of those people is the most important thing and that to give references is a risk to all members of Parliament that should not be given.

• (1805)

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I will concede points in a debate. The hon. member makes a good point. Some Liberal members of Parliament are not keen on patronage appointments. For example, when the list is drawn up of who should be appointed to positions in Elections Canada, they do not submit a name. They do not submit the name of their campaign manager or someone they have known for a long time. They say: "I am not going to get into that. That is a neutral position. It should not be partisan".

I share the member's concern. I do not put forward names for enumerators. I do not put forward names for appointments to Elections Canada.

As a matter of fact, when Mr. Kingsley was before the procedure and House affairs committee I asked him a question. We give advice to countries around the world on how to run fair elections. I asked Mr. Kingsley: "When we go to other countries to help them run their election campaigns, for example, do we tell them that the government should appoint all of the returning officers or should it be a neutral process?" His response was: "When we are overseas we do not want the government involved because the government has to be at arm's length from the elections". I thought that was a good idea. If we could follow that in Canada we would be much better off.

Mr. Alex Shepherd (Durham, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for York North.

I listened with interest to the hon. member for Fraser Valley East. The Reform Party has moved this debate along quite a ways today. We started off with the hon. member for St. Albert saying that the 271 governor in council appointments were a poor choice and in fact do not exist. The hon. member for Fraser Valley East said it was a good thing. We can see that there is a great dichotomy within the Reform Party itself.

The member talked about his fresh start campaign. I was shocked to watch this unfold on television the other day. My campaign buttons and material in the last federal election said we were the fresh start team. In fact, everybody was met at the door for the fresh start campaign in 1993. That gives us an idea of what kind of imagination the Reform Party has. It thrashes out old ideas. We

Government Orders

are on the fresh start team. This is the fresh start team on this side of the House.

The member for Fraser Valley East talked about their vision of Canada. There has been debate going back and forth this evening on that subject. The conclusion is the Reform Party would like to lead us into a cheque book government. In other words, up here in Ottawa all we would do is collect money and send cheques to the provinces. That would leave us with some limited responsibilities in international trade, the coast guard and so forth, but not much of a government. That is not a vision, that is a fragmentation of the country. It would lead us into a country of ten separate governments.

I had a discussion late last week with pharmaceutical companies which told me that Canada is very much like the European Union. Drugs must be approved by the federal government and then it takes another three years to have them approved by the provinces. There is a cost to the consumers of Canada. It is one of the reasons drug costs are so high.

Under the Reform Party's administration we would continue to have ten strong decentralized governments, creating ten duplications across the nation. We should be moving in the other direction.

Bill C-49 basically attempts to standardize remedial and disciplinary measures in certain tribunals of Canada and to standardize chairpersons in administration tribunals. It also winds up seven organizations and downsizes another 13 organizations.

The object of the exercise is not to make the government smaller, although that is one of the results of some of our downsizing efforts; the object of the exercise is to do two things, to make government more efficient and to make government more affordable to the taxpayers of Canada.

• (1810)

The taxpayers of Canada are telling us in no uncertain terms that government is too big. It is too big and unresponsive to their needs and concerns.

This bill is a focus on how our government is reacting to the very real concern of the average Canadian. It does reduce certain tribunals but, more important, it begs one question. The question is who are the customers. Are the customers the bureaucracy or the public?

The bottom line is by also dealing with the concept of remedial and disciplinary action, the government is addressing a very real and important issue. People want to see that governments are responsive. They do not want them responsive to bureaucrats but instead to their concerns.

The current issue with tribunals is that it is very difficult to remove people from tribunals for wrongdoing. Indeed, it takes a legal process and it also has to go before the exchequer court of Canada. This bill will make that system a lot easier.

There is nothing worse than having a tribunal with people on it, possibly giving erroneous advice and making erroneous decisions. We want the ability of government to be able to replace those people. It is that issue that this bill is addressing.

That is very important because throughout government people are asking how government is responding to people. There is a great parallel to this, small and medium size businesses.

Small and medium size businesses have had to learn to work smarter. They have had to learn that the customer is very important. We have to satisfy the needs of the customer. To not recognize that is basically not to be in business at all.

Governments in some ways, while not a business, have to act a little more like them. They have to be more responsive to the needs of people. Let me give an example.

In my riding I have Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. When I first got elected I went around visiting all the federal institutions in my riding and those that service my riding to see what they were doing.

I was surprised that a lot of them did not have Canadian flags and we are working to make sure they now have. One organization struck me in particular, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

It had just implemented a total quality management system. This was totally unlike most other parts of government because it required a response time. If somebody phoned, it had to return that call within so many minutes.

If it was an application for a mortgage loan, it had to be answered within a certain timeframe. There were timeframes for everything it did. The people were very rejuvenated about what it was doing. It was very happy and very focused on executing programs that people liked. It recognized that the customer was the general public.

I have been very happy to work with those people in delivering some of their programs to some of the people in my riding. The point I am trying to make is that Bill C-49 addresses that issue. It allows the government through its various boards and directives to replace people if they are not in sync with best interests of people generally.

This gets us back to accountability in government. Generally speaking, people want the government to be accountable to them. They are asking for a more clear, transparent system of government.

Government Orders

Once again, this legislation deals with that issue. Remember that one of the things we are doing here is reducing the cost of government by upwards of \$5 million per year. That may seem like a small amount of money but it is part of the process.

We are doing two things. We are reducing the cost of government and making it more efficient. Just because we are making government smaller does not mean we are making it worse. The bottom line is that we can deliver these programs a lot more efficiently using technological advances that we have before us and at a lower cost.

The services that governments once did can continue at a lower cost and with fewer individuals involved in the process.

• (1815)

I notice from time to time the opposition has said that we have not done anything in terms of cost reduction. Forty-five thousand civil servants have been shed from this process. CN is no longer a federal government owned organization. Some of my colleagues mentioned the CBC. All of these are real things that affect people. People are demanding better service at less cost.

I say to the Reform members and others that we are reducing the cost of government but at the same time making our program delivery more efficient.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to my colleague from Oshawa. He mentioned something that I want to ensure I understood correctly.

He talked about the notion that the pharmaceutical industry felt that the inefficiencies related to getting their drug systems approved were costing it a lot of money, and the fact that it had to go through all these regions was a negative situation.

Is the member promoting a more reinforced Government of Canada national standards for these program approvals? Is that what I understood him to say?

Mr. Shepherd: Mr. Speaker, to be honest with the member, yes it would be.

One of the big problems in this country is duplication and overlap. However it takes two to duplicate so we are talking about provincial and federal jurisdictions.

We have to analyse those areas where the federal government can be more efficient. It makes sense in the area of drug certification that one government, the federal government, should provide that service. I have heard some of my Bloc colleagues talk about how important it is. I do not think the afflictions that affect human beings stop at borders.

The bottom line is that from a national perspective we should set national standards. We have been all too lax at not doing that and letting these things slip away from us. That is part of the reason why this country is slipping away from us as well.

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (York North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, debates like today's debate on Bill C-49 give Canadian viewers an opportunity to really distinguish between the two visions that exist in this House. The vision proposed by the Reform Party sees government and governance in its most evil way. The vision espoused by Liberals is that government and its agencies can be a source of positive change for the good of the collective. It is really important to note that because it makes people understand the difference between the Reform Party and the Liberal Party.

As a member of the greater Toronto Liberal caucus I am quite happy today to see that *Fortune* magazine named the greater Toronto area as the number one international best city for work and family. I am proud of that achievement because in the Toronto area since the 1993 election of the federal Liberal government, there has been greater co-operation between all stakeholders in various communities.

There has been a greater sense of purpose. Government has not been standing in the way of business but rather it has been a full partner in bringing about the type of economic change and increasing the viability of businesses, in helping with productivity.

I have some examples of positive things the government has done. There are programs related to technology partnerships Canada, the Canadian television and cable production fund and the program for export market development, not to mention the work of the Federal Business Development Bank and other government agencies that serve the Canadian public very well.

• (1820)

I would like to return to the Federal Business Development Bank. I remember a couple of years ago when two of my constituents, who were around the ages of 20 and 21, came to my constituency office to ask if they could get some advice on how to run a business and perhaps access some funding so they could start a technology based business.

I am very happy to tell the House that a couple of months ago these constituents came back to my office and expressed a great deal of gratitude for the advice that I was able to provide to them. I was happy to find out they were doing quite well. They are brothers who are now self-employed in the growing technology industry. They told me that this year they will be recording a profit of approximately \$723,000.

Two years ago these two young Canadians, obviously very bright and technologically advanced, were part of the unemployment

Government Orders

statistics of this country. The help came from the Federal Business Development Bank which was able to provide them with the type of capital required.

Let us look at the function of government in that equation. These young people knew that they could approach a member of Parliament who has a constituency office and is there to provide help in connecting young people or his or her constituents to government agencies that are there to help them. This is a perfect example of the positive role the government plays, whether it plays it in a constituency office or through various departments. Nevertheless it speaks to the fact that government can play a positive role in the lives of Canadians.

Therefore, the anti-government and anti-government agency feelings expressed by the Reform Party are based on a very simplistic view of the world, not to mention the fact that I do sense parochialism based on the bottom line. It is not whether these agencies are producing services that are good for people or providing young people or small business people with opportunities. The only thing it wants to do is slash and burn. Once that is done then the Reform Party will be happy.

I cannot remember the exact title of their booklet, but in this booklet the Reform Party has now changed its tune and wants to actually spend more money. The reality is that Canadians have learned through the years of Liberal government that a more balanced approach, a two track approach where we are reducing the deficit, creating jobs and investing in people, is really the route to go.

Nothing makes me more proud than to be part of a government that actually hits the targets it sets. We can look at some of its records and listen to the finance minister's announcement that the federal deficit for 1995-96 was \$28.6 billion. That is \$4.1 billion lower than the \$32.7 billion target for the year.

The reason why I am happy and proud to be part of this government and this caucus is because I remember sitting on the other side of the House when the Conservative government was in power. I remember the then minister of finance, Michael Wilson, never ever hitting a target on the deficit.

• (1825)

The present Minister of Finance has created a great deal of confidence in the economy of Canada. We are hitting the deficit targets. The deficit has been lowered. Inflation is low. Consumer and business confidence is better than it has been for many years. This is the type of role the government has played in the lives of Canadians. It speaks to the fact that when a party such as the Liberal Party comes into power with a plan and sticks to that plan

which was endorsed by the people of Canada, then great results are achieved.

That is why today we are able to stand before Canadians and say that the red book plan is working for them. Unemployment numbers are down. Over 700,000 jobs have been created. We are investing in our young people more than any previous government.

Beside me is the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development who has worked extremely hard to make sure that the priorities of young people are looked after by the government. That is why the Minister of Finance was able to announce an increase in the federal budget by approximately \$350 million toward youth programs, for a total of \$1 billion for youth programs. That does not include the \$2.5 billion or 57 per cent increase for Canada student loans which will allow young people to access education. Since I am talking about our young people, I also want to remind Canadians from coast to coast about the \$165 million invested in education tax credits to further enhance opportunities for young people.

The bill before us today proposes a style of government that is efficient and smaller. But unlike members of the Reform Party who basically think that in order to reach a deficit target you need to slash and burn, we believe there is a better way, a smarter way to bring positive change to the lives of Canadians.

As I conclude my remarks, I want to give some practical examples of how the government has been able to achieve positive ends for people. For example, interest rates have decreased 18 times over the last 17 months. Between January 1995 and October 1996 short term interest rates fell to 4.75 per cent. The prime lending rate charged by Canada's chartered banks has fallen to 5.25 per cent, the lowest rate since 1959. I was not even born in 1959.

As a member of Parliament who was born in 1960, I am happy that happy times are here again and that people can look to the future with optimism and a sense of confidence that speaks to developing a nation that is once again prosperous.

Our achievements are far too many to list in this debate. I can talk about the fact that in my area we have the lowest crime rate ever, thanks to the measures taken by the Minister of Justice under the leadership of the Prime Minister. Businesses are looking to the future with a great deal of optimism because interest rates are low and consumer confidence is high. People are being equipped with the skills required to take on the global economy of the 21st century.

After having heard this morning that the greater Toronto area was the best place in the world in which to live, I can only say it is only matched by the fact that I am a part of perhaps the best government in the history of this country.

Government Orders

[Translation]

BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY ACT

The House resumed from October 10, 1996, consideration of Bill C-5, an act to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and the Income Tax Act, as reported with amendments from a committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It being 6.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of deferred divisions at the report stage of Bill C-5. The first vote will be on Motion No. 1.

Call in the members.

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

(Division No. 136)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bélisle
Brien
de Savoye
Dubé
Fillion
Gauthier
Guimond
Lalonde
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lefebvre
Mercier
Paré
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)

Bachand
Bellehumeur
Dalphond-Guiral
Deshaies
Duceppe
Gagnon (Québec)
Guay
Jacob
Landry
Lebel
Loubier
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Laurent
Venne—32

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bhaduria
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Calder
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Cohen
Copp
Crawford
Cummins
Dhaliwal
Dion
Dromisky
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harb
Harper (Churchill)
Hickey
Hopkins

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Brushett
Caccia
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Culbert
DeVillers
Dingwall
Discepola
Duhamel
Easter
English
Finestone
Flis
Gaffney
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Goodale
Grose
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
Harvard
Hoepfner
Hubbard

Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Jennings
Karygiannis	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney	Manley
Manning	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McKinnon	McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Meredith
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mitchell
Murray	Nault
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Patry	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Proud
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Rock
Scott (Skeena)	Serré
Shepherd	Sheridan
Simmons	Solberg
St. Denis	Strahl
Szabo	Taylor
Telegdi	Thalheimer
Thompson	Torsney
Valeri	Vancief
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Whelan
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)	Williams
Wood	Zed—146

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock	Bélanger
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bertrand	Canuel
Caron	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Collins	Comuzzi
Crête	Cullen
Daviault	Debien
Dumas	Fry
Galloway	Gerrard
Godin	Jordan
Keyes	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	McGuire
Ménard	Minna
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	Pillitteri
Pomerleau	Robichaud
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wells	Young

● (1855)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare Motion No. 1 lost.

[English]

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Speaker, I was a little late for the vote but I would have been voting with the government.

Government Orders

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, Lib.) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Ms. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the House agrees, I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that the members who voted on the immediately preceding motion be recorded as having voted on this motion, with Liberal members voting yes.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: Mr. Speaker, members of the official opposition will vote no.

[*English*]

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will be voting yes unless they have been instructed differently by their constituents.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the NDP will vote no on the concurrence motion at report stage.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I missed the first vote but I want to be counted as voting with the government on this vote.

Mr. Bhaduria: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting for the motion.

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

(Division No. 137)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Adams
Allmand	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bellemare
Bevilacqua	Bhaduria
Blondin-Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Caccia
Calder	Campbell
Cannis	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Copps	Cowling

Crawford	Culbert
Cummins	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dingwall
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Grose
Guarnieri	Hanger
Harb	Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
Harper (Churchill)	Harvard
Hickey	Hoepfner
Hopkins	Hubbard
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Jennings
Karygiannis	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney	Manley
Manning	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McKinnon	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Mifflin
Miliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Patry	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Proud
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Rock
Scott (Skeena)	Serré
Shepherd	Sheridan
Simmons	Solberg
St. Denis	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Thalheimer	Thompson
Torsney	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Whelan	White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)
Williams	Wood
Zed—145	

NAYS

Members

Bachand
Bellehumeur
Brien
de Savoye
Dubé
Fillion
Gauthier
Guimond
Lalonde
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lefebvre
McLaughlin
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Laurent
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock	Bélangier
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bertrand	Canuel
Caron	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Collins	Comuzzi
Crête	Cullen
Daviault	Debien
Dumas	Fry
Galloway	Gerrard
Godin	Jordan
Keys	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	McGuire
Ménard	Minna
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	Pillitteri
Pomerleau	Robichaud
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wells	Young

• (1900)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare the motion carried.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN FOOD INSPECTION AGENCY ACT

The House resumed from October 10, 1996, consideration of the motion that Bill C-60, an act to establish the Canadian food inspection agency and to repeal and amend other acts as a consequence, be referred forthwith to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the motion of Mr. Goodale on Bill C-60.

Mrs. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, if the House agrees I propose that those members who have voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with the Liberal members voting yes.

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: Members of the official opposition will vote no.

[*English*]

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present will be voting no unless there is something I do not know about and their constituents told them otherwise.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the New Democrats vote no on this motion.

Mr. Bhaduria: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting for the motion.

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 138*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Allmand
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bellemare	Bevilacqua
Bhaduria	Blondin-Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Cannis
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Copps
Cowling	Crawford
Culbert	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dingwall
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Grose
Guamieri	Harb
Harper (Churchill)	Harvard
Hickey	Hopkins
Hubbard	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Karygiannis	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Patry	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Proud
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Rock	Serré
Shepherd	Sheridan
Simmons	St. Denis
Szabo	Telegdi
Thalheimer	Torsney
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Whelan
Wood	Zed—130

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Asselin
Bachand	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Blaikie
Brien	Cummins
Dalphond-Guiral	de Savoye
Deshais	Dubé
Duceppe	Fillion
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier
Guay	Guimond
Hanger	Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
Hoeppner	Jacob
Jennings	Lalonde
Landry	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Lefebvre
Loubier	Manning
McLaughlin	Mercier
Meredith	Nunez
Paré	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Ramsay
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
St-Laurent	Strahl
Taylor	Thompson
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Venne
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)	Williams —50

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock	Bélangier
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bertrand	Canuel
Caron	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Collins	Comuzzi
Crête	Cullen
Daviault	Debien
Dumas	Fry
Galloway	Gerrard
Godin	Jordan
Keys	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	McGuire
Ménard	Minna
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	Pillitteri
Pomerleau	Robichaud
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wells	Young

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare the motion carried. Consequently, this bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food.

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

* * *

[English]

OCEANS ACT

The House resumed from October 10 consideration of the motion that Bill C-26, an act respecting the oceans of Canada, be now read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at the third reading stage of Bill C-26, an act respecting the oceans of Canada.

Ms. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, if the House agrees, I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that those members who have voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on this motion with the Liberal members voting yes.

[Translation]

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: Members of the official opposition will vote no.

[English]

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party members present will be voting no unless instructed otherwise by their constituents.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats vote yes on this motion.

Mr. Bhaduria: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting for the motion.

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

(Division No. 139)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Allmand
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bellemare	Bevilacqua
Bhaduria	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Caccia
Calder	Campbell
Cannis	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Copps	Cowling
Crawford	Culbert
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Duhamel	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harper (Churchill)
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Karygiannis
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln	Loney
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick

Government Orders

McKinnon
 McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
 McWhinney
 Milliken
 Mitchell
 Murray
 O'Reilly
 Patry
 Peters
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Essex—Kent)
 Reed
 Richardson
 Rock
 Shepherd
 Simmons
 Szabo
 Telegdi
 Torsney
 Vanclief
 Walker
 Whelan
 Zed —133

McLaughlin
 McTeague
 Mifflin
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
 Murphy
 Nault
 Pagtakhan
 Peric
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Proud
 Regan
 Rideout
 Serré
 Sheridan
 St. Denis
 Taylor
 Thalheimer
 Valeri
 Volpe
 Wappel
 Wood

● (1905)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare the motion carried.
 (Bill read the third time and passed.)

* * *

[*Translation*]

MANGANESE-BASED FUEL ADDITIVES ACT

The House resumed from October 11, 1996, consideration of the motion that Bill C-29, an act to regulate interprovincial trade in and the importation for commercial purposes of certain manganese-based substances, be read the third time and passed; and of the amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the amendment of the hon. member for Laurentides, at the third reading stage of Bill C-29.

[*English*]

Ms. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think if you would seek it, you would find unanimous consent that the vote just taken on the motion be applied to the vote now before the House in reverse.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: Members of the official opposition will be delighted to vote yes, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we accept the deputy whip's motion.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what to say now but the New Democrats vote no on this motion in any event.

Mr. Bhaduria: I will be voting against this motion, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order. I wonder if I could have the attention of members. I need some clarification on behalf of the Reform Party. I wonder if the member for Fraser Valley East and the Reform Party whip would simply indicate to us would that be a yea or a nay.

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we were applying the previous motion in reverse which means that the Reform Party's position was yea.

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 140*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
 Bachand
 Bellehumeur
 Cummins
 de Savoye
 Dubé

Asselin
 Bélisle
 Brien
 Dalphond-Guiral
 Deshaies
 Duceppe

NAYS

Members

Abbott
 Bachand
 Bellehumeur
 Cummins
 de Savoye
 Dubé
 Fillion
 Gauthier
 Guimond
 Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
 Jacob
 Lalonde
 Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
 Lefebvre
 Manning
 Meredith
 Paré
 Plamondon
 Rocheleau
 Scott (Skeena)
 St-Laurent
 Thompson
 Venne
 Williams —47

Asselin
 Bélisle
 Brien
 Dalphond-Guiral
 Deshaies
 Duceppe
 Gagnon (Québec)
 Guay
 Hanger
 Hoepfner
 Jennings
 Landry
 Lebel
 Loubier
 Mercier
 Nunez
 Picard (Drummond)
 Ramsay
 Sauvageau
 Solberg
 Strahl
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
 White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock
 Bergeron
 Bertrand
 Caron
 Collins
 Crête
 Daviault
 Dumas
 Gallaway
 Godin
 Keyes
 Lastewka
 Leblanc (Longueuil)
 Leroux (Shefford)
 Ménard
 O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
 Pomerleau
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
 Wells

Bélanger
 Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
 Canuel
 Chrétien (Frontenac)
 Comuzzi
 Cullen
 Debien
 Fry
 Gerrard
 Jordan
 Langlois
 Laurin
 Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
 McGuire
 Minna
 Pillitteri
 Robichaud
 Tremblay (Rosemont)
 Young

Government Orders

Fillion	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)	Hoepfner
Jacob	Jennings
Lalonde	Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Lefebvre	Loubier
Manning	Mercier
Meredith	Nunez
Paré	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Ramsay
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
St-Laurent	Strahl
Thompson	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne	White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)
Williams —47	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Allmand
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)	Baker
Bakopoulos	Barnes
Beaumur	Bélair
Bellemare	Bevilacqua
Bhaduria	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Caccia
Calder	Campbell
Cannis	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Copps	Cowling
Crawford	Culbert
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Duhamel	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harper (Churchill)
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Karygiannis
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln	Loney
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McKinnon	McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Patry	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Proud
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Rock	Serré
Shepherd	Sheridan

Simmons
Szabo
Telegdi
Torsney
Vanclief
Walker
Whelan
Zed —133

St. Denis
Taylor
Thalheimer
Valeri
Volpe
Wappel
Wood

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock	Bélanger
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bertrand	Canuel
Caron	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Collins	Comuzzi
Crête	Cullen
Daviault	Debien
Dumas	Fry
Galloway	Gerrard
Godin	Jordan
Keyes	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	McGuire
Ménard	Minna
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	Pillitteri
Pomerleau	Robichaud
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wells	Young

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare the motion negatived.

* * *

NUNAVUT WATERS ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-51, an act respecting the water resources of Nunavut, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-51, an act respecting the water resources of Nunavut.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, if the House agrees I propose that those members who have voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with the Liberal members voting yes.

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: Mr. Speaker, the official opposition will vote yes.

[*English*]

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present will be voting no, unless instructed otherwise by their constituents.

Mr. Blaikie: The New Democrats vote yes on this motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bhaduria: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting for the motion.

Ms. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe the Minister of Health is no longer in his seat and therefore is not eligible to vote on this motion.

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

(Division No. 141)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Allmand
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Bachand	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélsisle	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bevilacqua
Bhaduria	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brien	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Cannis
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Copps
Cowling	Crawford
Culbert	Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye	Deshaies
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Dubé
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Fillion
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harper (Churchill)
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Jacob
Karygiannis	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lalonde	Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lefebvre
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McKinnon
McLaughlin	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mercier	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
Nunez	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paré
Patry	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Plamondon	Proud

Reed
Richardson
Rocheleau
Sauvageau
Shepherd
Simmons
St. Denis
Taylor
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
Wood

Regan
Rideout
Rock
Serré
Sheridan
St-Laurent
Szabo
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Venne
Walker
Whelan
Zed—164

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Cummins
Hanger	Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
Hoepfner	Jennings
Manning	Meredith
Ramsay	Scott (Skeena)
Solberg	Strahl
Thompson	White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)
Williams —15	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock	Bélanger
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bertrand	Canuel
Caron	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Collins	Comuzzi
Crête	Cullen
Daviault	Debien
Dumas	Fry
Galloway	Gerrard
Godin	Jordan
Keyes	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	McGuire
Ménard	Minna
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	Pillitteri
Pomerleau	Robichaud
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wells	Young

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare the motion carried.

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It being 7.10 p.m., the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24.

(The House adjourned at 7.10 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Monday, October 21, 1996

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

An Act to Revoke the Conviction of Louis David Riel

Bill C-297. Motion for second reading	5447
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	5447
Mr. Duhamel	5450
Mr. Kirkby	5451
Mr. de Savoye	5453
Mr. Harper (Calgary West)	5454
Mr. Marchand	5455

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Yukon Quartz Mining Act

Bill C-6. Consideration resumed of motion for third reading	5456
Mr. Stinson	5456
Ms. McLaughlin	5459
Mr. Caccia	5461
Ms. McLaughlin	5463
(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.) ...	5464

Nunavut Waters Act

Bill C-51. Motion for second reading	5464
Mrs. Robillard	5464
Mr. Patry	5464
Mr. Bachand	5466
Mr. Abbott	5471

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

National AIDS Strategy

Mr. Flis	5472
----------------	------

The Travels of Alain Bourbeau and Jean-Philippe Bourgeois

Mrs. Picard	5472
-------------------	------

Reform Party of Canada

Mr. Hoepfner	5472
--------------------	------

Youth Internship

Mr. Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	5473
--	------

Small Business

Ms. Torsney	5473
-------------------	------

Women's History Month

Ms. Guarnieri	5473
---------------------	------

The Congrès International Francophone sur le PME

Mr. Rocheleau	5473
---------------------	------

Lighthouses

Mrs. Jennings	5474
---------------------	------

Women's History Month

Ms. Beaumier	5474
--------------------	------

Toronto

Mr. Bevilacqua	5474
----------------------	------

East Timor

Mr. Allmand	5474
-------------------	------

Justice

Mr. Thompson	5475
--------------------	------

Job Creation in Quebec

Mr. Discepolo	5475
---------------------	------

Jennifer Hale

Mr. O'Reilly	5475
--------------------	------

Poverty

Mr. Nunez	5475
-----------------	------

Liberal Government

Mr. Strahl	5475
------------------	------

Presence in Gallery

The Speaker	5476
-------------------	------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Poverty

Mr. Gauthier	5476
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	5476
Mr. Gauthier	5476
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	5476
Mr. Gauthier	5476
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	5477

Unemployment Insurance

Mrs. Lalonde	5477
Mr. Pettigrew	5477
Mrs. Lalonde	5477
Mr. Pettigrew	5477

Employment

Mr. Solberg	5477
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	5478
Mr. Solberg	5478
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	5478
Mr. Solberg	5478
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	5478

Communications

Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	5478
Ms. Copps	5478
Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	5478
Ms. Copps	5479

Employment Insurance

Mr. Silye	5479
Mr. Pettigrew	5479
Mr. Silye	5479
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	5479

Official Languages

Mr. Marchand	5479
Ms. Copps	5479
Mr. Marchand	5479
Ms. Copps	5480

Taxation

Mr. Grubel	5480
------------------	------

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	5480
Mr. Grubel	5480
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	5480
Canada–Israel Free Trade Agreement	
Mr. Sauvageau	5480
Mr. Eggleton	5481
Mr. Sauvageau	5481
Mr. Eggleton	5481
Status of Women	
Ms. Phinney	5481
Ms. Fry	5481
Ethics	
Mr. Strahl	5481
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	5481
Mr. Strahl	5482
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	5482
Asbestos	
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac)	5482
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	5482
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac)	5482
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	5482
Canadian Heritage	
Mr. Abbott	5482
Ms. Copps	5482
Mr. Abbott	5483
Ms. Copps	5483
Endangered Species	
Mr. Adams	5483
Mr. Marchi	5483
Land Claims Agreements	
Ms. McLaughlin	5483
Mr. Irwin	5483
Presence in the Gallery	
The Speaker	5483
House of Commons	
The Speaker	5484
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS	
Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Zed	5484
Committees of the House	
Agriculture and Agri–Food	
Mr. Vanclief	5484
Canada Elections Act	
Bill C–63. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	5484
Mr. Gray	5484
Petitions	
Taxation	
Mr. Szabo	5484
Labelling of Alcoholic Beverages	
Mr. Szabo	5484
Justice	
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	5484
Profits from Crime	
Mr. Finlay	5485

The Senate	
Mrs. Picard	5485
Profits from Crime	
Mr. Calder	5485
Impaired Driving	
Mr. Calder	5485
Land Mines	
Mr. Calder	5485
National Unity	
Mr. O'Reilly	5485
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Zed	5485
Questions Passed as Orders for Returns	
Mr. Zed	5485
Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Mr. Zed	5486
Motion for concurrence in 38th report	5486
(Motion agreed to.)	5486

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Nunavut Waters Act	
Bill C–51. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading	5486
Mr. Abbott	5486
Division on motion deferred	5487
Administrative Tribunals (Remedial and Disciplinary Measures) Act	
Bill C–49. Motion for second reading	5487
Mr. Massé	5487
Mr. Bélisle	5490
Motion	5492
Mr. Williams	5492
Mr. Jackson	5497
Mr. Nunez	5499
Mr. MacDonald	5501
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	5503
Mr. Szabo	5504
Mr. Strahl	5505
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	5508
Mr. Szabo	5509
Mr. Shepherd	5509
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	5511
Mr. Bevilacqua	5511
Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act	
Bill C–5. Consideration resumed of report stage	5513
Motion negatived on division: Yeas, 32; Nays, 146	5513
Motion for concurrence	5514
Mr. Manley	5514
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 145; Nays, 35	5514
Canadian Food Inspection Agency Act	
Bill C–60. Consideration resumed of motion	5515
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 130; Nays, 50	5515
(Motion agreed to and bill referred to a committee.)	5516
Oceans Act	
Bill C–26. Consideration resumed of motion for third reading	5516
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 133; Nays, 47	5516

(Bill read the third time and passed.)	5517
Manganese-Based Fuel Additives Act	
Bill C-29. Consideration resumed of third reading	5517
Amendment negatived on division: Yeas, 47;	
Nays, 133	5517

Nunavut Waters Act

Bill C-51. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading	5518
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 164; Nays, 15	5519
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee.) ..	5519

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

8801320

Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canada Communication Group — Publishing

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Groupe Communication Canada — Édition

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :
<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>**

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from the Canada Communication Group — Publishing, Public Works and Government Services Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, at \$1.75 per copy or \$286 per year.

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant au Groupe Communication Canada — Édition, Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada,
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, à 1.75 \$ l'exemplaire ou 286 \$ par année.**