



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 134 • NUMBER 052 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, May 29, 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

Wednesday, May 29, 1996

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

The Speaker: As is our practice on Wednesdays, we will now sing O Canada, which will be led by the hon. member for Durham.

[*Editor's Note: Whereupon members sang the national anthem.*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

INDIAN ELECTION

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I call upon all Canadians to recognize and congratulate the 900 million people of India for completing what is the largest democratic voting exercise in the history of our world.

As a Canadian MP I want to restate the support of Canadians for the growth and evolution of the democratic electoral process in all countries. We believe that this is the best way to develop our political futures.

During the Indian election campaign there were some terrorist incidents but the people have prevailed. I condemn those who would offer us bombs and bullets instead of voting ballots and those responsible for the murders and maiming that occurred in India.

Of particular interest is the upcoming final balloting day in Kashmir where there remain many difficult issues to be resolved by the people of Kashmir. I encourage Kashmiris to reject violence and adopt the electoral process as the means of achieving their collective goals. Their future cannot be left exclusively to the forces that use violence.

* * *

PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we seem to spend a lot of time in this House arguing and disagreeing about legislation. Later on today I will be introducing a

bill to strengthen property rights in federal law. Debate on this bill should find more agreement than disagreement between Liberals and Reformers.

Property rights is an issue which transcends partisan politics. Property rights were first protected in Canada by John Diefenbaker with the passage of the Canadian bill of rights. Both Pierre Elliott Trudeau and our current Prime Minister argued forcefully without success to have property rights included in the charter of rights and freedoms. As it now stands there is very little protection of a person's right to own, use and enjoy property.

My bill strengthens property rights in the Canadian bill of rights and therefore only applies to the activities and laws passed by the federal government. My bill does not intrude into areas of provincial jurisdiction and avoids the concerns raised by some provinces and interest groups that argued against including property rights in the charter of rights and freedoms.

This bill should unite us rather than divide us when it comes before the House for debate.

* * *

[*Translation*]

OLD AGE SECURITY PENSION

Mr. Gilles Bernier (Beauce, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, the reform proposed in the federal budget relating to the old age pension has upset the plans of those who have been saving for years for their retirement.

As well, some of the provincial governments are not being too kind to their seniors. The ones feeling the effects are not the rich but the middle class, who are finding the substantial sum of \$1,000 to \$5,000 lopped off their incomes, a considerable blow to their standard of living. The ones who will pay for this reform are not the privileged members of society, but the people who have planned ahead for their retirement.

Can the government make adjustments so as to encourage people to save, rather than discouraging them? Couples who have made preparations for retirement, who have put money aside, particularly in RRSPs, instead of spending it, would lose their pension, while others with the same income would not.

I do, however, approve of the more well off not receiving the pension anymore, since they have to pay back what they have received when they file their income tax return.

S. O. 31

AIRCANADA

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on May 24, Air Canada announced that it would be opening up a new reservations centre in Saint John, New Brunswick, by this fall.

This centre would employ some 650 people processing toll free calls from anywhere in Canada. Montreal will then gradually phase out its reservations centre except for local callers. The FTQ estimates that this might mean the loss of about 600 Quebec jobs.

Having pressured ADM for the transfer of international flights to Dorval from Mirabel, Air Canada is now preparing to move its services out of Quebec. One might ask serious questions about the intentions of this air carrier. After the railway sector, is it now the turn of the airline sector to move lots of jobs out of Quebec?

Quebec is being attacked on all sides: first by the railway industry, then by the marine industry, now by the airlines.

* * *

[English]

DR. JAKE O'CONNOR

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with the colleagues of Dr. Jake O'Connor of Dartmouth who have bestowed on him the highest award of the Canadian College of Family Physicians by naming him family physician of the year for 1996.

• (1405)

Dr. O'Connor has been practising family medicine since 1972. He is one of the few physicians, in Dartmouth at least, who still find the time to do home visits for some elderly patients.

In addition to his family practice, Dr. O'Connor teaches a course in family medicine at Dalhousie University's medical school as well as being the chief of staff at the Dartmouth General Hospital.

I speak from experience in saying that Jake O'Connor is a physician par excellence since he is my family physician and indeed delivered my son Matthew to a proud mom and dad only a few short years ago.

Congratulations, Doc, on this appropriate recognition of your commitment to family medicine and the people of your community. Your colleagues have finally recognized what your patients have always known, you are one heck of a great doctor.

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL KITE FESTIVAL

Mr. Raymond Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, from June 6 to June 9, the city of Verdun will host its fourth international kite festival. Over 15 countries will be represented.

This festival, which won the Montreal small tourism enterprise award and draws more than 150,000 people, is the pride of all the people of Verdun, in my riding.

I invite all of you to come with your families to this international kite festival, which will be held in my beautiful riding of Verdun—Saint-Paul from June 6 to June 9. We promise you some good weather and a memorable show.

* * *

[English]

FUNDY GYPSUM COMPANY

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to congratulate the Fundy Gypsum Company located in my riding of Annapolis Valley—Hants.

In April of this year Fundy Gypsum received the John T. Ryan regional safety trophy for select mines in eastern Canada. This award is in recognition of Fundy Gypsum's remarkable low injury rate.

What makes this achievement even more appealing and impressive is the fact that this is the third year in a row that Fundy Gypsum has received this trophy. The commitment to safety and efficiency shown at Fundy Gypsum is a model for businesses across Canada.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the plant manager, Terry Davis, and all the employees at Fundy Gypsum for their commitment to excellence in workplace safety.

* * *

[Translation]

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for two people in my riding of Chambly, Félix Patenaude and Marie-Pier Parent, the daughter of Renée and Pierre Parent, Director of Park Canada, Montreal District, life came to an abrupt stop on May 27 in Lake Louise, Alberta, when a drunk driver brutally shattered their dreams.

That long-awaited trip, a graduation present planned as a journey of discovery, will always remind their loved ones of a dream that went unfulfilled.

Once again, death and alcohol, which often go together in such circumstances, struck indiscriminately.

Because their memory will live longer than the screeching of tires, the shattering of glass and the clash of metal, it is important to tighten criminal laws so as to reduce as much as possible the number of regrettable accidents like the one that killed these young people, who had their whole lives ahead of them.

On behalf of all my colleagues in this House, I wish to express my heartfelt condolences to the grieving families.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Canada is a great country because of the freedom every citizen enjoys. Yet while we believe and make that statement, some do not enjoy a highly prized Canadian freedom, that is the freedom to work, to produce goods and to sell those goods in a free open market.

Canadian grain farmers are forbidden their maximum benefit because they must market through a government appointed, producer ignoring board. No western grain farmer can freely choose where, when and how their product will be sold nor choose who will buy their product.

Western grain producers want the same freedom and privilege as others, an end to discrimination and control of their own destiny, not their destiny controlled by dictatorial government appointed hacks.

This Liberal government makes criminals of grain farmers who want the right to market their product as freely as other Canadians.

I call on the minister of agriculture to allow farmers to opt out of the wheat board if they so choose and to allow them the freedom to escape government appointed dictatorship.

I speak of freedom for all Canadians. Freedom. Freedom for all.

* * *

• (1410)

CANADIAN WAR MUSEUM

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, many Canadians were shocked to learn that the government had terminated the Canadian War Museum's contract with the Canadian Corps of Commissionaires, of which one-third are Canadian war vets. These war vets did not just provide security services, they acted as tour guides. What better tour guides to have in a war museum than ones who actually served in war?

If the government wishes to save \$100,000, then all it has to do is drop one of its patronage appointments off the veterans appeal board where they earn \$85,000 plus expenses to sit three days a week.

S. O. 31

I think 72-year old veteran and former war museum commissioner Mabel Ralph said it best when she said: "It's a slap in the face to all veterans—They made such a to-do about us when they were commemorating the 50th anniversary. Now it's a different story".

I urge the government to reconsider this decision and reinstate the vets.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this year Environment Week is being celebrated from June 1 to 9. Next week is our chance to reflect on our successes and renew our commitment to a healthy environment.

I would like to take this opportunity to applaud the work of the Cumberland County River Enhancement Association which began in 1987. Its mission is to protect and enhance the aquatic systems as well as to raise community awareness of the value of inland waterways.

The Maccan River will be the focus of a new project including tree planting, erosion controls and river clean-up. Currently all along Nova Scotia's vast coastline, natural marshlands are being used in the purification of waste water.

Nova Scotians recognize the value of their environment. They are committed to protecting it, making the province of Nova Scotia a wonderful place to live.

* * *

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is becoming clearer by the minute that, like bookends, the Reform Party and the Bloc Quebecois are seeing eye to eye on the subject of official languages.

They both want to see Canada's Official Languages Act disappear so that Canada can then be redesigned on a linguistic basis by confining francophones to Quebec and scattering anglophones among the other provinces, which leaves francophones outside Quebec completely out of the picture. This linguistically segregated Canada advocated by the Reform Party and the Bloc Quebecois is not the kind of country we want to live in.

As a Franco-Ontarian MP, let me tell you that we will not let our country be broken up just to satisfy the territorial ambitions of a few extremists. Whether the Reform Party and the Bloc Quebecois like it or not, we are proud to have French and English as the official languages of Canada.

Oral Questions

[English]

CHINOOK SALMON

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, extraordinary conditions created in 1992-94 by El Nino's warm water currents and by the movement north of hundreds of millions of mackerel that devour young chinook salmon have brought a crisis for west coast sports fishers who contribute \$740 million a year to the B.C. economy and up to 6,000 full time jobs.

A more than 90 per cent loss of production of chinook has necessitated stringent conservation measures for the 1996 season with time and area based bans on chinook fishing on the west coast of Vancouver Island and in the Queen Charlottes. With the co-operation of the sports fishers, this vital B.C. resource can be preserved and restored.

The state of Alaska, where 37 per cent of the mortality in chinook stocks occurs, should try to be a good neighbour and live up to the letter and spirit of the 1985 Canada-U.S. Pacific Salmon Treaty.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN PARLIAMENTARY SYSTEM

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon, the Speaker of the Senate and yourself unveiled plaques commemorating the history of Canadian parliamentary service. These plaques will remind tourists of the names of parliamentarians who served their country with dedication and earnestness.

The official opposition takes pride in sharing this historic moment with our colleagues, past and present. While we are sovereignists, we nevertheless recognize the intrinsic value of the British parliamentary system and its underlying traditions and principles.

I compliment the Speaker on his initiative, which shows how much regard he has for these men and women who have helped shape the Canadian Parliament's history and democratic tradition, regardless of their origins, social condition or political views. Rest assured that, after achieving sovereignty, we will draw inspiration from this model.

* * *

[English]

PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome all of the former senators and members of Parliament who have gathered here in Ottawa today to commemorate the

history of parliamentary service in Canada. It is a history they should be proud of and I am very sure they are.

• (1415)

At times public service can be very difficult, trying and seemingly a thankless task. I am sure every member who has served in this House has, in a moment of frustration, questioned whether they were really making a difference. My message is simple: Your efforts not only made a difference, they made a great difference for us here in Canada. Just look at what we have accomplished.

In 129 short years we have grown from a mere colony to a country that is the envy of the world. We have built a free, democratic and tolerant society where we dream big dreams and then live them. We occupy a proud place in the family of nations. Much of that credit goes to these many men and women who are here today.

On behalf of my colleagues and the Reform Party of Canada, I would like to join in paying tribute to all the men and women who have served in the Parliament of Canada since Confederation. Thank you very much.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[Translation]

MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Prime Minister attempted to make light of the discriminatory and unacceptable remarks made by his Minister of Human Resources Development.

In the light of very strong reaction by all political commentators and by organizations like the Canadian Jewish Congress, for example, who reacted strongly to the minister's remarks, and now that he has had the time to reread what his minister said, will the Prime Minister dissociate himself from his minister's remarks—yes, or no? We await a reply.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to what I said yesterday.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, by refusing to condemn his minister, as is his duty and as all Canadians consider he ought, does the Prime Minister realize that his entire government is associated with the unacceptable and discriminatory remarks of the Minister of Human Resources Development?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when I see members of the Bloc Québécois getting upset over words considered unacceptable, I hope they in turn will ask their mother house to apologize for having said a few weeks ago that Canada was a prison. The ultimate proof that Canada is not a prison

Oral Questions

lies in the fact that a member who came here as an immigrant and a refugee can support their party in Canada. This is a far cry from a prison, it is freedom at its finest.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, you will understand I am surprised to find the Prime Minister indignant over the opposition's distress when a new Canadian member is told to go and find another country.

The opposition's indignation, I remind the Prime Minister, is echoed unanimously by all commentators in Quebec and throughout Canada.

The very day of a momentous event in the history of Canada's Parliament and with this morning's praise of the quality of democracy and the freedom of expression in Canada, how can the Prime Minister let one of his ministers tarnish, by his unspeakable remarks, the image of all those who sit or have sat in this Parliament?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if we had to ask the members of the Bloc Québécois and of the Parti Québécois in Quebec City to apologize each time they want to tarnish Canada's reputation, perhaps they could ask Minister Landry to withdraw his description of Canada as being "more authoritarian, intolerant and close-minded than the former totalitarian communist governments".

We need no lessons from anyone. The member is entitled to work for the separatist party; we have nothing against that. He is entitled. The minister said he does not agree with what the member is doing. Disagreement is permitted in this House.

• (1420)

He exercised the right to speak. The member expresses his point of view. Another member of this House, an Acadian, who belongs to a minority that stands to lose a lot if Quebec ever separates, is entitled to express a point of view different from that of the member who spoke before him.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, does the Prime Minister realize that, by accepting and even supporting the comments of his minister, he is sending immigrants and Canadians by adoption a message unworthy of this Parliament?

Does the Prime Minister realize that he is telling these men and women that they do not have the same rights as other Canadians, that freedom of political expression does not exist for them, unless they happen to think like him and his minister?

[*English*]

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, freedom of expression exists in this House. I could make a list of completely unacceptable statements that attack the fundamental values of this nation which have been made by members on the other side day after day.

For a member who is an Acadian to get up and tell another member that he is a refugee who is trying to destroy the country which gave him the freedom that he did not have in the country he is from is acceptable in a democracy. Mr. Speaker, you felt it was part of fair debate. A member of Parliament has the right to be a separatist, but we have the right to combat the separatists in Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister feels that some comments made by Bloc Québécois members are unacceptable, it is his duty to condemn them. Let him do it and let him do it when it is appropriate to do so.

When the Prime Minister heard the comments made by members of the Reform Party, he took exception, but the Reform Party leader did take action. The Prime Minister is right when he says federalists can oppose separatists, but not at any price, not at the expense of dignity and democracy.

I call on the Prime Minister's common sense. Will he demand his minister's resignation, or will he support the unsupportable?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if I were to ask for the resignation of all those in this House who support the unsupportable, there would not be one Bloc Québécois member left.

* * *

[*English*]

MINISTER OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it has been well documented that the defence minister gave his campaign pals over \$150,000 in questionable public contracts out of his ministerial budget. Stephanos Karabekos, one of his campaigners, received \$100,000 to help soothe feelings in the Greek community in the minister's Don Valley East riding.

Instead of coming clean with Canadians, the minister and the Prime Minister have chosen to defend this patronage saying that it was really good value for the money. It was good value for his money, but the Canadian taxpayers are paying the bill.

How can the defence minister justify doling out thousands of dollars in public contracts specifically and explicitly to his former campaign workers?

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad at my first opportunity to be back in the country to deal with these very troubling issues which have reflected on my reputation.

Yesterday the President of the Treasury Board outlined the general response to this question. As members of the House of

Oral Questions

Commons we have budgets to hire staff. We hire them either as full time employees or for project work. That goes for the members of the Reform Party as well as other parties. Similarly ministers have budgets that can be used for project work or for exempt staff.

In the case of the arrangements that were referred to in the House, as the President of Treasury Board has stated, those arrangements were made within Treasury Board guidelines.

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is easy to talk about Treasury Board guidelines, but I want to talk specifically about project work. A ministerial budget is one thing, a member of Parliament's budget is another.

• (1425)

The Canadian public that is paying the bill for this wants to know why in the world this soothing of the Greek community is always happening in his riding. Surely there are enough communities across the country from which he can hire people to do the work for him out of his ministerial budget.

It seems ironic that every time a name comes up it is someone specifically from his constituency. The Liberals railed against this when the Mulroney government was in power. Now they are saying that they are proud of it, that everything is okay.

Will the defence minister admit that he is guilty of the same Mulroney-like patronage that he and his colleagues criticized while in opposition? Will he repay the \$150,000 spent on these unethical contracts?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we had better get our facts straight.

The hon. member accused me of unethical behaviour. I hope she withdraws that before I give the answer to the question.

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your rulings on these things, not those of the minister.

I grant what we are talking about here is a tender issue for the minister. It is so tender that every contract more than \$30,000 is literally supposed to go out to tender and this has not happened.

Stephanos Karabekos has received more than three contracts, every one of which should have gone out to tender. When it is split up, then it looks okay because it is under \$30,000.

Mr. Speaker, you can call that unethical, I can call it unethical, I know the Canadian public thinks it is unethical. It is deplorable. Why has the minister allowed this contract splitting to take place? Why has he allowed this to become such a tender issue?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is not a tender issue. It is a factual issue.

The hon. member says this is unethical. I am surprised that language is allowed to stay, but I obviously respect your ruling on that, Mr. Speaker.

What she is saying by extension is that the officials in my department, the assistant deputy minister of finance who said that these contracts were within the guidelines, the Treasury Board officials who said that these arrangements were within guidelines, are also unethical.

It seems that when the Reform Party casts its net, it casts it widely. It does not pay attention to the facts. It does not pay attention to the reputations of individuals.

With respect to the specific contract that the hon. member raises, I would like to draw her attention to the fact that the Hellenic Canadian Congress, the umbrella group of all Greek Canadians in the country, issued a statement last night in support of the work that was done in this very difficult circumstance—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Collenette: —and in a letter to the hon. member for Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt condemned him for the false statements that he made in connection with this issue.

* * *

[*Translation*]

VARENNES TOKAMAK PROJECT

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Natural Resources.

The federal government announced that it was cutting off its annual \$7.2 million contribution to the tokamak project. By withdrawing from this project, the government is adding to the huge research and development deficit and jeopardizing the potential of scientific research in Quebec.

Why is the minister standing by this bad decision to no longer participate in the Varennes tokamak project?

[*English*]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I believe I have made clear in the House on a number of occasions, because of the fiscal situation in which the government found itself, having been placed there by the previous government, some very difficult choices had to be made. It is not possible for the government to continue to do everything it had done.

In relation to the future of AECL and the nuclear research program, it has been decided to focus on the export sale of Candu reactors. That export market provides benefits to both Quebec and other parts of Canada.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister is changing her versions, even if she thinks she keeps telling us the same thing. This is the first time she has admitted in this House that CANDU reactors are producing spin-offs elsewhere than in Quebec, quite a few other places in fact. She is cutting in Quebec in favour of British Columbia, about which—

It would be nice if everyone could agree that the federal contribution to the tokamak project in Quebec is money well spent, and since she will be saving only \$7.2 million, what are the minister's real motives for—

• (1430)

The Speaker: My dear colleagues, we must not question the motives of our hon. colleagues. If the minister wishes to reply to the question, she has the floor.

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will simply reiterate what I have said before in the House to the hon. member and others. Government is about making choices and we have had to make some difficult choices.

I have explained over and over again that one of our choices was in relation to the future of the nuclear program in this country. We are going to focus on the export sale of Candu reactors.

Let me remind the hon. member that the sale of one Candu reactor represents potentially over \$100 million to the province of Quebec and 4,000 person years in jobs.

* * *

MINISTER OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Defence has been trying to defend his pork barrel abuse of his budget. He says he saved the taxpayers millions of dollars. This is bogus. In fact, the minister and Karabekos cost taxpayers millions of dollars.

According to information I have received directly from Veterans Affairs, it admits that Karabekos was instrumental in extending benefits that the government had planned to cut off in the March 1995 budget.

Will the minister not admit that he abused his budget, rewarding campaign pals with cushy contracts that cost Canadians millions of dollars?

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will not address the specific accusation, the comment the member got from Veterans Affairs, except to say that what the hon. member said is absolutely and totally false.

I want to deal with the fact that these particular arrangements, that is hiring people either on exempt staff or for specific projects, is open to ministers and is also open to party leaders, the Leader of the Opposition, for example, the leader of the Reform Party.

I would like to know if the hon. member has asked his party leader how he hires and retains the services of people. Does he have people just as full time employees or does he have people who are hired on project work.

As to the propriety of this, the fact is that these particular arrangements are within Treasury Board guidelines. It was stated by the President of the Treasury Board, gone over by the various officials. I think the facts speak for themselves.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I will ask the questions. The minister's job is to answer them.

I have the contracts, I have the guidelines. The minister has broken the guidelines. Canadians can see that there is no value for money in these contracts. The minister hired a musical conductor to do partisan work in the minister's riding. Karabekos is not the only political hack that the minister has rewarded with cushy contracts. There have been three others as well.

Will the minister tell the House if the pork barrel contracts end here, or does he plan to hire every campaign worker on his team?

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, far be it for me to defend the people he has described as political hacks. Perhaps he would refer the term political hack to the former Reform candidate for Ottawa—Vanier who is an employee in his office.

* * *

• (1435)

[Translation]

ATOMIC ENERGY OF CANADA LIMITED

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Natural Resources.

On top of the withdrawal from the tokamak project in Varennes, now this Monday the parliamentary secretary has confirmed that Atomic Energy of Canada is looking at the possibility of moving its offices from Montreal to Toronto, which would mean a direct loss of 120 jobs to the Montreal region.

Can the Minister commit at this time to maintaining AECL's activities in Montreal?

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, AECL is going through a process of restructuring and rethinking its main lines of work and its main objectives. That process is ongoing. At this time no final decisions have been made.

*Oral Questions**[Translation]*

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ): Mr. Speaker, why is the minister concentrating on systematically destroying Quebec's scientific potential all the time, always in favour of Ontario?

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe what I have just heard from the hon. member. He should consider the hundreds of millions of dollars that are spent in the province of Quebec by the federal government in relation to science and technology.

In my department alone, some of our best research facilities presently exist in the province of Quebec and will continue to exist in the province of Quebec. I suggest that the hon. member get his facts straight.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Justice acknowledged that a senior official of his department inappropriately tried to influence a chief judge of the Federal Court. What the minister did not reveal was that the meeting between his assistant deputy minister, Ted Thompson, and the chief justice took place on March 1.

Who within his department authorized the meeting and why has it taken him three months to acknowledge and respond to this obvious violation of judicial independence?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the meeting was held, according to the chief justice, at the request of the chief justice. The meeting was for the purpose initially of discussing concerns with the pace of litigation generally in the Federal Court.

As I said yesterday, we have also acknowledged that it was inappropriate for the meeting to discuss specific cases without notice being given to counsel in those cases and an opportunity for those counsel to participate.

In specific response to the point raised by the hon. member about the timing, I can tell him that it was Mr. Ted Thompson who brought to the attention of the department the fact that the meeting had taken place. He brought the correspondence to the attention of the department. We then brought that to the attention of counsel in those cases.

In the weeks since March 1 our focus has been on the litigation. Lawyers for the parties involved in the three litigation cases have brought a motion, to which we have responded. We have been in the courtroom resisting their application for stay.

At this point it is appropriate for me to make a statement. I propose to do that. I will address in that statement the response, internally, of the department to these circumstances.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Chief Justice Isaac of the Federal Court, in my opinion, should never have met with Mr. Thompson to discuss this matter in the first place.

In 1990 the current Tory leader resigned as minister of fitness and amateur sport after it was revealed he had called a judge. That particular judge was not implicated in that case because he had the integrity to hang up on the minister.

● (1440)

I ask the Minister of Justice if he has laid a complaint before the Canadian Judicial Council to have Chief Justice Isaac's participation in this matter dealt with.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): No, Mr. Speaker. Our focus has been on the litigation and now internally with respect to the appropriate response to Ted Thompson's conduct.

The instances to which the hon. member has referred involved either ministers or members of government communicating with judges directly, and that is not what happened in this case.

What happened in this case is an instance of a long serving and excellent lawyer with the department who at the request of the chief justice participated in a meeting which eventually turned to subjects that were more appropriately dealt with on notice to counsel involved in those cases and with their involvement.

We acknowledge that was inappropriate. Our focus has been on resisting motions to stay those cases in the court and now on how to deal with Mr. Ted Thompson internally in the department. That has been the focus of our attention.

* * *

*[Translation]***DRUG PATENTS**

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry.

On May 9, 1994, the Prime Minister made a commitment in this House not to modify C-91 on drug patents before its 1997 revision. Last week, however, the Minister of Industry announced his intention to modify the link regulations, thus affecting the C-91 regulations and therefore decreasing protection for drug patents.

Can the Minister of Industry indicate to us whether it is his intention to respect the Prime Minister's commitment and to not revise C-91 before 1997, or is he preparing to make unilateral

modifications in the link regulations before the 1997 revision date, without any public consultation whatsoever?

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.): Mr. Speaker, I will always respect the Prime Minister's commitments.

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, are we to understand from the minister's response that there will be no changes to the link regulations before the act is revised in 1997?

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.): Mr. Speaker, what we have said on a number of occasions is that we will respect our international commitments concerning drug patents.

I believe that even the hon. member asking the question wishes us to respect the 20 year principle, that is the lifetime of a drug patent. The question with the link regulations is to ensure that, as soon as a patent runs out, the generic companies have the opportunity to manufacture the product.

This is the reason the regulations are a means of balancing the life of a patent and access to an expired patent. Moreover, we are going to continually ensure that court rulings actually confirm the hon. member's opinion, that these regulations are working well.

* * *

INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board.

Some municipalities in my riding of Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle are concerned about not yet having filed their applications under the infrastructure program and their projects not being approved before the deadline.

Could the minister tell us whether this program will be extended to allow these municipalities to complete their projects?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the federal government and the Quebec government have agreed on the changes required to extend the time frames provided for in the Canada-Quebec agreement on the infrastructure program.

Oral Questions

Details will be announced shortly and I encourage Quebec municipalities to fill in their applications as quickly as possible. I am also pleased to announce that more than 12,000 infrastructure projects were approved during the first two years of the program, including 2,400 projects in Quebec, which represents a \$1.8 billion investment and accounts for the creation of thousands of jobs in Quebec.

* * *

• (1445)

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, for weeks now the government has piously proclaimed it is very concerned about the price of gasoline, so much so that it has struck another committee to look into gas prices.

The government does not really need a committee. What it needs is a calculator. Out of every litre of gasoline 3.5 cents is GST, all of it hidden. Under the minister's new harmonization agreement he is adding another 4 cents per litre to the price of gas.

My question is very simple. Is a 100 per cent increase in the GST charged on gasoline his idea of no new taxes?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, given that the GST harmonization agreement has not gone into effect yet, it is very hard to place the blame for the increase in gasoline prices on the GST.

My colleague, the Minister of Industry, has explained a number of times in the House the reasons for the increase in the price of gasoline. He has also expressed his concern and his desire to take action where necessary.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, \$84 million in new taxes for the province of Nova Scotia and a 4 cent per litre increase in the price of gasoline repudiate the minister's promise of the budget just two months ago when he said there were not to be any new taxes.

My question again is will the minister admit today his promise of no new taxes is bogus and that once again Canadians were misled by the government?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for giving me the opportunity once again to point out to the House that in our first budget we did not increase personal taxes. In our second budget we did not increase personal taxes. In case it has escaped the member's attention, in our latest budget we did not increase corporate taxes, excise taxes or personal taxes. Mr. Speaker, we did not increase taxes.

*Oral Questions**[Translation]***AÉROPORTS DE MONTRÉAL**

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

For months now, the minister has been making excuses for Aéroports de Montréal's failure to release all studies on the transfer of international flights from Mirabel to Dorval by saying that this firm is not subject to the Access to Information Act. However, the contract between ADM and the Government of Canada does specifically state that ADM shall co-operate with the minister in responding to any questions, complaints or comments from the public regarding the airport.

How is the minister ensuring that the terms of an agreement entered into by his own department are being complied with?

[English]

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, the airport authority in Montreal has complied with all agreements with this department. If the hon. member has evidence of anything other than that I would be happy to receive it and examine it in due course.

However, an allegation totally unsupported by evidence of misbehaviour by a regional organization which involves municipal governments of the city of Montreal and most of the outlying regional governments is thoroughly improper in the House.

We trust regional and municipal governments to act properly. We trust provincial governments to do the same. An allegation that they are acting improperly is quite out of order.

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, is the minister suggesting that the people of Quebec, to whom the transfer of operations from Mirabel to Dorval will cost in excess of \$200 million, have no business knowing what the studies supporting this transfer say?

[English]

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the information about the very difficult decision made by the airport authority at Montreal has been made public. There are 21 members of the authority and seven municipalities involved. They make the information public.

The hon. member must remember these are extremely difficult decisions for that authority involving the future and what we hope will be the restoration of economic health to the city of Montreal.

We cannot continue to ignore what is happening in international aviation in terms of companies getting together. We cannot continue to ignore that because if we or the ADM did so it would be to the detriment of the citizens and the future of the city of Montreal. We will not do that.

* * *

● (1450)

JUSTICE

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this week in Hamilton two local teenagers have been charged with murder. On Monday, May 27 six teens wielding baseball bats fatally beat Roberto Oliviera, an 18-year-old, while his younger brother looked on. Yesterday Roberto died and a 15-year old youth has been charged with second degree murder. This vicious murderer will be eligible for parole in seven short years if convicted.

Can the justice minister explain why he reduced the parole eligibility for these young offenders from a maximum of 10 to a mere 7 years, forcing judges across the country to hand out pathetic penalties for such horrendous crimes?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the facts of the sad cases recounted by the hon. member are dreadful. Without commenting on the liability of cases to be before the court, all of us of course share the grief of the families of the victims involved in those cases.

The hon. member also knows that in Bill C-37 we changed the Young Offenders Act to increase substantially the penalties for murder to make it easier to transfer 16 and 17-years-olds to adult court for adult trial in crimes of serious violence.

His party is working actively on the justice committee reviewing the act in its entirety. We have already made it clear we will listen carefully to the recommendations the committee makes later this year and we shall make whatever other changes in the act are required to meet the needs of public safety.

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I did not really get an answer to my question. I am curious to know why so many of these things are not working the way they are supposed to, according to the minister.

As I stated before, there has not been only one murder of a youth in Hamilton but two in one week alone. On May 23 a 14-year old youth appeared in court charged with the first degree murder of Lee James Doherty, who was bludgeoned to death with a crowbar. This youth charged with first degree murder will serve a mere seven years. It is nothing more than the failure of the minister's approach to youth violence which is causing it.

Oral Questions

Will the minister finally listen to the Reform Party now and tighten up the Young Offenders Act so that vicious criminals like this get the sentence they deserve?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I shall do better than that. I shall listen to the justice committee on which the Reform Party is well represented. The hon. member for Crowfoot and his colleagues from that party on that committee are at work on the very issues the hon. member has referred to. When those recommendations are received, we shall pay very close attention to what they recommend.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mrs. Carolyn Parrish (Mississauga West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while Canada has made progress in reducing toxins and air pollutants much more remains to be done. Concerns about UV radiation, toxins and smog become more acute as the summer months approach.

Can the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment tell the House what specific action is being taken to address the changes affecting the earth's atmosphere?

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member from Mississauga West for her question. She has repeatedly demonstrated a concern for and commitment to environmental issues.

I am pleased to say that on Monday the Minister of the Environment announced that in partnership with two private sector partners and the University of Toronto we are committing \$1.9 million for a research chair that will look at the complex issues of atmospheric pollution.

A world leader in his field, Professor Jim Drummond will chair the program. The program will develop and use space based instruments to measure and track air pollutants on a global scale.

Crucial information for addressing global environmental issues such as climate change, smog—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Chicoutimi.

* * *

[*Translation*]

GLIDING SCHOOL

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

Two days ago, the minister was roundly criticized for allowing the gliding school to move from Saint-Honoré to Saint-Jean-de-Ri-

chelieu. The department refused to hold a public hearing on this project despite its highly controversial nature.

How can the minister justify his authorizing this move without a public hearing, when this project, which is already causing a fierce public controversy, will have a significant environmental impact?

• (1455)

[*English*]

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will realize that in the last two budgets there have been many closures of national defence facilities and the transfer of many activities across the country, all in the name of saving money.

In this case we are saving \$300,000 by moving the gliding school from St. Honoré to St. Jean, Quebec. The environmental assessment has been done. I realize some people in St. Honoré are not very happy but there were a lot of unhappy people when we closed bases throughout Atlantic Canada, in Calgary and in Chilliwack. We are consolidating our operations to make them more efficient. The bottom line is we are saving the taxpayers money.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

The department has never succeeded in proving that it could achieve substantial savings. If he has nothing to hide, will the minister promise to release all the studies prepared in this matter, including the additional costs taxpayers will have to bear to effectively lower the noise level of tug aircraft?

[*English*]

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to furnish any information that would allay the hon. member's fears.

Two weeks ago I appeared before the defence committee on the estimates, and the critics for his party never asked one question about this. If they had, I would have given them more details.

* * *

FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, for a month now Reform has urged the government to reverse the current policy on the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and grant immediate diplomatic recognition to this country.

I ask the Minister of Foreign Affairs if he is now willing to grant diplomatic recognition.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, about three or four weeks ago I was in the Balkans area and we had a number of discussions. We

Oral Questions

are holding similar discussions in Canada with affected groups. I hope to be making some decision on that matter within the next month or so.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the decision to grant diplomatic recognition to the former Yugoslav Republic is long overdue.

In 1995 Greece recognized its independence and yet last month the Minister of Foreign Affairs was still writing letters saying Canada could not recognize it because of its dispute with Greece. It seems the minister does not really know what is happening in this case.

The UN also recognized this country. Still the government delays and evades the issue. I would like the minister to give me one reason why Canada cannot now recognize and give diplomatic recognition to this country.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows there were some very major complications. We are dealing with two very important allies in the NATO system. It had to do with names of countries and the nature of the recognition that would be taking place.

I just told the hon. member we are not ignoring it, we are not delaying it. We are actively pursuing it. We have been talking to the parties involved. We will be looking at the options we have. I just told the hon. member we will be making a decision within the next month. I think that shows quick and ready action.

* * *

HOLLINGER INCORPORATED

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister.

Canadians are quite amazed that the federal government has stood by and allowed Hollinger Incorporated to acquire over 53 per cent of all Canadian newspapers.

The 1981 Kent commission recommended that no one company should control more than 20 per cent of Canadian circulation, as it threatens freedom and democracy. Yet Hollinger now controls over 42 per cent. By any definition this is an alarming development.

My question to the Prime Minister is what further threats to freedom and democracy will there have to be before the government takes action to ensure competition, freedom of speech and the public's right to know?

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.): Mr. Speaker, it is a little hard to follow the premise of the member's question and connect it to the conclusion he has drawn.

When freedom of speech prevails in Canada in very clear and legal ways he criticizes the ownership of newspapers at a time when we are surrounded not only by newspapers but by other media and means of exchanging information.

• (1500)

Mr. Blaikie: What are you going to do about it?

Mr. Manley: The member for Winnipeg Transcona seems to think he has lost his voice in this House, largely because they did not elect enough members in the last election. That is why he does not get his chance to make those comments.

The competition law deals with the economic impact of acquisitions, such as that which is proposed by Hollinger, that will be reviewed by the director of investigations and research as to whether there are anti-competitive reasons that the director should intervene in the transaction. He has done that. He has concluded that is not the case. But that does not deal with future behaviour. He will continue to monitor the behaviour as a result of this acquisition. If it is anti-competitive, he will act.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Bernie Collins (Souris—Moose Mountain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

In the last two budgets the government has implemented big changes to Canadian agriculture, including the reduction or elimination of previous subsidy programs. The government has also committed itself to adaptation measures to ease the process away from subsidization.

What is the government going to implement to commit itself to help farmers adapt to the new reality?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is correct to say that for fiscal, trade, diversification, innovation and efficiency reasons a number of former subsidy programs have been brought to an end. In every case appropriate transitional measures or gradual phase out measures or other adaptation measures have been put in place to smooth the process of transition equitably all across the country.

The hon. gentleman comes from Saskatchewan and might refer specifically to the end of the WGTA subsidy. Part of the adaptation in that case is the WGTA adaptation fund with \$300 million over the next couple of years to help smooth out the process of changing the freight pooling system, to assist the alfalfa dehydration and compressed hay industries and also to help enhance rural infrastructure like rural roads which are of critical importance in the prairie region.

*Tributes***PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

The Speaker: In keeping with the program which we have established here over the last two and one-half years, it is our custom to recognize distinguished Canadians in our gallery.

Today is a very historic day for us as parliamentarians and for us as Canadians. I would like you to join with me in welcoming home some of the men and women who have served this Parliament and who have served Canada so well.

My Canadian parliamentarians you have served Canada well and you honour us by being here today. Would you please stand.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

[*English*]

The Speaker: Colleagues, I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received as follows:

Government House
Ottawa

May 29, 1996

Mr. Speaker:

I have the honour to inform you that the Right Honourable Roméo LeBlanc, Governor General of Canada, will proceed to the Senate chamber today, the 29th day of May, 1996 at 3.30 p.m., for the purpose of giving royal assent to certain bills.

Yours sincerely,

Judith A. LaRocque,
Secretary to the Governor General

• (1505)

The Speaker: Colleagues, in the last short while one of our former parliamentarians has passed away. I refer to the former member for Burlington, Mr. Bill Kempling. His wife is with us today.

We are going to have tributes. I will recognize the hon. member for Sherbrooke, the leader of the Conservative Party.

* * *

THE LATE WILLIAM KEMPLING

Hon. Jean J. Charest (Sherbrooke, PC): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the Senate and the hon. member for

Saint John, as well as a colleague who worked with him, the hon. member for Beauce, I rise to pay tribute to Hon. William Kempling, an esteemed parliamentarian and a member of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada.

Bill Kempling, as we knew him, was an outstanding parliamentarian. He was an exceptional Canadian and a great man.

As I rise today I cannot help but think that the timing of our tribute could not have been better planned. This is the day the House has chosen to commemorate the memory of the men and women who have served in this place from its very beginning in 1867 to this day. If we had to choose one person, one single outstanding example of a member who had served his country, we could not have chosen a better example, a better person than Mr. Bill Kempling.

Mr. Kempling was tested early on in his life. This is not known by a number of people. Very early on in his life he was affected by polio, as were a number of Canadians of his generation. This was a great challenge for him.

I learned last week at the religious service in his honour that he had come to know his present wife Muriel, who is honouring us with her presence in the gallery today, by being introduced by a young boy on the street next to his who equally was suffering from polio. I will refer to this later. However, this would be, as we can imagine, one of the first great tests of this young man's life.

At the age of 19, Mr. Kempling went on to serve as a flight lieutenant in World War II with the Royal Canadian Air Force. He served in Burma in an exceptional capacity. He was part of a group of soldiers who were flown behind enemy lines to raid the installations of the enemy. He flew on these exceptional and very dangerous missions.

He was among a group of soldiers who not only fulfilled the mandate they were given, but also had a great deal of difficulty surviving. One of these encounters resulted in a six month trek through jungles and across mountains before he would finally reach peaceful territory and rejoin forces with the allies. This exceptional and outstanding service in Burma was only a prelude to what he would offer to Canadians in his later life.

In 1964 Mr. Kempling founded a business in Hamilton, Ontario. As a businessman he was also concerned about government, the way it operated and its accountability. He went on to found a truck body equipment association to lobby government so that he could bring about some changes. As his experience increased, so did his dealings with government.

Mr. Kempling had a fervent desire to represent the interests of small business and of the constituents of Burlington. In 1972 he successfully ran as a Progressive Conservative candidate. As a parliamentarian he spent over two decades in the House of Commons. He was considered by many as a father figure in this House.

Tributes

• (1510)

I first ran into Bill Kempling in 1984 as a member of the Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Association. I have a very fond memory of Mr. Kempling carrying the brief on steel and steel issues at a meeting of this association. In my first experiences, I was faced with exceptional parliamentarians from both countries, on the American side very experienced congressmen and senators. I remember being very, very proud of the performance, of the arguments and of the force of knowledge Bill Kempling brought to this file as he defended the interests of Canada's steel industry with our American counterparts. In fact I would venture today that Bill Kempling, with regard to the steel caucus that he formed in this House, has not been replaced since 1993.

His lengthy parliamentary service included chief government whip in 1979 and the chief opposition whip from 1980 to 1983. He was appointed deputy finance critic in 1983. He also served as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. He served as Parliamentary Secretary to the President of Treasury Board until his retirement in 1993.

Just recently I had the pleasure of meeting with Bill. He reflected upon how satisfied and proud he was with the more than 20 years he had dedicated to serving the people of Canada. His integrity, generosity and honesty are benchmarks that Canadians will strive to uphold. As a fellow parliamentarian and an upstanding Canadian citizen, Mr. Kempling was a true friend and also true to his word in his forthrightness.

He will be missed by a number of us but we are honoured today by the presence of his wife Muriel who was, in every true sense of the word, his partner through his political career. Everywhere Bill went Muriel would accompany him serving the people of Burlington and the people of Canada. I also want to recognize the service of his sons Angus and Bruce and his daughter Jane who also made a great contribution to his public life.

In my opening remarks I referred to Bill's bout with polio and what a challenge that must have been for this young boy. At his funeral service his brother-in-law told a story of how Bill had been challenged by his parents to walk to the end of their backyard where there were animals. They hoped that this young boy, who they were told may never walk again, could learn how to walk and survive this bout with polio. We can all imagine the young man walking a step and falling, getting up and walking another step and falling and getting up and walking, until the day he reached his objective and his destination.

There was in that episode of his life a great metaphor for all of our lives. Bill Kempling represented the best that this House of Commons has to offer. In the end, I think he offers the best that Canada has to offer to the world.

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the tribute that was so eloquently given by the member for Sherbrooke, the leader of the Conservative Party, for our old friend and colleague, Bill Kempling.

Bill served in this House for 21 years. I was privileged to serve with him for 10 of those years. He was chief government whip from 1980 to 1983. I really got to know him well because at that time we were going through the very emotional debates on the Constitution. Mr. Speaker, I know you remember them as well. They were difficult, they were emotional, they were very partisan but Bill Kempling, despite being partisan in the Chamber, as most of us are when we feel very strongly about issues, was the perfect gentleman and a friendly colleague in the lobby.

Bill was well prepared for the rough and tumble world of politics because he enjoyed a successful career as a businessman. Other than overcoming the physical challenge that has been mentioned, the real test for him came as a member of the Royal Canadian Air Force during the second world war.

Bill Kempling's distinguished wartime career is one that should be remembered. He joined the RCAF in 1941 at the age of 20 and went on to fly in virtually every theatre of war, from England and northwest Europe to the Mediterranean and southeast Asia. He showed enormous courage and determination in the face of danger.

• (1515)

On one occasion, he took part in a daring mission in which allied forces landed behind enemy lines in Burma to blow up bridges and railways. It took six months before the men returned to India and freedom. The region's dense jungle and rugged mountains were formidable obstacles, but that did not mean much to Bill Kempling and his determination.

The campaign in southeast Asia was tough by any standard. Mr. Kempling was one of the many Canadians who had to face not only a battle-hardened enemy but also the natural elements that showed little mercy. The climate was harsh and the living conditions were often appalling but the Canadians persevered.

Bill left the air force in 1945, having achieved the very distinguished rank of flight lieutenant.

Bill Kempling served his country with pride and commitment in the second world war. He overcame numerous challenges and hardships and for nearly four years performed this duty whenever he was called on. Because of men and women like Bill Kempling, Canada and the Royal Canadian Air Force made an important contribution to allied victory in the second world war. His wartime record reflects the skill and bravery of all RCAF personnel during that long and bitter conflict.

Tributes

Bill Kempling knew the meaning of sacrifice. He risked his life, like thousands of others, so that future generations could live in peace and freedom. Not content to serve his country once in the field of war, he offered himself for public life.

For many in public life, we often feel that it is war because it is a fight for ideals, for values and for the essence of being Canadian. It is our perspective in being a Canadian. Bill Kempling certainly had his views on what Canada meant.

He was strongly partisan. He had a love for this country. He was an active small businessman. He was a man who was knowledgeable about economic policy, but I remember him as a man with a hearty laugh that could enjoy some fun once we left the intense confines of the Chamber.

On behalf of the Prime Minister and the members of my party, I would like to offer my condolences to Muriel and to the other members of his family along with his friends at this difficult time. All members of the House share in their sorrow.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on my own behalf and on behalf of my colleagues in the Bloc Québécois, I would like to say a few words in memory of Bill Kempling, the former Conservative member for the riding of Burlington, Ontario.

Mr. Kempling was already an experienced parliamentarian when I met him in 1984. He first became a member of the House of Commons in 1972 and was re-elected without interruption until 1993, when he took well deserved retirement.

He was the chief whip of the government under the Right Hon. Joe Clark, who was Prime Minister at the time. He was also a parliamentary secretary under the Right Hon. Brian Mulroney.

Despite this distinguished career in politics, we would be remiss in not mentioning his achievements in the Royal Air Force in southeast Asia during the World War II, where he was a Japanese prisoner of war. Despite this event, which marked his life, he was never bitter toward his former enemies.

Bill Kempling told us that one Japanese died in his arms during the war. He said he gathered up some of the man's personal effects thinking that one day, perhaps, he could return them to his family. He told us that he had had the opportunity as a parliamentarian to travel to Japan and had managed to reach the young man's family. He gave them the young man's effects personally. He was very moved by this.

He always encouraged young people to join and take part in the world of politics. He was also an inveterate collector of old books, which he adored and he liked to read in his leisure time.

I offer my sincere condolences and those of the Bloc Québécois to his family, his friends and his former colleagues.

• (1520)

[*English*]

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I too rise for a few moments on behalf of my caucus to pay tribute to the memory of the late Bill Kempling. It is appropriate that today we are honouring former parliamentarians because he was one of them.

Mr. Kempling's military accomplishments and his accomplishments here in the House of Commons as parliamentary secretary and government whip have already been mentioned.

One young man, who is now working for our caucus, worked for Bill Kempling some years ago in the House. He has this memory of Bill: "The only thing he told me when he hired me was 'this is hard ball we are playing here and don't forget it'". I believe that is good advice for anybody who comes here as an MP or works on the Hill.

Bill Kempling was the Conservative whip who refused to come down the aisle, causing the famous 14-day bell ringing incident. The Table is nodding. I am sure they remember that all too well. Charles Turner, the government whip at the time, was reported to have camped out in the government lobby. He had his pillow and blanket there waiting for Bill to come to the House. He eventually did show up brandishing his whip. Those are just some really personal memories.

It was mentioned earlier that he won six elections. It is just incredible that anyone would sit in this House for that length of time.

I want to quote the Toronto *Star* of May 2, 1993 when Bill Kempling announced that he would not be seeking re-election. He said: "I have so many other things in my life and I am going to do them with all the strength and vigour that I have". He was 72 at the time.

It is one thing to run in six elections and win them but it is another thing to know when to go out gracefully. He did that in May 1993. I am sure his family members were very grateful when he retired from politics because they had two and a half years to enjoy his company. I am sure those are memories they will treasure forever.

I extend our sympathy to his family, Mrs. Muriel Kempling, her children and grandchildren. I believe she is here today in the gallery. We want to pay tribute and thank her and her family for the sacrifice they gave. God bless you.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the NDP, I would like to join with other members of the House who have already paid tribute to the Bill Kempling. I served

Points of Order

in the House with Mr. Kempling for 14 of the 21 years that he was here. I certainly have very vivid memories of Bill in the House, particularly as the whip. I see him in my mind's eye proceeding to the Table.

I also remember the time, as the member for Beaver River just mentioned, when Bill did not come in and we were subjected to 16 days, I believe, of bell ringing.

I remember Bill as a partisan member of Parliament. He could be very direct and even harsh. He was impatient with things that he did not agree with. However, like the minister of defence said, he also had the ability to put all that aside and to be a good colleague all at the same time outside of the Chamber and in various other joint pursuits that members of Parliament are called on to participate in.

This may say something about the humility of Mr. Kempling, but I knew nothing of the struggle he had with polio in his early life. He was not the kind of fellow to talk about those kinds of things, I presume, although I never worked with him directly.

However, I did know about his war record and we all honour him for that. We also honour him for his personal struggles with disease in his youth, particularly polio. We honour him for his service here in the House of Commons. We extend our condolences to his family.

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to rise and pay tribute to William Kempling, the former member of Parliament for Burlington and the former riding of Halton—Wentworth.

Bill Kempling passed away on May 27 at the age of 75 and will be remembered by all as a dedicated public servant. I think it is interesting, on this day of tribute and at the funeral service on Friday, that we learn so much about all of the work that he has done, the people he mentored, some of whom are here today, Shirley Martin and Barbara McDougall, and how great he was for newly elected members. It is unfortunate that all of us work so hard and constituents and the general public do not hear about that work and so it is terrific to be here to pay tribute to Mr. Kempling.

• (1525)

The Kempling family sacrificed a lot of their time with Bill so that he could serve Canadians. And serve he did. Together the team of Muriel and Bill Kempling worked hard from 1972 to 1993.

A true survivor, as we have heard, Bill Kempling survived childhood polio to serve as an officer in the RCAF and was a successful business person prior to his election. As a parliamentarian he served as the party whip to Prime Minister Clark and as parliamentary secretary to several ministers. He inspired loyalty and dedication among his staff and I have heard nothing but terrific stories from them.

Mr. Kempling worked hard for the Canadian steel industry as chair of the all party steel caucus. He was very active in the Canada-Japan interparliamentary group. He was a history buff and he left me very large shoes to fill.

In their retirement Muriel and Bill Kempling faced another challenge which they survived with strength and dignity but they could not beat. Post-polio syndrome claimed a true parliamentarian on May 27. It also claimed a husband, father, grandfather and a friend to many.

My prayers and thoughts are with you, Muriel, Jane, Bruce and Angus. God bless.

The Speaker: My colleagues, rather than going into the business of the day I understand that the hon. Minister of Justice and the critics from the other parties are going to be making statements. I wonder if we might suspend for a few moments while we wait for the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod so that we can go for royal assent to a bill.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

DISTRIBUTION OF LITERATURE

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to keep harping on this, but when we came to the House today we had this publication on our desks.

I have raised a point of order before about it. I do not know who is doing this. I know it was not the pages but I do not think—

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for raising the matter again. I notice that I have one here in front of me, as the Speaker. I do not know where it came from. I will inform myself and as much as possible see that these publications are cleared through the Speaker before they are put on any desks.

I will get back to the House more specifically later on.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on the same matter, I want to say that I personally distributed this leaflet, as did someone else regarding the Stratford festival, which is a cultural event in Ontario.

I thought that, since this was a cultural event in Quebec, it might also be of interest to members from western Canada and the rest of the country. The intention was the same. There is no partisan idea expressed in this leaflet and I take this opportunity to cordially invite you to attend our festival.

The Speaker: I thank you for providing this information. I was asked to take the matter under advisement. I want to find out what the policy was in months and years passed. The Chair will make a decision if necessary.

*Routine Proceedings***ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS***[English]*

Miss Grey: Mr. Speaker, while we are sitting around waiting for the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod to come, I wonder what the chances are of me presenting a couple of petitions? Is there time?

The Speaker: Right now they wouldn't be so hot.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: We only have 45 seconds and, hark, I think I hear somebody coming.

• (1545)

*[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 eight petitions.

* * *

JUSTICE

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to report to the House on a matter that involves the management of the Department of Justice for which of course I am responsible.

My reference is to the communications that took place recently between Assistant Deputy Attorney General Ted Thompson and Chief Justice Julius Isaac of the Federal Court of Canada.

The communications related to a number of citizenship revocation cases that are pending before the Federal Court. The circumstances in which those communications took place have raised concerns that require an appropriate response.

Canada has one of the finest judicial systems in the world. Its strength is derived in great part from the principle of judicial independence and from the confidence of the public in the integrity of those who administer the system.

Canada's Department of Justice has a special responsibility to ensure that judicial independence and the integrity of the system are maintained. As Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, I, in turn, am answerable for the department and for its officers.

I can tell the House that in its dealings with the courts and with other counsel, the Department of Justice takes its responsibility in this regard very seriously. And so do I.

[Translation]

This brings me to the particular matter. I want to note at the outset that as soon as the department became aware that Mr. Thompson and Chief Justice Isaac had met, and as soon as the correspondence between the two came to light, the department provided copies of that correspondence to the lawyers acting for the three persons involved in the revocation cases pending before the Federal Court.

The communications in question are now the subject of litigation before the honourable Mr. Justice Cullen of the Federal Court. The

ROYAL ASSENT

• (1535)

[Translation]

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the Senate.

Accordingly, the Speaker with the House went up to the Senate chamber.

[English]

And being returned:

The Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that when the House did attend His Excellency the Governor General of Canada in the Senate chamber, His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills:

Bill C-3, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (nuclear undertakings) and to make a related amendment to another act—Chapter No. 12.

Bill C-9, an act respecting the Law Commission of Canada—Chapter No. 9.

Bill C-11, an act to establish the Department of Human Resources Development and to amend and repeal certain related acts—Chapter No. 11.

Bill C-14, an act to continue the National Transportation Agency as the Canadian Transportation Agency, to consolidate and revise the National Transportation Act, 1987 and the Railway Act and to amend or repeal other acts as a consequence—Chapter No. 10.

Bill C-15, an act to amend, enact and repeal certain laws relating to financial institutions—Chapter No. 6.

Bill C-16, an act to amend the Contraventions Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts—Chapter No. 7.

Bill C-18, an act to establish the Department of Health and to amend and repeal certain acts—Chapter No. 8.

Bill C-275, an act establishing the Canadian Association of Former Parliamentarians—Chapter No. 13.

Routine Proceedings

Court must now decide whether the communications between Chief Justice Isaac and Mr. Thompson justify staying the proceedings in the three revocation cases.

[*English*]

Accordingly, it would not be appropriate for me to argue the details of that issue in the House but hon. members should know that justice counsel are opposing the motion for a stay. Our counsel have formally acknowledged in court that this meeting between Ted Thompson and the chief justice ought not to have taken place without other counsel being present.

Counsel are arguing that staying the proceedings is not the appropriate response. Quite apart from the court proceedings, I have a larger responsibility to ensure that appropriate steps are being taken internally to evaluate the conduct of my own officials in the matter and to respond as required.

In that regard, I want to inform the House of three developments. First, Mr. Ted Thompson has, on his own initiative, written to the Law Society of Upper Canada to inform them of this incident. He has asked the Law Society, which is the governing body for lawyers in this province, to decide whether his actions constitute professional misconduct.

He has agreed to make himself available to the Law Society to answer all questions and to produce any documents that relate to these events. This is the right thing to do. I would have expected no less from Ted Thompson, who is an excellent and an experienced lawyer and has served the Department of Justice long and very well.

Second, the deputy minister of justice has retained the services of the Hon. Charles Dubin, the former chief justice of Ontario who has particular expertise in these matters to review the facts surrounding Ted Thompson's communications with the court and to determine whether his conduct or that of any others in the department departed from the standards expected of a departmental employee.

• (1550)

I believe that within the Department of Justice the principles governing the relationship between the courts and judges on the one hand, and justice officials on the other, are well known and are broadly understood.

Notwithstanding that, we have also asked Mr. Dubin to suggest any steps that he thinks I should take, or that my officials should take, to ensure that in our dealings with the court, the department does nothing to harm the independence of the judiciary, or to reduce the public's confidence in the integrity of the justice system.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dubin has been asked to provide his advice as soon as possible. Once Mr. Dubin's advice is in hand, the deputy minister will discharge his responsibility to decide what steps, if any, should be taken as a result of it.

I will advise the House of the deputy minister's actions and the reasons for them at an appropriate time, having regard to the proceedings that are pending.

[*English*]

Third, I should tell the House that Ted Thompson has decided to take leave of his current position as assistant deputy attorney general until Mr. Dubin reports to the deputy minister.

I conclude by emphasizing that I take this matter seriously. Allegations of impropriety against officials of the Department of Justice are quite exceptional. It is precisely because the department has a deserved reputation for understanding and maintaining the principles of judicial independence and impartiality, and for respecting the highest standards in its dealings with other parties in the courts, that I have felt it necessary to address the House today.

I will, of course, keep the House informed as to the ultimate resolution of the matter.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am outraged at the way the Minister of Justice is dealing with the Ted Thompson issue.

This is a case of a senior official from the federal justice department interfering with the judicial process. An assistant deputy attorney general, Ted Thompson, tried to influence the Chief Justice of the federal court to speed up the proceedings of a case involving the federal Department of Justice. This is why I am outraged.

Even more disturbing is the fact that Mr. Thompson threatened to make a reference to the Supreme Court if proceedings were not accelerated. Threats were made. Given such a blatant case of undue interference on the part of one of his senior officials, we expected the Minister of Justice to take quick, energetic and decisive action. However, the minister is doing just the opposite.

First, he sets up a non public inquiry which must report at the earliest opportunity, but with no specific date set. Given the seriousness of the incident, the public has a right to quickly know all the circumstances surrounding this matter. It is unacceptable that such a serious incident be investigated behind closed doors.

The minister must pledge to release the full report of the inquiry that will be conducted by Mr. Justice Dubin, a report that will

undoubtedly condemn the action taken in this case. Let us hope that the Minister of Justice will have the decency to make the results of this report public when the House is sitting, and not at some quiet moment, as the government has unfortunately taken to doing recently.

Furthermore, it is difficult to see how the minister can fail to address in his statement the threat made by his assistant deputy minister to take a reference to the Supreme Court. It is completely unacceptable that the Department of Justice of Canada can hold this authority as a threat over courts of first instance.

• (1555)

The minister has a responsibility to reassure the public about the integrity of his department and to state clearly that the threat to exercise authority to take a reference to the Supreme Court is completely intolerable, and instead of trying to cover for his official, he should have expressed his disapproval and dismissed him immediately.

Of course, Mr. Thompson has decided to take leave of his position while awaiting the results of the investigation. However, the minister cannot shirk his responsibilities by hiding behind his investigation. Furthermore, he himself admits in the statement he has just made that he is answerable for the actions of his department and its officials.

In addition, before the court, lawyers from his own department admitted that Mr. Thompson had approached the chief justice. So what more is the minister waiting for? On the very face of it, it is clear that the deputy attorney general has committed a serious error that the minister must indicate his disapproval of through an immediate dismissal. This he refuses to do, instead singing the praises of Mr. Thompson in his statement.

Another fundamental point is completely absent from the justice minister's statement. Two Federal Court judges, one of them the chief justice, have demonstrated a flagrant lack of impartiality and integrity in their task as guardians of justice. In fact, instead of showing Mr. Thompson the door, the judges complied with these requests, thus violating their duty to remain neutral and impartial. The presiding judge, Mr. Justice Jerome, even had to remove himself from the case as a result of this incident.

I would remind the minister that, as he himself pointed out in his statement, responsibility for ensuring the independence of the judiciary rests with him. The two judges in this case, Chief Justice Isaac and Associate Chief Justice Jerome, have obviously not fulfilled their duty of integrity. What is the minister waiting for to refer these two cases to the Canadian Judicial Council?

In conclusion, the Bloc Québécois is outraged by the insignificant and not very convincing actions taken by the justice minister in response to such a serious case of undue interference in the judicial system. The minister is clearly shirking his responsibilities

Routine Proceedings

as watchdog of the integrity of the judicial system. We are asking the minister to launch a public inquiry, to take immediate action against Mr. Thompson, and, in particular, to file complaints about the actions of the judges in this matter.

[English]

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I respond today to the statement made by the justice minister regarding the communications which took place between Assistant Deputy Attorney General Ted Thompson and Chief Justice Julius Isaac of the Federal Court.

This is an extremely serious matter. Many questions have not been answered and we must get to the bottom of this whole situation before we can rest assured that the independent integrity of the justice system is in place and working.

I agree with the statement of the Minister of Justice that Canada's Department of Justice has a special responsibility to ensure that judicial independence and the integrity of the system are maintained. We must have a very distinct line between those who create the law and those who enforce it. That is a very firm principle on which we all stand, including the Reform Party of Canada.

The minister said that the justice department provided the defence attorneys acting for the three persons involved in the revocation cases with copies of the correspondence between Mr. Thompson and Chief Justice Isaac as soon as it was aware of the situation.

The minister did not disclose today when the information regarding this judicial interference was brought to his attention. The meeting between Mr. Thompson and Chief Justice Isaac took place three months ago. Did the minister just recently learn of the March 1 meeting, or has he had knowledge of it for months? This question remains unanswered. If the minister wishes to clear this matter up we must know who knew about Mr. Thompson's intervention and when. This must include the minister. We must know when he first became aware of this matter.

• (1600)

Editorials appeared in both the *Globe and Mail* and the *Ottawa Citizen* on May 23. The *Globe and Mail* made this observation: "Nobody seems to be paying much attention to the attempt by a senior justice department official to influence a judge".

The *Citizen* stated: "Allan Rock and Federal Court Chief Justice Julius Isaac owe the public an explanation about the latest and potentially worst official blunders, and they owe it right away, because the independence of Canada's courts has been jeopardized".

In view of these recent editorials it is rather suspect that the minister has just now, three months after the fact, publicly stated an internal departmental investigation is taking place.

Routine Proceedings

Many other questions remain unanswered, questions the minister has not made reference to today. It must be determined who authorized Mr. Thompson's private meeting with the chief justice. If the Minister of Justice did not authorize this meeting, nor did the deputy minister, was Mr. Thompson acting on his own? If it is determined that Mr. Thompson was acting on his own, on how many other occasions that have not been made public has the assistant deputy attorney general interfered in judicial proceedings?

The minister said he has the responsibility of ensuring that appropriate steps are being taken to evaluate internally the conduct of officials in the matter and to respond as required. In my opinion the only appropriate response is for the minister to ask for the immediate resignation of Mr. Thompson. The evidence is quite clear. Mr. Thompson crossed the line, which is absolutely unacceptable. Chief Justice Isaac crossed the line as well.

The minister made absolutely no mention today that any action be taken against the chief justice of the federal court in this regard. The minister has not laid a complaint with the Canadian Judicial Council, which is the only appropriate course of action.

I leave the House with the 1986 landmark decision of then Chief Justice Brian Dickson: "No outsider, be it government, pressure group, individual or even another judge, should interfere in fact or attempt to interfere with the way in which a judge conducts his or her case or makes his or her decision. This core continues to be central to the principle of judicial independence".

* * *

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 19th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the membership of the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development.

If the House gives its consent, I intend to move concurrence in the 19th report later today.

I also have the honour to present the 20th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding its order of reference from the House of Commons on Thursday, March 7, 1996 in relation to the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1997 with regard to vote No. 20 under the privy council chief electoral officer. The committee reports the same.

[Translation]

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint-Denis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration relating to settlement renewal.

* * *

• (1605)

[English]

CONSTITUTION ACT, 1867

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-284, an act to amend an act for the recognition and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms and to amend the Constitution Act, 1867.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this has taken over a year of research and effort on behalf of my own staff, my lawyer in legislative counsel and the diligent staff of the Library of Parliament. I thank all of them for their hard work and expert assistance. I also thank those members of Parliament who jointly seconded my bill.

My property rights bill amends the Canadian bill of rights and adds two new sections to the Constitution Act of 1867, thereby strengthening property rights in federal law.

If passed, the bill would specifically guarantee that every person has the right to the enjoyment of that person's property and the right not to be deprived of their property unless the person is accorded a fair hearing, is paid fair compensation, the amount of that compensation is fixed impartially, and that the compensation is paid within a reasonable amount of time.

Every person's property rights would be guaranteed in every law of Canada unless it is expressly declared by an act of Parliament that it shall operate notwithstanding the Canadian bill of rights. An adoption of a notwithstanding would require the votes of at least two-thirds of the members of the House of Commons.

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

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations among parties and groups in the House and I believe you will find unanimous consent for the adoption of the following motion. I move that the first report of the

Routine Proceedings

Standing Joint Committee on Scrutiny of Regulations, presented Wednesday, April 24, be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the House gives its consent, I move that the 19th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, presented to the House earlier this day, be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

* * *

PETITIONS

TAXATION

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I present two petitions which have been circulating all across Canada.

The first comes from Calgary, Alberta. The petitioners draw to the attention of the House that managing the family home and caring for preschool children is an honourable profession which has not been recognized for its value to our society. They also state the Income Tax Act discriminates against traditional families that make the choice to provide care in the home for preschool children, the chronically ill, the disabled or the aged.

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

ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition comes from South Porcupine, Ontario. The petitioners bring to the attention of the House that consumption of alcoholic beverages may cause health problems or impair one's ability, and specifically that fetal alcohol syndrome and other alcohol related birth defects are 100 per cent preventable by avoiding alcohol consumption during pregnancy.

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

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by approximately 100 residents of the city of Burlington, Ontario. They are praying that Parliament act immedi-

ately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

• (1610)

JUSTICE

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a large number of petitions and I have grouped them into three groups.

I present two petitions signed by 48 Canadians who ask Parliament to enact legislation that would prevent criminals from profiting financially from their crimes. Currently there is no Canadian law that prohibits convicted criminals from selling their stories for publication through books, movies or video tapes.

ABORTION

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the second group of petitions I have the honour of presenting there are 16 petitions signed by 375 concerned Canadians primarily from the provinces of Saskatchewan and Ontario who draw to the attention of Parliament that there are over 100,000 therapeutic abortions performed each year in Canada at a cost of over \$50 million. Since Canadians deserve a say in how their scarce health dollars are spent and which health care procedures they consider essential, these petitions call on Parliament to support a binding national referendum to be held at the time of the next general election to determine whether Canadians are in favour of federal government funding for abortion on demand.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I also have 30 petitions signed by 697 Canadians from Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario who are opposed to the inclusion of the term of sexual orientation in the Canadian Human Rights Act. These petitioners feel homosexuals are already protected by law and that the inclusion of the term of sexual orientation would only lead to special rights for homosexuals. These special rights would in turn infringe on the fundamental rights of Canadians such as freedom of religion, conscience and belief. I am pleased to present these petitions.

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions signed by approximately 200 residents of Scarborough, Markham and North York.

The petitioners call Parliament's attention to the difficulties associated with the inclusion of the term sexual orientation in the human rights act and the possible effect that may have on other Canadians' rights and freedoms and they ask Parliament not to further proceed with any such legislative amendment.

*Government Orders***QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER**

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

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the government House leader when I can expect to receive answers to my questions on the Order Paper Nos. 2 and 4.

I requested an answer within 45 days. As of today 93 days have already passed. Also, before the House prorogued they were on the Order Paper for 71 days. That is a total of 164 days. The answers to these questions are a matter of public safety and include government liability for injuries suffered by prisoners under its care and the unsafe storage of firearms in police and military armouries.

The government keeps assuring me there is to be an answer but so far none has come forward. When can I expect an answer?

Mr. Zed: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his patience and endurance. We expect to provide him with some information very soon.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Shall all questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

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

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I wish to inform the House that because of the ministerial statement Government Orders will be extended by 18 minutes.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

**CIVIL AIR NAVIGATION SERVICES
COMMERCIALIZATION ACT**

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.) moved that Bill C-20, an act respecting the commercialization of civil air navigation services, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Stan Keyes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to rise today to speak at third reading of Bill C-20, the act which will

provide the legal means to transfer the air navigation system currently operated by Transport Canada to a private not for profit corporation, Nav Canada.

• (1615)

As members know, the bill carries out the decision which was taken by this government to commercialize the air navigation system announced back in February 1995 in the federal budget. In December 1995 an agreement in principle was reached for the sale of ANS to Nav Canada for the purchase price of \$1.5 billion. Now that is a very significant contribution to the government's deficit reduction efforts.

I am pleased to highlight that on April 1, 1996 the Minister of Transport along with Nav Canada representatives signed the agreement to transfer which will allow this transaction to proceed to closing, subject to a number of conditions of course. Key among them are the approval of this legislation by Parliament and Nav Canada's ability to raise the required \$1.5 billion purchase price for this not for profit entity.

Bill C-20 has received the benefit of thoughtful consideration by the members of the Standing Committee on Transport who, in addition to carrying out their own review and analysis of the legislation, also heard from a number of important national and regional witnesses representing, among others, industry, labour, government and community groups. A number of written briefs were also submitted. For all of these efforts we want to extend our appreciation.

A number of the witnesses demonstrated strong, unconditional support of the bill, recognizing the desirability and necessity of commercialization. Some of these were the Air Transport Association of Canada, the Aerospace Industries Association and Air Canada, the Nav Canada Bargaining Agents Association, including the Canadian Air Traffic Control Association and the Canadian Airline Pilots Association.

Other witnesses expressed a range of concerns, some of which were outside the scope of the legislation. However, I believe the government was well able to address many of these concerns.

There was a concern that Nav Canada might not continue to operate the ANS in a bilingual environment. In fact, the bill is very clear that the Official Languages Act will apply to Nav Canada as if it were a federal institution. It ensures the use of both official languages in communications with the public and the language of work. This is entirely consistent with established practice and is reflective of the national nature of Nav Canada activities. In the same context, Nav Canada has already enacted bilingual bylaws.

Another concern involved what some believed was an absence of regional representation. I want to reassure the House that this is simply an unfounded concern. In fact, the make-up of Nav Canada's board of directors and its newly appointed advisory committee, about which I will speak in a minute, have been

designed to bring a wide range of regional and other perspectives to the Nav Canada decision making process.

What is more, the two national trade associations, the Air Transport Association of Canada and the Canadian Business Aviation Association, have member groups of all sizes appointing directors to the Nav Canada board. They are drawn from all provinces and territories. These members are likely to account for more than 90 per cent of the current ANS revenues to be generated by Canadian operators.

The testimony of all the witnesses who appeared before the Standing Committee on Transport provided a very useful and timely perspective on their diverse interests. This has been helpful in setting the broadest possible context, moving the legislation forward in support of the further streamlining and modernizing of Canada's transportation industry.

Before going further, I would like to take the opportunity to commend the members of the Standing Committee on Transport, of which I am also a member, for their judicious handling of the legislation and the whole legislative review process to date, and for enabling this precedent setting bill to progress to this stage in the parliamentary process.

Let us look at the legislation for what it is. The bill represents a careful balancing of the commercial interests of the new ANS entity and the interests of the Canadian public. The bill will give Nav Canada the commercial freedoms it needs to develop and maintain a safe, efficient, cost effective and technologically advanced air navigation system while at the same time looking after the public interest by imposing certain operating conditions on Nav Canada and establishing a regulatory framework. For example, the bill ensures a continued high level of system safety by clearly establishing the supremacy of the Aeronautics Act and regulations made pursuant to the act.

• (1620)

Canada, perhaps more than any other country in the world, with its geographical uniqueness is dependent on air transportation that must be reliable, safe and competitive. The network of air traffic control services, flight information services, aviation weather services and navigational aids which comprise the ANS provide for this necessary safe and expeditious movement of aircraft in Canada.

For over 50 years Transport Canada has managed the safe provision of these air navigation services to the industry and to meet the needs of the travelling public. However, government realized that it does not need to own or operate the air navigation

Government Orders

service to ensure that the public interest is met. Legislation, regulation and other means can accomplish this.

ANS commercialization is therefore a very visible demonstration of this commitment. It is yet another example, along with a host of others such as the commercialization of federal airports, ports and harbours and Canadian National, of initiatives that will move Canadian transportation into the 21st century. It will also move Transport Canada away from being the operator of the system toward a more policy and regulatory role, but I stress with a continued priority on safety. This government remains committed to streamlining and moving away from activities that can be operated more efficiently by the private sector unfettered by government processes.

Although internationally, commercialization of aviation facilities and services is progressing steadily, Canada is the first country to establish a commercial air navigation system entity without government ownership. This is an important precedent setting milestone.

A few words about Nav Canada's not for profit organization model are in order at this point to provide another context for understanding the uniqueness of this particular transaction. This model was the choice of an advisory committee of users, unions and other stakeholders who, over the course of several months, studied various commercialization options.

Since the time of its incorporation in May 1995, Nav Canada has carried out the necessary extensive due diligence process associated with purchasing the entity, and which contemplated the overall negotiation process leading to the \$1.5 billion agreement in principle with Transport Canada in December 1995, and the signing of the larger agreement to transfer on April 1, 1996.

Nav Canada is also proceeding to establish itself as a responsible corporate citizen such as with the appointment of a board of directors, the naming of a president and chief executive officer and in other tangible ways that will ensure prudent corporate governance, including the articulation of a code of conduct and conflict of interest guidelines. Its unique structure with board members appointed by user associations, unions, government, as well as independents, will ensure that the corporation receives the benefit of a wide range of stakeholder views to guide its operations.

At its first annual meeting held in Ottawa in April 1996, which was open to and very well attended by the public, it announced the appointment of an advisory committee of 15 members from a broad range of groups, including Quebec, B.C. and Saskatchewan regional associations. This, along with the broad representation of the board of directors, should provide a further measure of reassurance regarding the opportunity for the inclusion of Canadians regionally and nationally in Nav Canada decision making.

Government Orders

Nav Canada through its annual report has highlighted four corporate priorities it will pursue as the operator of the ANS: people, safety, technology and service. Of particular importance to the government and public interest of course is Nav Canada's commitment to safety as the core of every operating policy, procedure and activity performed by Nav Canada. Nav Canada also recognizes the role which Transport Canada will continue to play in the establishment and monitoring of safety regulations and standards.

• (1625)

The point here is that Nav Canada is demonstrating that it understands only too well the critical mandate it will have as the operator of the system and the priority it is placing on successfully meeting these challenges.

I will now very briefly reiterate some of the key provisions of Bill C-20 which continue to be the cornerstones of this legislation.

Safety will continue to have the highest priority for Transport Canada. Safety regulations will be in place before ANS is transferred. Transport Canada will monitor and enforce compliance with these regulations as it does now in the case of airlines. The Aeronautics Act which sets out the regulatory framework to maintain the safety and integrity of the aviation industry will prevail. I point out to members of the Bloc that it will prevail over the ANS Act.

The transfer will see approximately 6,400 public servants being offered positions with Nav Canada with equivalent working conditions and benefits. During the transition period until Nav Canada reaches its own agreements with the employees, the current collective agreements will continue to apply and bargaining agents will be granted successor rights. This tripartite employment agreement reached in support of this transfer was a major accomplishment in that Nav Canada, Transport Canada and the bargaining agents worked together very successfully. We are pleased that the bargaining agents and the employees themselves continue to be strong supporters of Bill C-20.

All of the assets used by Transport Canada in the provision of air navigation services will form part of the transfer, including land, equipment and other items required to ensure its continued effective and safe operation.

The act grants certain powers to Nav Canada as well as imposes certain operating obligations on the corporation. For example, it obliges Nav Canada to provide public notice of any contemplated changes in services or facilities that are likely to affect a significant group of users in a material way. In addition, a process has also been established in the legislation to ensure public input to decisions by Nav Canada in respect of the introduction, increase, termination or even reduction of services and of course the closure of facilities.

The government must also monitor the performance of Nav Canada as a monopolist. There are many safeguards against

possible use of arbitrary power. These start with the nature of Nav Canada itself which, as a not for profit entity without share capital, does not have a financial incentive to abuse its monopoly position.

The act establishes an economic regulatory framework in respect of user charges based on requirements for public notice and consultation. A set of charging principles is established in the legislation and there is an opportunity for users to appeal new or revised charges.

The charging principles address issues such as transparency, safety, impact, equity and international obligations. The act also provides an opportunity for users to appeal new or revised charges to the National Transportation Agency. The legislation prohibits Nav Canada from generating revenues reasonably and prudently projected from exceeding Nav Canada's current and future financial requirements for the provision of civil air navigation services.

Through the board of directors and advisory committee, users of the system will now have more opportunity to determine their future in the way the corporation and the system will operate. For example, stakeholders in the industry will have meaningful input into the use of ANS revenues, setting of fees, long term expenditures and service standards.

The government also ensured that the special transportation needs of isolated communities would continue to be recognized in a commercial environment. This act preserves air navigation services to northern and remote communities, including a process which will involve provincial and territorial governments should possible service reductions be proposed by Nav Canada at any time in the future.

• (1630)

In summary, here are the highlights of Bill C-20, which will allow the air navigation systems transaction, one of the largest and most precedent setting commercialization initiatives which the federal government has undertaken to proceed for the benefit of all Canadians.

For taxpayers, it will make a \$1.5 billion contribution to reducing the federal deficit.

For the industry, it will maintain safety while increasing the system's ability to respond to changing demands and new technologies.

For the users, it will provide more efficient and cost effective operations.

For the air navigation service employees, it offers the opportunity to continue to contribute in a new and challenging work environment.

For Nav Canada, it sets the stage for it to operate one of the best run and safest air navigation systems in the world.

Government Orders

Bill C-20 is yet another initiative by the government to ensure that the Canadian transportation industry meets the demands of our ever changing economy. This legislation, once passed, will be a milestone not only for Canadians but internationally, and something in which we should all take enormous pride.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: the hon. member for Lévis—Quebec bridge.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this bill at the third reading stage.

I became a member of the Standing Committee on Transport when we were at the final stages of the bill. We looked at the bill as a whole, and the amendments moved. I could see that the committee members had put a lot of work into it, and that there was a desire to correct a situation that had existed in the past, namely the problem of controlling the costs of air navigation.

The Bloc Québécois also saw, however, that the situation was a bit like a pendulum, having gone from one extreme to the other with no stop in the middle. The bill could, in our opinion, have turned into something worthwhile and acceptable. Its purpose was to create a not-for-profit organization in an attempt to involve representatives of the entire industry, with everyone having the opportunity to sit on the board. It seems, however, that the small carriers will not have a say, despite their expectations.

This is one of the negative aspects of the bill, and one which has not been corrected along the way since it was introduced. No amendment in this connection has been made, despite the numerous representations made about it.

Today, however, at the third reading stage, what I would like to tell the government is that, if it were to agree to modify the bill to give precedence to air safety instead of the financial stability of Nav Canada, this bill would have the potential of becoming an acceptable one, in our opinion.

That is what is missing from the bill at present, and our concerns have grown because of the government's refusal at other points, for example, to add a preamble to the bill which would satisfy the need for giving precedence to air safety. This is a very important aspect because of its considerable human impact. We have just had an example of this with the recent U.S. crash, with the loss of many lives, and all of the personal and economic aspects of it.

Canada has, in the past, acquired a reputation for air safety, since we have not had an undue number of accidents. From that point of

view we have had a good reputation; our problem lay more, as I have said, with controlling costs.

By trying to settle the problem of controlling costs, we are leaving the door open to the creation of a new air navigation problem: safety. In its present form, the bill does not address that aspect satisfactorily.

• (1635)

This is why we want to ask the government once again to consider the question and, if possible, accept an amendment from us that would make the bill acceptable to the official opposition.

Why does so much importance need to be given to safety? Well, this is an area where mistakes are fatal. Newspapers regularly carry reports of events that have taken place. In this area, for both equipment and people, the most important thing in getting the job done is safety.

We were told in committee, particularly by the spokespersons for the Air Canada pilots' association, by those who came to talk about the use of French in the air and by representatives of the general population, the users of air services, that this was an important consideration and that the government's responsibility should be carried out by Transport Canada.

This distinction is not in the bill. Why is the government not agreeing to include this request on safety in Nav Canada's mandate? The question arises when we look at the make-up of the board of directors. All the representatives of the industry are there, people who are obviously in an industry aimed at making money. The major carriers, like Air Canada and Canadian International and others, are in the air transport business to make money, obviously, and this is perfectly normal.

These people are on the board of Nav Canada and will have to ensure the services they receive from Nav Canada are charged at an acceptable level and that they, after calculating their own costs, will be able to declare a profit.

So when they arrive on the board of directors, their first concern will be to look at the effect of the decisions on their own companies. As for public protection, as it appears in the legislation establishing Nav Canada and in the mandate defined there, we will see whether the members of the board of directors in fact do abide by acceptable standards of safety.

Except that the mandate establishes no such requirement. There is no provision for anyone in Canada to refer to, in the event of an accident or for prevention purposes, saying: "In a certain airport, in a certain situation, Nav Canada decided not to provide a certain sort of equipment or service, and we would like it to do so for safety reasons".

Government Orders

The legislation as it stands contains no provision for appeal or consultation and certainly no legal clout making such arguments possible. So, as far as safety is concerned, there is some anxiety.

The method of financing Nav Canada is also worrisome. Let us take a brief look at how it will work. There are some very large carriers who will bring in a significant amount, who will provide a lot of money to finance Nav Canada, because of the frequency of use of equipment and of Canadian air space, while use by others will be considerably less.

Accordingly, when the time comes for the board of directors to make budgetary choices, when decisions have to be made about what equipment to invest in, certain individuals will have a greater say than others. I am speaking of those who control air transportation.

What, however, will happen to small carriers, as well as people living in remote areas, for instance? I do not necessarily mean the Far North, which the bill covers quite adequately by making provision for special rules, but regional airports. I could mention the Mont-Joli airport, in my region, or the one in Sept-Îles, or any other regional airport in Canada. If Nav Canada decides not to add a particular piece of equipment to their airport so that a particular plane can land, that would have an important regional economic impact. This is a reality communities will have to live with. We have a very telling example, the situation now being experienced in the area of Montreal and Mirabel, with ADM.

• (1640)

You will recall that this was an organization created by the former Conservative government to manage Montreal's airports. We have here the same financial objective as Nav Canada's. There is a decision to turn the management of the airports over to the private sector, just as the question of air navigation services is being turned over to the private sector, through Nav Canada. In both cases, the organization created will have a phenomenal amount of leeway and will not necessarily have to be truly accountable for its actions.

In the case of ADM, we now see what this leads to. Without in any way saying whether the choice of Dorval or of Mirabel is right, what can be said with certainty is that the public is not now in a position to judge the best possible decision. They must pretty much rely on ADM, which is not accountable for its actions to either the Government of Quebec or the federal government.

Even if the federal government owns these airport facilities, even if there is a lease between the federal government and ADM for the management of the Dorval and Mirabel airports, the government has not left itself any position from which it could say to ADM that the decisions it takes will have a major impact, a direct economic impact on air navigation, as well as on the tourist

industry, the industrial sector, and all sorts of other impacts. Again today, during question period, the federal government, through the responsible minister, could not tell us anything other than that ADM is autonomous and can do what it wants.

I give this example because, in the case of Nav Canada, it seems to me that there is a risk that we will find ourselves in exactly the same sort of situation in the years to come. There will be quite a heated battle in certain regions for safety equipment accommodating particular types of planes and people will practically be begging Nav Canada for this equipment.

No appeal mechanism is provided by which a community, citizens, organizations or users can be heard and can obtain rulings reflecting the economic impact of these decisions.

At the same time, I would also like to make a comparison with what happened with Canada Post Corporation. This is a Crown corporation with considerable leeway, which was given a mandate of becoming cost effective. Because this corporation was showing deficits, the only criterion was to require it to be cost effective. This led to a policy of brutally closing down post offices, with the determining factor being quite simply the age of the postmaster. It had nothing to do with the number of clients served.

It took a political decision, a moratorium by the present government to stop this operation. The same mistakes are being made, as though we were in some sort of neo-Liberal model, where, when we see the pendulum swinging back, we say: "Before, we interfered in everything and it was costing too much, because we were doing it badly. Now, we will not interfere in anything and we will give people free rein". But between these two extremes, a balance must be sought, and in the case at hand, it is the issue of safety.

This raises another problem as well, and that is the question of transparency. Even if Nav Canada makes the best decisions in the world, for them to be accepted by the regional communities involved, public debate must be possible. Certainly public debate brings about delays on occasion, but the time spent in public debate is often shorter and more profitable than that spent in legal wrangling.

We need only think of what is happening with the ADM, in the case of the Montreal airports, Dorval and Mirabel. Since we are not allowed access to all of the studies on this, we are now faced with citizens who want to institute legal proceedings, and unacceptable delays may result. The bill we have before us now will not solve this problem of transparency.

• (1645)

Let us just look at the question of the small carriers. In Canada, there are carriers that can be identified as major carriers with high volume and a heavy influence on air travel markets. There are,

however, also many small carriers. These are found just about everywhere in Canada.

There are, for example, tourist carriers which take southern hunters or biologists to the north. There are many of these in the west, and many also in northern Quebec. There are also small charter companies. These are not companies that do a lot of business, but they will be considerably hindered by the fee scales set by Nav Canada.

Setting fees in this way will not impact only on the economic survival of the small carriers. The rates set could well have only a minimal effect on the major carriers, but a considerable one on the smaller ones.

The way the board is set up, small carriers will not have enough representation to make themselves heard. I believe that Nav Canada could, in good faith, take decisions that are not intended to hurt the small carriers but will in fact do so. There will be a negative impact, and that is the first consequence of the fee scale.

There is another. Obviously, because there is more air traffic between major centres, the small ones, the small airports will find it harder to defend their arguments for obtaining relevant equipment.

As small carriers are the ones using small airports, a sort of vicious circle is created. We have people who are not represented on the board of directors—small carriers—and small airports with limited traffic, providing essential services to the smaller centres. In the end, this could even lead to lessening economic activity in certain regions. The effects of the choices made will be felt in two, five, ten or twenty years with the small carriers being shifted to the larger airports or simply eliminated. These are some of the effects of Bill C-20.

Despite the government's best intentions, despite the work in committee, the finishing touches are lacking. There is one element that was not given sufficient consideration. Accordingly, if there are no amendments, the official opposition will be unable to vote in favour of this bill, because some things need to be changed.

Let us consider for a few minutes the various decisions that will have to be made by Nav Canada and that may have negative effects because of this lack of concern for safety.

For example, Nav Canada could decide to set up new navigational equipment in an airport. As the bill now stands, the cost of the aircraft will be reviewed, as well as all the charges for the whole country, but not the issue of whether this equipment is really needed in this or that airport to ensure adequate safety. There will be no advisory committee to warn us of an inadequate level of safety in a given sector.

This is not an area in which things can be fixed afterwards. In air navigation services, any mistake that causes the death of people or

Government Orders

that has a major economic impact is very harmful to all of society. You may appoint as many inquiries as you like, but all it takes is one or two major accidents to have bitter regrets about not making safety a top priority right from the start.

• (1650)

Another decision that can be made by Nav Canada is to redistribute the equipment. For example, if air traffic in eastern Quebec was down, it could be decided that the facilities in Mont-Joli are no longer be needed and some of the equipment could be transferred to the national capital region, for instance. There is no control, no requirement to inform the regions concerned that part of their equipment will be transferred to another airport or to tell them about the possible consequences. This bill does not provide any mechanism for appealing decisions or consulting the communities affected.

Several amendments to that effect were put forward during consideration of the bill at report stage. Those amendments were rejected.

Now that we are at third reading, we would like the government to at least pay attention and realize that making safety a priority would have a direct impact on such decisions. Through this bill, the government could prompt Nav Canada to take into consideration the security of any given airport when moving equipment. We do not feel this was emphasized enough in the bill.

Generally speaking, this bill will no doubt make the whole cost control issue easier. I hope we will see a marked improvement. At the same time, it seems to us that it has deficiencies in terms of safety, by not making safety the first consideration. This is something we feel the government should reconsider before giving this bill the force of law.

In the coming years, we will live through the situation I described earlier and already experienced by other organizations, where the federal government has relinquished so much responsibility that it does not even have the nub to pull the door shut with. One, two or three years from now, it will not be able to tell Nav Canada that its decisions do not meet an acceptable minimum level of safety.

It is all interconnected. It does not allow citizens or users to request information about Nav Canada under the federal government's Access to Information Act because it has been decided that this act would not apply to this particular organization.

All the more proof that this bill is only about economic and cost effectiveness considerations. But what we are dealing with is not a cannery or some private sector enterprise where safety is not that important. This is an area where the federal government must always have some responsibility over safety, air safety and related regulations. It must give the organization it is establishing and

Government Orders

which will be in operation for many years to come the mandate to give top priority to safety. The bill does not contain anything to this effect.

That is why I move the following amendment:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following:

"this House declines to give third reading to Bill C-20, an act respecting the commercialization of civil air navigation services, because the bill does not give the safety of passengers, airline personnel and the public priority over all other considerations in business decisions made by Nav Canada."

• (1655)

I move this amendment, which I have signed, seconded by the hon. member for Blainville—Deux-Montagnes, hoping that the House will debate it and see that it can help ensure that the final product meets all public requirements in that respect, so that the bill is acceptable to all members of this House.

[English]

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of this bill. I think it is the best of all possible outcomes. That is not to say there are not some weaknesses and flaws in it. In honesty, what bill does not have something in it that could be improved?

I begin by making a few comments on the speeches by the Bloc members. I am sure these things were said with great sincerity. I noticed they member focused on various parts of Quebec. That is not unreasonable for a single province or regional party to do.

However, because I have a much broader spectrum, being the national transport critic, I have looked at the potential problems and concerns of the bill from a more national perspective.

Any time a change or something new is introduced it is only natural that it would make some people who are affected by it nervous. The member for the Bloc talked about no representation for airlines, even small airlines. He was speaking from Quebec's perspective, as he should.

Mr. Jenner is the head of a large airline organization in Quebec, representing mostly small airlines, the very people the member was concerned about. I am sure the member knows Mr. Jenner was offered a seat on the board of directors of Nav Canada and turned it down. Also, the head of the Canadian Owners and Pilots Association, small aircraft operators, was offered a seat on the board of directors of Nav Canada and turned it down.

I would not want him to leave the impression that Nav Canada is trying to bully these small companies and have a little clique of selected people. That is not the case.

The member also mentioned there would be no public consultation if Nav Canada decided it wanted to take a particular piece of equipment out of an airport and move it elsewhere. I do not know of any procedure that requires Transport Canada to have public

consultation if it wishes to move a particular piece of equipment from one airport to another.

I have seen some of the old equipment that Transport Canada operated a decade or two ago. If there were public consultation to finally move this rather decrepit equipment it would be cause for celebration and rejoicing.

When the bill was first introduced there were a number of possible ways of divesting Transport Canada of its air navigation system. A variety of things were looked at, including profit companies, a mixture of private sector businesses working together. Some sounded a little wild but were considered because, wild or not, they should at least be looked at because maybe there was a portion merit.

• (1700)

However it was very quickly narrowed down to just two particular aspects, one being a crown corporation and the other being the not for profit corporation which is what we have ended up with. As near as I can see, the government to its credit did not appear to be pushing any one scenario. The same thing cannot be said for the bureaucrats who were falling all over themselves trying to make sure it was a crown corporation while they were busy jockeying for position to ensure they got all the key positions in this new crown entity.

Fortunately, industry got its act together and the users and the various employee groups got together. They quickly recognized what was happening and that what was good for industry and the travelling public was the not for profit concept. They did an excellent job of not saying one at a time: "I want it and I can work with him". Rather they said: "We the industry, we the users, we the operators, we the employee groups, we the bargaining agents are all sitting together and we have agreed how to do this jointly". Thus was born Nav Canada. It was a very good collaboration by industry. People put together the best possible outcome for the divestment of the air navigation system.

The price was mentioned by the parliamentary secretary to the minister. Nav Canada was ripped off. I must make that comment because Nav Canada will not make it. Nav Canada negotiated with a gun at its head. They were the only obvious buyers and it was in their own best interests to ensure that they were the ones to take over this operation. They did not want somebody from outside with no expertise, with no concern about the users, the bargaining agents and all the internal people that make up Nav Canada to come in and take over. And they certainly did not want it to remain with the government because it was hardly an efficient or effective system.

They were the only buyers but they were also in need of getting the system and it had to come from the government. Therefore they had to pay whatever the government asked. I think they paid too much, in part to bail the government out of a problem contract it got into and perhaps also to pay off some other bad investments. One example is the microwave landing system. It was not that this concept was bad but government inertia makes it difficult to let go

of something when its time has passed. The government continued with the MLS long after it should have been abandoned, when other industrialized countries had dropped it.

We heard concerns and fears from some of the northern operators, even some remote regional operators, as the Bloc mentioned. I am a commercial pilot and I was an air traffic controller for 22 years. I have a lot of background in the specific issues people were concerned about. I have looked closely at what this bill contains and the risks. It is not a perfect bill, but what bill is? I am satisfied it contains the necessary protections and has the right intent with Nav Canada moving forward.

It is only natural that some operators should have some fears. That is to be expected. If there is any fault here it is that the government and perhaps even the committee, of which I am a member, did not do a good enough job of selling the idea and convincing the people that they were protected.

There is one area which came to the fore and troubled me a bit: general aviation and recreational aircraft fees. It is only natural for people to object to fees when they have been getting something essentially for free and which will now have a cost. Instead of a regular user fee for this category of aircraft there has been talk about a general flat annual fee. The amount that has been discussed is in the range of \$500 but there is nothing in the bill. It is a Nav Canada charge.

• (1705)

I have heard a lot of objections from different operators and owners of aircraft along with their representatives such as the Canadian Owners and Pilots Association. They proposed an alternative, not that they do not want to pay and I am sure they do not want to pay. Who does?

However, it is reasonable that a system is there. They will have to call flight service to get weather briefings and flight information and to file flight plans. Maybe they are not flying on instruments but many people who have the equipment—and many do—still tune in and use the airway as a navigation aid for themselves. They talk to air traffic control whenever they go into a controlled airport. Some of them fly on instruments and make use of the area control centres. It is not unreasonable that they pay something for the service.

One of the suggestions they brought forward was the idea of paying for the service through an excise gas tax. I hasten to point out that they pay a significant gas tax already. It could be some portion of the amount that is already paid dedicated to go to Nav Canada instead of the fee, or even possibly a bit of that combined

Government Orders

with a very nominal, and I stress very nominal, increase in the gasoline component of the aviation fuel tax. A pilot who flies 50 hours a year, which many private aircraft owners do, would pay based on his 50 hours. An operator or an owner who flies 500 hours would pay that much more in a similar type of aircraft because he potentially is making 10 times the use of the service.

I am not proposing that at this time. However this is enabling legislation, and is not a finely detailed, carved in stone type of legislation. I will continue to look at that proposal. I will continue to consult with the various groups and individuals this is going to impact on to see if that would have real favour. I will confirm with Nav Canada that it is something it would look on favourably if that were to be the type of system that was put in.

I move next to labour disputes. This is something that has not been overlooked by the committee. I brought it up. Again, it was something that came up. It is a very overwhelming issue. The bill moved through far too quickly. It would be a long delay to try to address this issue and would hold up a bill that should move ahead.

A lot of the bargaining agents are critical of the operation of the entire air transport system of this country, the total transportation system. The work of the air traffic controllers, flight service people, the licensing people has to continue. When it stops, the entire system stops. The government has introduced something and it is jury-rigged and a poor way of doing it.

I am not talking about this government, I might add, before I get its dander up for no reason. I do it often enough for reason so I certainly do not want to do it for no reason. I hear kind comments coming from the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands. Of course, those are the only comments I get from him.

What happened is a right to strike was given. I will use the air traffic controllers as an example. They are not the only group, but they are the ones I am most familiar with.

In the late 1960s they got the right to strike. In a contract dispute in the early 1970s when a settlement could not be reached between the Air Traffic Controllers Association and Treasury Board, the air traffic control system was shut down. The controllers went on strike and air transportation in this country stopped. After a week and a half in the dead of winter, the government legislated the controllers back to work. Mandatory arbitration was the settlement dispute.

Some time later, a contract dispute came up again. Once again it looked as if we were headed toward a strike. This time the government in advance of a strike taking place legislated the controllers so that they could not go out on strike and legislated the

Government Orders

settlement. In other words, it completely revoked not only their right to strike but even their right to bargain.

• (1710)

During the time when the strikes took place, the controllers had agreed and worked with the government. There would be a number of designated employees who would go in to ensure that safety was still maintained.

If there was an aircraft still up and in distress the controllers would handle it. If there was a medical emergency, the controllers would handle it. They would handle flights that reprovisioned remote communities in the north and air defence flights. All these types of things were still handled. It amounted to about 15 per cent of the control staff. The controllers did this willingly and the system was fine.

Sometime after the second piece of legislation, the government came out with a new list of designated employees. It pertained to everybody who controls aircraft. It came out with a list of designated duties which contained everything the controllers did. This was appealed and taken to court all the way to the top and the government prevailed.

From that day forward and for approximately the past 20 years air traffic controllers have had the right to go on strike, but when they go on strike every one of them has to report to work and they have to do all the duties they normally do. No other dispute settlement was put in place. The only dispute settlement is to strike when in fact they cannot strike. It has been a very unsatisfactory system for the past 20 years.

Now controllers and other bargaining agents in similar situations are once again getting back the right to strike. They are no longer covered by this legislation because they are no longer in the public service. They are now private sector employees covered by the Canada Labour Code.

I say in all sincerity that air traffic controllers are very conscientious and sincere people. They are interested in flight safety and in doing a good job. In fact, if controllers as a whole did not do a little more than the system even expects them to do or expects them to be able to do, the system probably would not work very well at all. They are very conscientious people but they are also people who have had a bad deal for 20 years. If there ever was a problem in negotiations between any of these bargaining agents and the new Nav Canada employer, we would have a major problem in this country.

The government had to legislate back to work the dock workers in Vancouver. I agreed in doing that. It causes severe economic problems in this country when the port of Vancouver goes down. The government legislated back to work the national rail system when it went on strike and I supported that as well. I believe it had to be done. But those two things pale in comparison to the economic impact of the air transport system of this country being shut down.

I say to the government that it should have a heads up on this problem. I want to make sure it understands that the problem exists, that we rely certainly on good faith bargaining between the various bargaining agents and Nav Canada, but at the same time the government should be aware that this potential problem is there. It may be necessary at some point in time for the government to do something about it and it should start putting some thought into it.

I will now move on to committee practices particularly with respect to this bill. I begin with the Canadian Transportation Act, specifically section 27.2.

When legislation starts in the House and goes to committee, I have to assume it goes to committee for a reason and not just because a piece of paper says that is the procedure. There has to be a reason for it to go to committee. I am told by the government that legislation goes to committee so we can discuss it openly, so we can hear witnesses, hear what problems might exist with the legislation, and address the concerns the majority of witnesses bring forward and find ways to deal with these problems.

There were many witnesses on that piece of legislation. Most of the people who came forward said: "Get rid of 27.2. It is a disaster for us". They quoted chapter and verse where all the problems were. On the other side were representatives of the National Transportation Agency, the government body. I asked them about section 27.2, which started as a significant prejudice and later became substantial commercial harm. What did it mean? They gave us a spectrum. Maybe it was a small loss or profit or, to the other extreme, maybe bankruptcy and anything in between. Lawyers will argue this for ages and precedents will eventually be set.

• (1715)

The government ignored that completely. It refused to do anything significant about section 27.2 or, more appropriately, remove it. Why were there all these hearings? Why was the bill sent to committee if the government was going to ignore what the public said? It then came back to this House.

A new minister is now responsible for this bill. A lot of the shippers began last minute consultations because there was a new minister and a new chair of the committee. They said they were really concerned about section 27.2. The minister said that he was also concerned, that he had just read it and had a lot of concerns about it. He asked for some time to look at it because he felt something would have to be done about it. This was nothing more than a ruse.

I offered the minister every opportunity to do something about section 27.2 without involving politics. I told him that if he wanted some co-operation to take it back to committee and do it in an all-party, relatively non-partisan way, no feet to the coals and no saying "I told you so, I'm right you're wrong". I told him it should be done because it was the right thing to do and that he had my total co-operation.

Government Orders

As soon as it was time for the vote they said they did not want to do anything. It passed and section 27.2 is still in the bill.

We then moved to another transport area involving the Department of Fisheries and Oceans or, more appropriately I guess, the department of oceans because in order to have a department of fisheries there has to be fish. The user pay concept is commencing, the coast guard recovery fees.

I attended the committee meetings of that department and listened to the witnesses talking about user pay. They recognized that they needed to pay and they were willing to pay. However, they thought the government was being a bit premature. There had been no cost rationalization of the coast guard and no impact study to see how this was going to affect them and the whole marine shipping strategy.

The minister was sure that the fees were going to have an impact and maybe cause some traffic to be diverted to the United States, but he felt that after the bill was implemented an impact study would be done to see how much damage it had caused. That is a pretty bizarre way of doing it. Again, it ignores everything that happened in the committee.

We now get to Bill C-20. At committee the government's privacy commissioner told us that he had a serious concern about the bill. At the present time the Privacy Act covers all the activities of Transport Canada in the operation of the air navigation system and when it is transferred to Nav Canada, a private corporation, that will not be the case.

There is also employee privacy which may possibly be dealt with in other ways. Almost everybody who takes to the air, except for some local flights, and who has to file a flight plan with particular information, is covered by the Privacy Act now. However, they will not be covered under Nav Canada as it is a private corporation.

The privacy commissioner said that it would not cost a dime and that the bill should include that the Privacy Act continue to apply to Nav Canada as if it were a crown corporation. This is the exact same wording that the parliamentary secretary bragged about tonight for the official languages. It was stated that Nav Canada, as a private company, still has to operate for the purposes of the Official Languages Act as if it were still a crown corporation.

I put in an amendment stating exactly that. I just extended what it said for the Official Languages Act. I wanted NavCan to be covered under the Privacy Act as if it were still a crown corporation. It passed. That is what a committee is supposed to do. It is supposed to consider these matters, listen to the witnesses and vote. Matters that are defeated are defeated and the matters that are passed are passed. My amendment passed and became part of the bill.

• (1720)

Democracy does not live well in committees. Certain parts of the committee, not sitting on this side of the House, did not like that. Democracy be damned, so they waited until the bill came to the House and put forward a motion to remove the amendment that the committee passed in response to the witnesses that came forward. That is not a very good system. It does not speak well of what the government does in committees.

I would like to turn now to what the Bloc said its amendment. The amendment is that the bill not be read the third time because the air navigation system will not be safe with Nav Canada.

I worked in the navigation system for 22 years. For all those years we wanted to get out of government control because it would be far more efficient and more technologically advanced. We could respond quicker to changing needs through the use of technology and changing conditions.

Contrary to what the Bloc says, I believe that the system will be at least as safe as it is now. I do not wish to suggest for a moment that it is not a safe system now. However, it is not in any kind of danger with regard to safety whatsoever. It will be a much more efficient and safe system once Nav Canada takes over. Therefore I will not be supporting the Bloc motion.

It will also enhance the air industry's viability. The air transport industry in this country is in trouble. Everyone knows about the clash between Air Canada and Canadian Airlines and how both of them are writing a lot of red ink. Perhaps that is why the government relates so well to them with its red ink book. They are in trouble. With open skies they get a lot of pressure from American competitors. They need to find ways to operate more efficiently.

If Nav Canada can operate the system, which is made up of users and operators, and operate it more effectively and more efficiently than the government does, then that is going to save money for all the people involved in the industry and it will enhance that industry's viability.

It will also give enhanced service and value to the travelling public. If NavCan can keep its costs down, better compete against foreign competitors, offer better fees and better opportunities to travellers and travel to more places, the travelling public has to benefit.

Finally, it is good for the general public. The government has been running this system for years at a significant loss. Most recently with some new initiatives added toward the end of the system being under government control, the government was

Government Orders

losing something in the range of \$200 million a year. This adds to the deficit and all the associated costs that go with that.

This is a good bill. There are some bumps in the road which the government could have handled a little better. If I had been in the government's place handling it, some things could have been done better. We have to move ahead. We have to recognize that the government needs to get out of business. The government's sole responsibility is regulation. It has retained all the regulatory controls. It will still monitor safety. It will still set standards. It will still ensure that those standards are kept up.

The government has brought forward several bills in the transportation sector. With one exception, the Pearson airport, they have been relatively good bills. It is only the implementation that has suffered.

I hope the government will continue to learn. I hope it will continue to listen, as the member for Kingston and the Islands is mostly doing, which is rather gratifying. When the government does I will be pleased to support it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): We will now move to the next stage of debate where members will be able to speak for 20 minutes subject to 10 minutes of questions or comments.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Mercier (Blainville—Deux-Montagnes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my speech will be quite similar to the one I made at second reading, since the bill before us is more or less the same, considering that all our amendments were defeated.

• (1725)

Again, we agree with the principle of privatization. However, we will oppose the bill because the government did not take into account certain principles which we felt were important and rejected our amendments.

One of these amendments had miraculously been accepted by the Standing Committee on Transport and we thought it would go through. It was an important amendment, since it provided that Nav Canada should, like the government did before, agree to comply with the Privacy Act.

The amendment had been adopted by the committee, but the government tabled another amendment to counteract ours. Therefore, the minister rejected the recommendation of the transport committee, even though his party has a majority in that committee.

Even so, we submitted other amendments that were all defeated. Let me quickly explain again what the issue was, to show the importance of the principle involved, and to explain why, in spite of our agreement in principle regarding privatization, we will have no choice but to vote against the bill.

First, there is the issue of privacy which we felt very important and regarding which our amendment was rejected. We also asked that further information be provided regarding the media and other means of communications that Nav Canada would use to inform the public about its intention to change, restrict or cancel its services, so that interested parties can react.

We felt it was important to specify which media should be used and how widespread the information should be, to ensure that everyone would be well informed. It would have been only natural to support this principle, but such was not the case. We also felt it was improper to have private users of Nav Canada's services pay for national defence, which is exempt from having to pay the fees involved. This situation is not reasonable. We tabled an amendment, but it was rejected.

More importantly, we wanted to emphasize the spirit of this legislation in a preamble. This is a private organization providing a public service, and we wanted the preamble to say that service to the public should always take precedence over financial interests. Even this principle, which would have been stated in the bill to ensure better service to the public, was rejected.

My colleague, the member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, drew a parallel between Nav Canada and ADM. We did not get together on this, but I am going to do the same thing, because the similarities and analogies are striking. ADM and Nav Canada were created by the government, more specifically the Minister of Transport. They are private organizations, both providing public services. What is now happening with ADM does not augur well for what may happen with Nav Canada.

I remind members that ADM recently took a decision, the principle of which I will not comment on here, but I protest against the fact that ADM, because of the status the government has given it, has no obligation to release to the public the information on which it based its decision.

• (1730)

Just a while ago, in response to a question, the minister said: "Yes, but there is SOPRAM". SOPRAM has 21 members. Of these, seven are on the board of directors that took the decision. Even this organization, which is, in short, the only avenue by which the public may examine ADM's decisions, even the members of this organization are not entitled to take out the studies that ADM says it used in reaching its decision. They must consult them on the premises. So much for the public's right to information.

So the parallel is obvious. The ability to make decisions in both these organizations is enormous, and the obligation to be accountable to the public, and to explain those decisions, is nil. It is therefore fairly easy to predict what might happen with Nav Canada. Just think about what has just happened with ADM. I would imagine that Nav Canada, with the enormous powers it

Government Orders

possesses, will make the decision to do away with this service or that service, when it does not seem sufficiently profitable.

As the law requires, it will publish its intention to do so in certain newspapers of its own choosing, according to criteria that are far too broad. Then, if there is no reaction, or even if there is one, since what is required is only to give notice, the situation will be judged and Nav Canada will take the decision it wanted in the first place, making its intentions as little known as possible and possibly without releasing the studies and other documents on which the decision was based.

In both cases, then, we are dealing with organizations that do not provide the public with the services it would have received when the government was providing them. Privatization, in one case as much as the other, has the effect of cutting back on services to the user, a lesser view of what service is, in one case as much as the other. That is what we cannot accept. Needless to say, I shall be supporting my colleague's amendment.

That, then, is what I had to say. Unfortunately, we cannot support this bill because it contains too many serious shortcomings to be acceptable.

Mr. Stéphan Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the debate on this bill because it concerns the representation of small carriers, the subject I have given greatest consideration to. We were told that the small carriers were represented.

I have here a series of facts. I have letters here. Those who are not familiar with the bill must understand that the government said it was going to privatize air services. No problem so far. For those who are not really familiar with air services, here is what that means. When a plane takes off from an airport, it must communicate with a control tower. Then there are the instrument flight rules and the pilot is in contact with other controllers whose job it is to direct aircraft according to the various weather conditions.

The government decides to privatize these services. So far so good. With the state of public finances at the moment, there is reason to think this is very appropriate. Then the government said it would appoint a competent board. Given that the government does not necessarily know everything in this area, it appointed a board to look after privatizing services and then set the charges for air services to users. When the time came to decide who would sit on the board of Nav Canada, discussions were held. My remarks will concern the persons on this board.

• (1735)

The people deciding the type of charges are probably experts in the area of aviation. The real problem is that, if these experts—as I

said—are major carriers, the charges will probably favour major carriers over small ones. This is my fear.

Coming from a remote region, I can confirm that small carriers in such regions encounter major difficulties. Travel by air is important if you want to go from the Lac-Saint-Jean region to Montreal. Air transportation is vital for business and economic development in remote areas; it also creates jobs. Given the need to provide a high level of service despite the fairly low number of passengers, costs are prohibitive. Ask most of the people in my riding and in all the regions from Vancouver to Newfoundland and they will tell you that plane tickets are very expensive.

This was the subject of a study. Every time the cost of tickets goes up by \$1, there is a corresponding \$1 drop in annual sales for the airline. Other modes of transportation are slower, but those who cannot afford to fly take the bus or the train even if it takes longer. But in business, time is important, time is money.

One chamber of commerce—I think it is in Matane but I am not sure—asked the Quebec government whether it could give remote areas a subsidy allowing them to reduce their costs. As I was saying, air service is a key factor of economic development.

This brings me to the squabble that surrounded the creation of the Nav Canada committee. As you know, sometimes it does not take much to provoke an outcry, but there may be cases in which such an outcry is justified. There are cases in which questions should be raised, but the issues are too complicated. That is one of the problems in this case; what happened is extremely complicated. People find it quite confusing.

I will try to explain the situation as best I can. The people in the Quebec air transport industry got together. As you know, I worked in that sector for three years so I am quite familiar with the difficulties faced by small airlines. Quebec set up an association of small airlines called AQTA or Association québécoise des transporteurs aériens.

We would have liked AQTA to sit on this committee for two reasons. First of all, because AQTA represents mostly small airlines and, second, because it represents the French fact in Quebec and Canada and also because it represents Quebec. I think it would have been important. There was a debate. They told us they invited us but we did not come.

I will quote from a few articles, including a letter of opinion published in *Le Soleil*. This letter, from Mr. Jenner of the Association québécoise des transporteurs aériens or AQTA, read as follows: “The privatization of Canadian air navigation services is turning sour. The Air Transport Association of Canada or ATAC has taken control of the new corporation”.

It is important to understand that the current president of Nav Canada is also the president of ATAC. The acronyms are confusing,

Government Orders

but the thing to remember is that ATAC stands for the Air Transport Association of Canada.

• (1740)

So this association is bragging, saying: "Look, do not say that small carriers are not represented. Not only does ATAC have a representative on Nav Canada's committee, but he is the chairman". The problem is, and I will come back on this later on, that ATAC and the AQTA are quite different in terms of representation.

The article reads on: "Ottawa has set out to privatize the entire Canadian air navigation system, which employs nearly 7,000 Canadians. A non-profit organization called Nav Canada has been created to eventually take over the administration of this operation on behalf of the industry. When the users committee responsible for incorporating the new company was formed, AQTA stepped aside to let the president of ATAC represent all users. This was too good to be true. As soon as the incorporation committee submitted the first draft of the letters patent, the fighting started", Mr. Jenner told the members of his association, who were gathered in Quebec City yesterday for their 20th annual congress.

The article reads on: "ATAC's president was holding the pen on our behalf but the fact of the matter is that he just wrote whatever he wanted to. He has betrayed us", Mr. Jenner told *Le Soleil*, adding: "Consequently, regional carriers are complaining about being completely excluded from the decision making process. Thus, any recommendation they may have made concerning the selection of board members came to naught. The president of AQTA had asked that Nav Canada's statutes and letters patent be bilingual, so as to recognize both official languages as equal, arguing that this was the practice in all legislation in Quebec and Canada. It was requested that the mission statement include a commitment to promote the use of the French language in air operations. The committee came back a week later, having settled the language issue. Only the company's name and corporate logo are bilingual".

So much for Canada being this great bilingual country. But this is another story, that I may get to debate in my future career.

According to Mr. Jenner, "such an attitude jeopardizes the headway made over the past 20 years in the fight for the use of the French language in the air transportation industry. What kind of quality of life and quality of service can we expect from Nav Canada's French speaking employees if management has a total aversion to our language?"

Sure, it is a bilingual service, except that only the logo is. But that is another issue.

Brian Jenner is concerned that small carriers are not represented on Nav Canada's board, particularly since the decisions that will be made will directly impact on the already exorbitant transportation costs in the regions.

The article goes on: "The costs of privatization are going up. Originally, there was talk of selling the service for an amount somewhere between \$800 million and \$1.3 billion. Now, the figure mentioned is \$1.7 billion, possibly more. The budget of the whole operation was also scaled up, as well as the anticipated deficit. In the end, the expected savings will give way to increased operating costs".

According to Mr. Jenner, "if regional airports are asked to be financially self-sufficient, it could really hurt air transport outside large centres. It is obvious that the Sept-Îles airport cannot self-finance itself; however, closing its control tower is not an obvious solution. There is a limit to the ability of small and medium size businesses to pay".

One problem is that if authorities find out that little use is made of a control tower in Sept-Îles or in northern Saskatchewan—because I am not merely talking about the interests of Quebecers but those of all small carriers in every remote area—if they find out you are not using your on-board equipment—I will spare hon. members the aviation jargon—they will decide to close it down because of the high costs involved. This is what privatization is about. If you want to keep your services you have to pay. How do you expect a small carrier to do that?

This was a letter published in *Le Soleil*, but I have another article, this one from the magazine *Circul-Air*, which is a Quebec publication on air transportation—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order, please. I would like to take this opportunity to remind the member for Lac-Saint-Jean that members may not use catalogues or other props. I would ask the member, if he wishes to quote from texts, to do so without a lot of fanfare, if I may put it that way.

Mr. Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean): My apologies, Mr. Speaker. I will see that it does not happen again.

• (1745)

In the editorial in *Circul-Air*, Édith Fournier, the general manager of Air Satellite and president of the council of the Association québécoise des transporteurs aériens, or AQTA, said the following: "In the course of the negotiations leading up to the privatization of air navigation services, we have heard some pretty strong language. John Crichton, the president of ATAC, the Air Transport Association of Canada—which I mentioned earlier—on the op-ed page of the January 4, 1996 issue of *Le Soleil*, took the contempt of regional bodies to new heights".

First of all, Mr. Crichton, from his lofty new perch as president of Nav Canada, took it upon himself to cast doubt on the accuracy of remarks made by Mr. Jenner, the president and CEO of AQTA at the association's 20th annual conference. In his article in *Le Soleil*, he said: "Let us be very clear: the bitter words of Mr. Jenner concerning the privatization of air navigation services say it all. Furthermore, they are an accurate reflection of the opinion of AQTA, which feels that ATAC stole control of Nav Canada away from small and medium size businesses in the air transportation sector."

As for Mr. Crichton's remarks about breaking solidarity, of greater importance to members of AQTA, there is a preoccupation with the almighty buck, a value completely foreign to AQTA. No one member is more important than another in our association. I will explain. Furthermore, it is because of scrupulous respect for this principle that AQTA rallied over 50 per cent of all Quebec air carriers, an unheard of level of support. ATAC cannot teach us anything about representativity, then, with its meagre 10 per cent of Canadian air carriers.

And here is where the problem lies. ATQA has more than 50 per cent of all carriers, whereas ATAC, which boasts that it is representative of all carriers, in fact represents only 10 per cent of them. They say ATAC is far larger. When one has on one's board members such as Air Canada and Canadian, which generate big bucks, one is capable of financing associations such as ATAC. The little guys are not necessary.

That is not the case with AQTA. In AQTA, whether you are a big or a small carrier, it is not the amount of your dues that counts. What counts is that you will be defended, and your membership is wanted.

Still quoting Mr. Crichton, it appears that Mr. Jenner was the only one opposed to ATAC's highjacking of Nav Canada. In reality, there was generalized opposition by the commercial airline associations, so much so that they formed the council of air carrier associations, or CATA, another four letter acronym to add to the confusion. There were some air carriers in Canada who did not agree and who formed an association called the council of air carrier associations to defend themselves against the privatization which had been decided upon with the greatest of insensitivity to the opinion of small and medium size businesses.

Through AQTA and other regional associations, the majority of small and medium size businesses chose to be represented by this CATA. Let there be no confusion. Democracy and fairness require that choice to be respected and not denigrated. Mr. Crichton still has a long way to go in that respect.

So that is about where the situation stands. I would have liked to talk of other things, including the letter from ATAC to Mr. Jenner inviting him to sit on the Nav Canada committee. I also have a letter from the AQTA, from Édith Fournier, the editorialist I have just referred to, expressing great pleasure, saying: "Yes, Mr. Jenner is in agreement, despite our not always agreeing on the

Private Members' Business

principle of Nav Canada, but since there was no other choice left, yes, we will get involved in the Nav Canada committee". A letter of acceptance.

I also have a third letter from ATAC, where the Nav Canada representative writes: "unfortunately, your candidature could not be accepted. Thank you for your offer, but unfortunately we cannot take you". And that is the end of that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I apologize for interrupting the hon. member. He can go on when the subject comes back to the House. If he wishes to complete his remarks, he will have two or three minutes at most. This is at his discretion.

In the meantime, it being 5.49 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider amending the Income Tax Act to provide a caregiver tax credit for those who provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill or the aged.

He said: Mr. Speaker, over the past two years I have presented a petition to the House of Commons which basically states 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 petition also states the Income Tax Act discriminates against families that choose to provide care in the home to preschool children, the chronically ill, the disabled or the aged. The petition therefore calls on Parliament pursue tax initiatives which would do just that.

Motion No. 30 is a votable motion of the House of Commons which asks the House of Commons and the government to consider the advisability of this motion and to provide a caregiver tax credit to those who choose to provide care in the home to preschool children, the chronically ill, the disabled or the aged.

I will give a bit of background. Last weekend I had the opportunity of attending a wedding of my cousin. As they exchanged vows I began to consider what family really meant to me.

Private Members' Business

This is a young couple starting their lives together. I wondered when they exchanged their vows did they automatically become a family. I looked around the church and I found there were many children there and I realized even more that family means children.

As I looked at my family members and relatives I saw an aunt whose husband had been disabled, chronically ill, and she had to leave her work to care for him. Tragically he passed away.

I saw a sister who is married but who decided not to have children. I saw my brother who has daughters, but both he and his wife decided to continue their careers because a parent lived next door to them who could care for their daughters during their formative years.

I saw my grandmother who is now 95 years old, who after my grandfather passed away had to leave her home because she was no longer able to care for it. Then she stayed with my mother. After some time as she needed more and more care it was evident she needed institutionalized care. I also saw a cousin who presently lives common law and who has no children.

Then I looked at my own family. My dear wife and I will celebrate our 25th wedding anniversary this year. We have three lovely children. My wife took 13 years off from her career to help raise those children to be fine young people.

The issue surrounding Motion No. 30 is family responsibilities. They are lifelong responsibilities, from cradle to grave. They reflect family values and social norms and values and choices related to children and other family members who may be chronically ill, aged or disabled

I quote Dr. Benjamin Spock: "Children are made to love. Parents love children because they remember being loved so much by their own parents. Despite all the hard work, taking care of children and seeing them grow up to develop to be fine young people gives most parents their greatest satisfaction in life. To reflect on children we see that this is creation, this is our visible immortality".

Dr. Penelope Leach is the author of *Children First*, a wonderful book which states that if couples are contemplating having children, one thing they must understand is they must be prepared to put the interests of their child ahead of their own. This is very difficult and in many cases not possible in today's society.

• (1755)

What is the current situation in Canada with regard to families and children? I come across many cases in which people have said: "Both of us are working. We have our children in child care spaces but after child care expenses, after income taxes, after the cost of employment, my net take home pay is so small I really do not know why we are doing this".

We have a situation now in which the drop-out rate in high school is around 32 per cent. We have growing concern about

young offenders and crime in general. We have concern about the literacy rate in Canada, which is presently at about the grade six level.

In 1968, 68 per cent of families with preschool children had one parent staying in the home and caring for those children. Twenty-five years later in 1993 that reduced to only 12 per cent.

We have social agencies everywhere for behavioural, learning and social skills. Schools even have full time psychologists now. Families are having increasing difficulty parenting their children.

The Standing Committee on Health is presently studying preventive strategies for the good health of children. We heard a number of witnesses. I refer to a couple of the points raised.

There was the point that quality day care cannot be provided or delivered without government subsidy, the reason being the salaries paid to qualified caregivers averages somewhere around only \$21,000. That was presented to us by Martha Friendly of the U of T child resource centre. She confirmed that the demand for subsidized child care is much greater than the availability.

Families are different. Choice and options are essential and desirable. Dr. Fraser Mustard of the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research also came before the committee. He told us about research that clearly shows there are factors occurring during the first three years of life that have a significant impact on the likelihood of positive outcomes of children, cognitive skills, social skills, behavioural skills, coping skills, mental and physical health.

We also had Dr. Marc Genuis of the National Foundation for Family Research and Education. He told us about a meta-analysis, a analysis of all the studies done on this subject matter.

He told the committee that if a child had more than 20 hours per week disruption of the secure attachment with the caregiver, there was evidence of increased likelihood of negative impact on socio-emotional development, behavioural bonding, consistent, secure attachment to an adult.

The *Globe and Mail* April 22, 1996 reported on a U.S. study, the most far reaching and comprehensive dealing with the first 15 months of infancy. It said the likelihood of a troubled mother-child bond can be increased by child care that is of poor quality, that changes several times or that extends to more than 10 hours per week. It also said that after the mother as primary caregiver, child care centres were ranked lowest in quality whereas fathers, relatives or other caregivers in the family home were ranked the highest.

This is not a situation of black and white. This is a situation of probabilities. We can have many situations turning out different ways but we are talking about the likelihood of outcomes. It is important for us to ensure there are high likelihoods of positive outcomes for the development of our children.

As legislators our job is to provide optimum flexibility to families to choose options suited to their situation and to their values.

What if more families could afford to provide direct parental care? In the short term, it would free jobs possibly for those on welfare or for those who really need the jobs. It would free the demand on child care spaces and institutionalized care spaces. It would reduce stress on the family and, most important, it would recognize the value of work in the home.

In the recent census we included a question to get information about the amount of unpaid work. In the long term health, social and criminal costs to Canada would decrease significantly because of the more positive outcomes of our children.

It would create healthier, happier families. It would allow families to better discharge their lifelong duties. It would be an investment in the healthy outcomes of our children and it would constitute a significant saving to the Canadian taxpayer.

• (1800)

The viability of M-30 needs to be assessed not from a financial perspective, but from a balanced perspective, taking into account both social and fiscal realities. The finance minister said to the House in his very first speech: "Good fiscal policy makes good social policy and good social policy makes good fiscal policy".

Now is the time to recognize that reality. Now is the time to stop defending the status quo based on soft mathematics. Now is the time to have tax reform which restores fairness and equity to all Canadians. Now is the time to reflect social priorities in our tax policy.

The recent bill on the employment insurance program showed some movement on behalf of legislators in Canada to recognize the value of work in the home and the importance of caregiving in the home. That reform showed this by recognizing and offering for the first time training assistance and wage subsidies to parents who have taken parental leaves to provide that parental care.

In October 1994 I had a private member's Bill C-256, which proposed income splitting between couples so that one could stay at home and care for preschool children. During the debate on the bill the finance department spokesman came before the House and dismissed it on the basis that the idea was too costly and because we had already provided many tax breaks to the family. In my view, no assessment of the social realities was given, no recognition to long term benefits and no mention of anything other than it being simply too costly.

Parents know intuitively that direct parental care is optimal. In a recent Angus Reid survey 70 per cent of parents, where both were working and had preschool children, said that if they could they

would choose to have one stay at home to provide direct parental care for their child.

I am not naive on this issue. The pie is not getting bigger. We do not have more money to spend. That means that we have to work smarter with what we have. Therefore, we need to reassess the propriety for existing deductions, tax credits and other tax benefits incorporated into the Income Tax Act. We need to establish whether tax breaks will be given on the basis of need and family income, such as is done with the old age security, the age credit and the new seniors' benefit which was announced in the last budget. We need to consolidate existing resources and allocate them to where we get the optimum benefit for all Canadians.

These changes will result in stronger, healthier families. I believe that if the family is strong the deficit would be gone.

The financial arguments against M-30, to provide a caregiver tax credit, take the narrow view of fiscal expediency and dwell on why we cannot rather than on how we can. I would like to give some examples to the House.

The child care expense deduction in the Income Tax Act provides for preschool children a deduction of \$5,000 per child. That is not available to a stay at home parent. It is only available to someone who actually incurs the cost and pays someone else to care for their child.

What is worse is that a deduction is worth more to a high income earner than to a low income earner. As an example, someone who makes \$60,000 a year and pays \$5,000 for child care space receives a refund cheque from the government of \$2,600. However, if someone makes only \$30,000 and incurs the same \$5,000 cost, their refund is only \$1,800. That is an \$800 difference when both taxpayers incurred the same expense for child care costs.

I have Bill C-240 before the House which proposes to convert that deduction to a tax credit so that it will be equitable and fair for all Canadian taxpayers.

Another example would be the supplement to the child tax benefit, which is \$213 per year, or a working income supplement, which could be up to \$500 a year. However, these are quite insignificant. They would represent something like about \$12 to \$13 a week. That kind of additional assistance to couples who want to choose to provide direct parental care simply does not facilitate that choice.

Also there is the disability tax credit, which can accumulate savings of some \$720 to the taxpayer who is caring for a disabled relative or dependant. The reason that they get the savings is that the disability credit is transferable to the relative that is taking care of them. Again, this represents a very small amount of money, some \$20 a week.

Private Members' Business

• (1805)

If Canadians were forced to provide care because they could not afford the cost of institutionalized care, this modicum, this very minuscule amount of dollars certainly is not going to deal with a situation that is imposed on a family. The family has that responsibility. Canadians want to be able to provide that kind of care in those situations for their family members.

The medical expenses credit provides a 17 per cent credit for expenses in excess of the lesser of 3 per cent of net income or \$1,614. This is available to all Canadians. What is not available to all Canadians is that those who are employed, who have employer paid plans, have all of their expenses covered subject to possibly certain deductions and there are some uninsured costs. Those uninsured costs then can be covered when they file their income tax return to claim the additional amount of the credit. Therefore, those who have insured plans have a better opportunity to recoup a greater proportion of medical expenses. That is not available to families who make the choice to provide care in the home to a family member.

We should have a special benefit. I proposed to the finance minister that there should be at a point special rules for uninsured Canadians so they do not have to have a deductible of the first 3 per cent of their net income and that every dollar of medical expenses incurred by families that are uninsured be covered in the Income Tax Act.

There is also an infirm dependant credit which could generate savings for a family of up to \$400; again, some \$8 per week.

The finance department in the past, and I suspect today, will characterize the existing benefits as significant assistance to the family. I characterize these benefits as inadequate in the extreme.

By investing in families through meaningful tax breaks which facilitate care in the home to preschool children, the chronically ill, the disabled or the aged, the savings to Canada in the long term would far outweigh the costs.

Motion M-30 is not a simple solution to a complex problem but rather an opportunity for all hon. members to ask themselves whether we can do better. I believe that we can.

Tax reform is an issue which I have talked about substantially in the House on a number of private members' bills and motions. I have also prepared a report which I sent to the finance minister before preparation of the last budget. I believe that the finance minister is open to suggestions on tax reform. A blue ribbon committee has been established to deal with the corporate taxation issue. I know the minister was very receptive to a number of the changes proposed. I am sure that the kinds of things that we are talking about are progressive and should be looked at very carefully.

Tax reform is not an option, it is an imperative. Therefore on behalf of the traditional family I ask the finance minister to heed his own words when he said that "good social policy makes good fiscal policy and good fiscal policy makes good social policy".

Now is the time for tax policy to reflect good social policy and the best interests of the Canadian family.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it I believe you would find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That should any vote by recorded division be requested on this bill today that it be deferred until next Monday, June 3 at 9.30 p.m.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on first reading of this private member's motion, there seems no reason to oppose it. If I may, I will read it again, simply for those who did not hear it the first time.

• (1810)

It reads as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider amending the Income Tax Act to provide a caregiver tax credit for those who provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill or the aged.

The initial reaction to this motion is to think, yes, but, if we support this motion, do we not run the risk of having the government use it as an opportunity to limit or change the benefits this group of persons already enjoys to ensure their quality of life?

There is the risk that, with this measure, by granting a tax credit, the government will reduce old age pensions or cut certain family allowances currently paid for small children.

In granting the tax credit, the government might also take away certain benefits accorded dependent individuals considered disabled.

Our first reaction was to say that we do not want the government to use this as a pretext to change the situation. After due consideration, however, we decided it was better to support this motion, which has the best of intentions, by proposing an amendment, which I will present to you in a few minutes at the end of my speech.

The purpose of this motion is not to improve the economy indirectly. We are not looking for ways to improve the lot of the unemployed or to reduce the deficit, although it would be nice to kill two birds with one stone.

The main purpose of this motion is really to find other ways to assist those who have been in dire need of such help for several years. We are thinking in particular of preschool age children, of those in early childhood, as the teachers and child psychiatrists who deal with them like to say.

According to the experts, it is before the age of three that children acquire almost all the psychological baggage they need for their own development.

Some experts say that the baggage received by children during the first three years will reflect on the rest of their lives and influence all other behaviours.

That being the case, it is important for children in that age group to have beside them people they can trust. These people are usually the mother or the father. But, when there is no mother or father available, there should be another adult in whom the children can confide, on whom they can rely every day to help in their development.

The government should have recognized this a long time ago and taken steps so that these children can get the help and support they need. Unfortunately, nowadays, financially strapped couples often have to place their children in institutions, which, as well-meaning as they may be, can never replace the love of a father, mother, big brother, big sister, uncle, aunt or grandparents who would be willing to raise these children but cannot do so for lack of financial resources.

• (1815)

A cure-all it is not but, in such cases, the tax credit could probably ensure that a larger number of can afford the time to do so. It could be that a person is looking to work outside the home to increase his or her self-esteem. Money is not always the only motivation.

But when people want to work outside the home but are penalized, either because their spouse will end up paying more taxes as a result or because they cannot find a job they like in a given field, there are instances where—as the hon. member who spoke before me pointed out—a cousin, uncle, aunt or other family member, provided they are not penalized, would take on this task, all the more readily if a tax measure were put in place to help them out.

Given a equivalent tax credit, some people may give up looking for a job outside the home paying \$5,000, \$6,000 or \$10,000 a year to look after children.

The same could be done for seniors. How many families are currently forced, again for economic reasons, to send a grandfather, a grandmother, a father or a mother to a seniors residence or a nursing home, because they do not have the time to look after them? Why do they not have the time? Because they must spend all their time earning a living to make ends meet, to provide for their family's needs.

Private Members' Business

If a tax credit could be applied to the family income, that is to the income of the working spouse, it would enable the other spouse to spend some time with an older person who, instead of being sent to a seniors residence, would live with the family.

The older person would not only be better off in terms of health care, but also in terms of his or her quality of life and psychological needs. Indeed, the emotional needs of seniors are met when they live with those they love and raised, and to whom they gave the greater part of their life. I am convinced that many seniors would then live longer because they would be in a better environment in terms of their emotional needs.

For these reasons, I feel it is important to support the motion of the hon. member for Mississauga South. However, I would like to propose an amendment to ensure that, after making such a change, the government would not be tempted to cut other benefits already enjoyed by these people. As you know, a government always means well. However, sometimes, when faced with difficult conditions, it tries to make up for what it gives by taking the necessary money elsewhere.

I move:

That the motion be amended by adding after the word "aged" the following:

"without curtailing the assistance already provided to those individuals and to those groups affected by the aforesaid motion".

This amendment is seconded by the hon. member for Abitibi. I submit this amendment to the House, in the hope that it will support it, to improve the motion brought forward by the member. The proposed amendment takes nothing away from the motion, quite the contrary. It simply allows the House to have a guarantee that all those we want to help will be helped without curtailing benefits they already enjoy.

• (1820)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The amendment by the hon. member for Joliette is in order.

[English]

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the motion put forward by the member for Mississauga South.

He points out this would contemplate changes to the Income Tax Act which would refocus available resources to those in need. Additional savings would be realized by reducing demand on child care spaces or institutionalized services. Cutbacks at both the federal and provincial levels necessitate that we look for creative ways to provide options or more choice to families.

Although the intentions are honourable, I feel the motion as it stands is vague. I missed the first part of his speech because of standing committee work. Unless it was pointed out earlier, it does not outline the amount of the tax credit he refers to so one can compare it to the existing redistribution of tax dollars that we now

Private Members' Business

apply to families in need, the disabled and all the people he wishes to assist in a greater fashion.

From his comments, I feel there is not enough of a cost benefit analysis. The motion talks of the need for people to have more money, to have more access to funds and it is a feel good motion. We all want to do the things this motion puts forward.

On a caregiver tax credit, I thought long and hard about what is a caregiver. A caregiver is somebody who earns money and who pays the bills. That is a caregiver. Whether they give the care to themselves as a single person, whether they give the care to a family of whatever size, a caregiver is someone who pays the bills. The existing system takes care of caregivers now because we do have a lot of exemptions, deductions, incentives and loopholes within the current system.

However, with the vagueness in the motion it seems the member for Mississauga South wants to give a bigger tax credit. He lists all the things this bigger credit would do, if it is a bigger credit or just a reshuffling. It would recognize the value of work in the home. It would free up jobs. It would free up child care spaces, spaces in long term care facilities for the handicapped and the aged, provide the option for direct parental child care, promote financial independence of the spouse in the home and enhance the quality of life for families.

It seems to do an awful lot of things but we do not know how much more we have to spend to achieve all those things. It sounds like the speeches I give when I talk about the flat tax and how that is the cure all and the end all for all our problems in this confusing complicated taxation system. It seems a caregiver tax credit will solve all our problems.

There is no question there are some issues the member is seriously trying to address, and I respect his efforts to do so. We both had private member's bills before the House in which we were concerned about the discrimination against stay at home parents. There is no question our system encourages, forces, begs, pleads and wants families to have both spouses working outside the home.

• (1825)

There is incentive to work outside the home. If parents each earn \$30,000 with two children at home versus a family that chooses to have one spouse work outside the home making \$60,000 and the other looking after the children and providing the care in the home, the difference in the family situation, same family size, same salary, is about \$6,000 or \$7,000 in taxes.

There is discrimination against stay at home parents. In order to solve the problem I presented a private member's bill which would provide a \$5,000 child care deduction for children up to age 7 and \$3,000 between the ages of 8 and 13. The finance department quickly calculated that number and the Parliamentary Secretary to

the Minister of Finance gave a nice speech and said "although the suggestion of the member for Calgary Centre is honourable and great, it will cost the taxpayers another \$6 billion more and therefore we cannot do it". So much for helping to eliminate discrimination against stay at home parents.

The member for Mississauga South also put forward a bill in which he looked at income splitting. I believe that suffered the same fate.

Mr. Szabo: It was not votable.

Mr. Silye: It is obvious the member is trying to find a way to get more money into the pockets of Canadians so they can look after the essentials of life, their children, the disabled and the aged and have more disposable income.

The solution is not by increasing the caregiver tax credit. The member also hinted that the solution is tax reform. He talked about the blue ribbon commission which will come up with a pink ribbon prize, I am sure. He is encouraging the finance minister to look further.

I support his efforts to eliminate discrimination against stay at home parents. This motion is too vague. It does not give any amounts and it will probably get shot down the same as my private member's bill did even though they both tried to do the same thing.

He is absolutely right about the tax reform angle he talked about. We have to create a tax free zone and allow the first \$8,000, \$9,000 or \$10,000 of a person's income to be tax free. We should also allow that same amount for a spouse, whether or not that spouse works outside the home. It would be the best way to develop good social programs by leaving the money in the hands of the people who earn it.

Currently the Reform Party is working on a simplified tax system in which the first \$8,200 would be tax free along with another \$8,200 for a spouse, for a total of \$16,400, and \$2,000 for each child up to age 16, which would be deductible as well. That would total \$20,000 for a family of four which would be zero taxed. Anything above that 21 per cent would be revenue neutral and all the other exemptions and deductions for the wealthy and the loopholes would be gone.

The income would be redistributed from this system of taxation which features a single rate through direct government spending, as is done through the Departments of Transport, Health or HRD. There would be better accountability and visibility of spending. That way we would get to a balanced budget faster and then we could decide how much more money to leave in the hands of the people who are suffering, the people who have specific needs for disabled. If they happen to be low income we could decide how much more we could help them. We could do it through direct

grants. Social workers in the field could find out where those 1 million starving children are.

We spend \$9 billion on this complicated, confusing, convoluted tax system we have now. Through five different programs we spend \$9 billion on children, subsidizing single parents, child care deductions, day care centres and there are a million children starving? This does not make sense to me.

I respect the efforts and the intent of the motion. However, because of its vagueness and lack of a cost benefit analysis I will be voting against it. It must be more specific. I really believe we should have a system in which the money is directly given to those people identified as being truly in need through direct spending instead of this mirage of the Income Tax Act. Change it, replace it with a simplified flat tax. That is how we could truly solve our social problems and create more hope, growth and expansion in the economy.

• (1830)

Mr. Barry Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with all this talk from the member opposite about shooting down bills I am proud to be part of a government that brought in gun control.

I am pleased to address private member's motion M-30. It asks the government to provide a child caregiver tax credit for those who look after preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill or the aged in the home.

The motion implies that the Income Tax Act somehow discriminates against families that make the choice to provide care at home for the categories of people mentioned earlier. In support of his motion, the member for Mississauga South implied in his remarks that the government does not care about families as much as he does. I know that is not the case.

The motion appears to target the provision of the Income Tax Act which disallows the deduction of child care expenses by one income earner couples. The purpose of the child care expense deduction is to recognize for tax purposes the child care expenses that taxpayers must incur in order to earn income, to attend a recognized educational institution full time or to take an eligible vocational training course.

This deduction provides a way for the tax system to acknowledge that those taxpayers have a lesser capacity to pay taxes than others with an identical income who do not have child care expenses. This deduction ensures up to a limit that income used to pay for child care expenses is not taxable.

In order to assist parents who choose to remain at home to raise their preschool aged children, the federal government introduced a supplement to the child tax benefit. The supplement is a benefit to low and middle income families that have preschool aged children

Private Members' Business

but do not have deductible child care expenses. This year the supplement is \$213 for each child six years old or younger and is in addition to the regular benefit of \$1,020 per child.

The federal government provides additional assistance to low income families through the working income supplement. This is a component of the child tax benefit. The working income supplement directs assistance to low income families with children by providing an additional annual non-taxable benefit of up to \$500. It supplements the employment earnings of families with net incomes below \$25,921.

As indicated in the budget presented to the House of Commons on March 6, assistance to low income families will be enriched through a two step doubling of the working income supplement. The maximum annual benefit will be increased from \$500 to \$750 in July 1997 and to \$1,000 in July 1998.

Recall for a moment that the motion suggests tax assistance should be made available to families that provide in home care for elderly relatives or relatives with disabilities. This already happens. Tax assistance for people with disabilities and for families caring for elderly or disabled relatives at home is provided by a number of existing tax measures.

For example, significant benefits are provided to those with a severe and prolonged mental or physical impairment through the disability tax credit. This credit reduces the federal tax of claimants by about \$720 and is equivalent to an exemption of \$4,233 for those in the 17 per cent tax bracket.

Where the disabled individual has little or no income, the unused amount of the credit may be claimed by a supporting relative. The ability to transfer the disability tax credit recognizes that people with disabilities and low incomes are often supported and cared for by family members.

I will focus on another provision of the act to further indicate things the act already provides for the categories of people mentioned by the hon. member in support of this motion. The medical expense tax credit is another such provision. It provides tax relief to those with extraordinary medical expenses by providing a tax credit for medical expenses in excess of a certain percentage of a taxpayer's net income.

The medical expense tax credit reduces the federal tax of a claimant by 17 per cent of qualifying unreimbursed expenses that exceed 3 per cent of net income or up to \$1,614.

• (1835)

Among the many expenses that qualify for this credit is up to \$5,000 in respite or part time attendant care expenses. This is specifically intended to assist families caring for elderly or disabled relatives at home. Tax assistance is provided for part time or temporary attendant care. Families caring for elderly relatives or

Private Members' Business

relatives with disabilities may also benefit from the ability to claim unused amounts of the credit.

Individuals supporting relatives with a disability may also claim the infirm dependant credit. This credit was significantly enriched in the budget presented to the House on March 6, 1996.

According to the income of the dependant, this credit reduces the federal tax of a supporting relative by up to \$400 and is equivalent to a deduction of as much as \$2,352 for those with incomes in the 17 per cent tax bracket.

Through all of these measures, the federal tax system provides a significant amount of tax assistance to families that decide to provide care in the home for preschool aged children, the disabled and the elderly.

I have given the House this evening a great deal of information about various programs which are already contained in the Income Tax Act. An hon. member opposite asked about cost. Let me state for the record that the programs I have outlined already provide \$1.4 billion in support to families that decide to provide care in the home for preschool aged children, the disabled and the elderly. These are substantial amounts of money available to families that support the disabled and the elderly. One of the problems with the hon. member's motion is that we do not know what it would cost.

I urge the House to withhold support for private member's Motion No. 30.

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure this evening to speak to Motion No. 30. I welcome the opportunity to speak to the motion which was put forward by my hon. friend, the member for Mississauga South.

The motion asks the government to provide a caregiver tax credit for those who provide care in the home for preschool aged children, the disabled, the chronically ill and the elderly. The tax system already provides a significant amount of assistance to families that provide care in the home for their dependants.

For parents with children, the child care expense deduction helps those with modest incomes with child care expenses they incur while at work, attending school full time or taking an eligible vocational training course.

The supplement to the child tax benefit helps parents who choose to remain in the home to raise their preschool children. It provides assistance to low and middle income families that have preschool aged children but do not have deductible child care expenses.

This year the supplement is \$213 for each child who is six years old or younger and is in addition to the regular benefit of \$1,020 for each child.

The working income supplement, the WIS, a component of the child tax benefit, helps low income working families meet some of the extra costs related to earning employment income, such as child care and transportation to work. It is a non-taxable benefit of up to \$500.

Changes introduced in the 1996 budget will double this supplement to \$1,000 by 1998, increasing the benefits to more than 700,000 working families by an average of \$350 a year. While the WIS is available to two-income families, it is also available to the single earner families where one spouse stays at home as a caregiver.

For people with disabilities and families caring for elderly or disabled relatives, the disability tax credit provides significant benefits to those with a severe and prolonged mental or physical impairment. The credit reduces the federal tax of claimants by about \$750 and is equivalent to an exemption of \$4,235 for those in the 17 per cent tax bracket. The unused amount of the credit can be transferred to the supporting relative to recognize that people with disabilities and low incomes are often supported and cared for by family members.

• (1840)

The medical expense tax credit provides tax relief for those with extraordinary medical expenses by providing a tax credit for medical expenses in excess of a certain percentage of a taxpayer's net income. Among the many expenses that qualify for this credit is up to \$5,000 in respite, or part time attendant care expenses. This is specifically intended to help families caring for elderly or disabled relatives at home by providing tax assistance for part time or temporary attendant care. Families who care for elderly or disabled relatives can claim the unused amounts of the credit.

Individuals supporting relatives with a disability can also claim the infirm dependant credit which was significantly enriched in the 1996 budget. Depending on the income of the dependant, the credit reduces the federal tax of a supporting relative by up to \$400 and is equivalent to the deduction of up to \$2,353 for those with incomes in the 17 per cent bracket.

Through all these measures the federal tax system provided \$1.4 billion in tax assistance in 1996 to families with preschool aged children, the disabled and the elderly.

My colleague's motion to introduce a caregiver tax credit does not indicate how much such a credit would cost taxpayers, nor are there sufficient details to estimate the proposed cost. If the proposed credits were to cost more than the current level of tax assistance, the government would have to reduce spending on other programs in order to avoid an increase in the deficit.

For these reasons the government cannot support private member's Motion M-30.

*Adjournment Debate***ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS***[Translation]*

On another note, there is no question that all of us would like to have a perfect family situation. We would like to have children reared in an environment that is caring and nurturing, where they get all the tools they require to become good citizens. The government works on many fronts. There are moneys in the Department of Health. There are moneys in the HRD department. There are income tax benefits. All of these are used collectively to try to improve the situation of Canadian families.

Where children are reared properly with a lot of nurturing and caring there is certainly a good community. If we travel around this world and see an environment where people are doing well, where there are many jobs and the environment is good there is less crime. When a country is functioning properly children are treated properly. They get the correct nurturing, they get the correct education and they develop. A country's chief resource is its people. It is people and ideas. It is not physical structures.

I like the general objectives of the motion of my colleague, the member for Mississauga South but obviously there are mechanisms currently within the system. After the deficit is looked after we may be able to look in that direction in the future.

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

Some hon. members: Question.

• (1845)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to order adopted earlier today, the recorded division on the amendment stands deferred until Monday evening, at 9.30 p.m.

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

QUEBEC BRIDGE

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on April 30 I put a question to the Minister of Transport about the Quebec bridge. As the reply did not satisfy me or the people of the Quebec City area, I hope that I will receive a better answer today from the minister or his representative.

Members will remember my question. In earlier replies, the minister kept repeating: "The Quebec bridge belongs to CN, and CN is now a private company. Since it is a private company, I, as the Minister of Transport, have no responsibility".

This is precisely what we want to challenge. In my question, I referred to the bridge between New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, in which the federal government has invested \$2.1 billion, although it is being built by a private enterprise, a consortium. We were trying to show that there was a double standard. After all, the Quebec City area has six times the population of Prince Edward Island.

Today, I would like to argue my point, since we have a few minutes. Why should the federal government continue? It cannot, in our view, invoke the transfer of responsibility to CN because of privatization for the following reasons.

CN was to receive in exchange for one dollar lands worth \$30 million for reconstruction and architectural restoration of the Quebec bridge, according to an agreement entered into in July, 1993. Earlier this year it was learned that Jocelyne Bourgon, of the Privy Council, the highest public servant in that body, had stated in a December 1993 letter to the Quebec deputy minister of transport, Mr Lalande, that the land would be fully transferred to CN only over a five year period.

In addition, the grant deed was signed only on November 7, 1995 by the federal Minister of Transport. This means, therefore, that the lands will not be fully deeded over the CN before November of the year 2000. The considerable neglect of the bridge occurred during the time that the federal government was still the owner.

• (1850)

By 1998, the federal government will have invested, and I give you these figures just as an example, \$250 million in the Champlain bridge and the Jacques-Cartier bridge, both located in the province of Quebec. So, we think the federal government should do the same for the Quebec bridge.

Adjournment Debate

Contrary to what the minister stated, the Government of Quebec has indicated that it was ready to reopen the agreement concerning vehicular traffic on the bridge, provided the federal government also makes a commitment within an agreement with both the CN and the Quebec Department of Transport.

The Quebec Department of Transport is ready to provide \$1.5 million a year, over the next 16 years, even if its current contribution is only \$25,000. Also, earlier this year, the Quebec bridge was designated a historic national landmark by the Minister of Canadian Heritage. Soon, Unesco will be designating the bridge as a world heritage site.

Under these circumstances, I do not think the federal government can argue that it is no longer its responsibility, as I said at the beginning, since it has yet to meet all the commitments it made to the CN.

Therefore, I would ask the representative of the minister not to give us the same arguments the minister used to turn down my request and to tell us if he has found the time, since the last time I asked a question on this issue, to meet with the Quebec Minister of Transport, who I know is very willing to do something about this whole situation.

I think the argument he used in his answer was also suitably addressed. So, can the federal government tell us what it intends to do about repairs to the Quebec bridge?

[English]

Mr. Stan Keyes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to address the question from the hon. member for Lévis concerning the government's responsibility for the Quebec bridge. I have had the occasion to drive over the magnificent structure and I have had the opportunity to be on a boat and pass under this historic landmark.

The hon. member for Lévis can ask the question time and time again, but we cannot change the facts. The Quebec bridge has been conveyed to CN along with other entrusted properties. In return, CN accepted a number of commitments, including as the new owner of the bridge, responsibility for a major maintenance program. CN is also committed to the 1993 agreement which transfers to it approximately 78,000 acres by July 1998 and not the year 2000 as was suggested by the hon. member for Lévis.

Despite the fact that the lands are located in six different provinces and jurisdictions, I am pleased to report that CN has made significant progress. Close to 20,000 acres have already been transferred.

Let me remind the hon. member that CN as owner of the bridge must restore this magnificent structure in order to ensure its long term viability. I reiterate that the bridge is CN's responsibility and I am confident it will fulfil its commitment as owner. CN has issued tenders already for more than \$1.5 million worth of work which will be undertaken this summer. There will be other significant expenditures by the company in the future.

As the hon. member is aware, the deteriorating physical appearance of the bridge is due in large part to the thousands of vehicles, the vehicular traffic that uses it daily. The hon. member should urge his provincial colleagues to acknowledge that the bridge's main purpose is a highway linking the north and south shore. He should urge his provincial counterparts to sit down with CN to negotiate an accelerated maintenance program that will see the main users pay a fair share.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24.

(The House adjourned at 6.55 p.m.)

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. PIERRETTE RINGUETTE–MALTAIS

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. GILBERT PARENT (CHAIRMAN)

MR. DON BOUDRIA

MRS. MADELEINE DALPHOND–GUIRAL

MR. GILLES DUCEPPE

HON. ALFONSO GAGLIANO, P.C.

HON. HERB GRAY, P.C.

MR. LEN HOPKINS

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

MR. JIM SILYE

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session – Thirty-fifth Parliament

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session — Thirty—fifth Parliament

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

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

MANITOBA (14)

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

NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

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

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
O'Brien, Pat	London — Middlesex	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Victoria — Haliburton	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Welland — St. Catharines — Thorold	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga West	Lib.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Lib.
Peters, Hon. Douglas, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Scarborough East	Lib.
Peterson, Jim	Willowdale	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Lib.
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Essex — Kent	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Lib.
Reed, Julian	Halton — Peel	Lib.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Perth — Wellington — Waterloo	Lib.
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — French River	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Lib.
Speller, Bob	Haldimand — Norfolk	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Northumberland	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of National Revenue	Brant	Lib.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew	Waterloo	Lib.
Thalheimer, Peter	Timmins — Chapleau	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Lib.
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Middlesex	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Lincoln	Lib.
Vanclief, Lyle	Prince Edward — Hastings	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Eglinton — Lawrence	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough West	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex — Windsor	Lib.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Lib.
VACANCY	Hamilton East	

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)

Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Secretary of State (Veterans)(Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Lib.
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Hillsborough	Lib.

QUEBEC (75)

Allmand, Hon. Warren	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau — La Lièvre	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni	Saint-Denis	Lib.
Bélisle, Richard	La Prairie	BQ
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	BQ
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Beauce	Ind.

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Mercier, Paul	Blainville — Deux-Montagnes	BQ
Nunez, Osvaldo	Bourassa	BQ
Paradis, Denis	Brome — Missisquoi	Lib.
Paré, Philippe	Louis-Hébert	BQ
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Lib.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Papineau — Saint-Michel	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	BQ
Pomerleau, Roger	Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies	BQ
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and Acting Minister of Canadian Heritage	Saint-Henri — Westmount	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
St-Laurent, Bernard	Manicouagan	BQ
Sauvageau, Benoît	Terrebonne	BQ
Tremblay, Benoît	Rosemont	BQ
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Témiscouata	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Hubert	BQ

SASKATCHEWAN (14)

Althouse, Vic	Mackenzie	NDP
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon — Clark's Crossing	NDP
Bodnar, Morris, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification	Saskatoon — Dundurn	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Ref.
Collins, Bernie	Souris — Moose Mountain	Lib.
de Jong, Simon	Regina — Qu'Appelle	NDP
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Regina — Wascana	Lib.
Hermanson, Elwin	Kindersley — Lloydminster	Ref.
Kerpan, Allan	Moose Jaw — Lake Centre	Ref.
Kirkby, Gordon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Prince Albert — Churchill River	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Swift Current — Maple Creek — Assiniboia	Ref.
Sheridan, Georgette	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Lib.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden	NDP
Taylor, Len	The Battlefords — Meadow Lake	NDP

YUKON (1)

McLaughlin, Hon. Audrey	Yukon	NDP
-------------------------	-------	-----

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chairman: Joe McGuire

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

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

Associate Members

Vic Althouse John Cummins	Ron Fewchuk Fred Mifflin	Jean Payne Roger Simmons	Paul Steckle Elsie Wayne
------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chairman: Bill Graham

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

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

Associate Members

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

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Chairman: Bill Graham

David Iftody	Bob Mills	Philippe Paré	Paddy Torsney	(5)
--------------	-----------	---------------	---------------	-----

SUB-COMMITTEE ON SUSTAINABLE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: John English

Colleen Beaumier	Maud Debien	John Godfrey	(4)
------------------	-------------	--------------	-----

SUB-COMMITTEE ON TRADE DISPUTES

Chairman: Michel Dupuy

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

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chair: Albina Guarnieri

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

John Bryden Paul Crête	Bill Gilmour Dick Harris	John Harvard Ovid L. Jackson	Gurbax Singh Malhi Dan McTeague	(11)
---------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------------------	------

Associate Members

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

HEALTH**Chairman: Roger Simmons****Vice-Chairs:****Beryl Gaffney
Pauline Picard**Antoine Dubé
Sharon HayesGrant Hill
John MurphyAndy Scott
Georgette SheridanPaul Szabo
Joseph Volpe

(11)

Associate MembersMargaret Bridgman
Jan Brown
Maurice Dumas
Laurent LavigneKeith Martin
Audrey McLaughlin
Réal MénardPat O'Brien
John O'Reilly
Bernard PatrySvend J. Robinson
Roseanne Skoke
Rose-Marie Ur**SUB-COMMITTEE ON BILL C-222 (FORMERLY C-337), AN ACT TO AMEND
THE FOOD AND DRUGS ACT (WARNING ON ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTAINERS)****Chair: Beryl Gaffney**Grant Hill
John Murphy

Pauline Picard

Andy Scott

Paul Szabo

(6)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HIV/AIDS**Chairman: John O'Reilly**Sharon Hayes
Réal MénardPat O'Brien
Bernard PatrySvend J. Robinson
Paul SzaboRose-Marie Ur
Joseph Volpe

(9)

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**Chairman: Maurizio Bevilacqua****Vice-Chairs:****Jean Augustine
Francine Lalonde**Warren Allmand
Christiane Gagnon
Daphne JenningsDale Johnston
Ian McClelland
Larry McCormickRobert D. Nault
Pat O'Brien
George ProudGeoff Regan
Anna Terrana
Stéphan Tremblay

(15)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Chris Axworthy
Leon E. Benoit
Bonnie BrownJan Brown
Gerry Byrne
John Cannis
Marlene CowlingPaul DeVillers
Wayne Easter
Jim Gouk
Herb GrubelRéal Ménard
Maria Minna
Svend J. Robinson
Andy Scott**HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE STATUS OF
PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES****Chair: Sheila Finestone****Vice-Chairmen:****Maurice Bernier
Andy Scott**Sarkis Assadourian
Jean AugustineSue Barnes
Daphne JenningsRussell MacLellan
John MaloneyIan McClelland
Réal Ménard

(11)

Associate MembersChris Axworthy
Robert BertrandSharon Hayes
Audrey McLaughlinPhilippe Paré
Svend J. RobinsonRoseanne Skoke
Myron Thompson

INDUSTRY**Chairman: David Walker****Vice-Chairmen: Nic Leblanc
Tony Valeri**Morris Bodnar
Pierre Brien
Bonnie BrownEd Harper
Tony Ianno
Walt LastewkaPhilip Mayfield
Réal Ménard
Ian MurrayWerner Schmidt
Alex Shepherd
Roseanne Skoke

(15)

Associate MembersPeter Adams
Pierre de Savoye
Nick Discepola
Jay HillKaren Kraft Sloan
Ghislain Lebel
Peter Milliken
Andy MitchellJohn Nunziata
Denis Paradis
Yves Rocheleau
John SolomonDarrel Stinson
Paul Szabo
Len Taylor**JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS****Chair: Shaughnessy Cohen****Vice-Chairs: Paddy Torsney
Pierrette Venne**Diane Ablonczy
Judy Bethel
Pierre de SavoyePaul DeVillers
Nick Discepola
Roger GallawayArt Hanger
Gordon Kirkby
François LangloisJohn Maloney
Jack Ramsay
Derek Wells

(15)

Associate MembersChris Axworthy
Jag Bhaduria
Garry Breitkreuz
Paul Forseth
Patrick GagnonJim Gouk
Stephen Harper
Sharon Hayes
Jay Hill
Gar KnutsonDerek Lee
Val Meredith
Bob Mills
George S. RideoutSvend J. Robinson
Bernard St-Laurent
Myron Thompson
Randy White**SUB-COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY****Chairman: Derek Lee****Vice-Chairman: George S. Rideout**

Nick Discepola

Gar Knutson

François Langlois

Val Meredith

(6)

LIAISON**Chairman: Bill Graham****Vice-Chair: Albina Guarnieri**Reg Alcock
Eleni Bakopanos
Maurizio Bevilacqua
Raymond Bonin
Charles CacciaMary Clancy
Shaughnessy Cohen
Sheila Finestone
Patrick Gagnon
Michel GuimondGhislain Lebel
Clifford Lincoln
Joe McGuire
Andy Mitchell
Jim PetersonRoger Simmons
Lyle Vanclief
David Walker
Paul Zed

(21)

Associate Member

Jack Frazer

SUB-COMMITTEE ON BUDGET**Chairman: Jim Peterson****Vice-Chairman: Paul Zed**Sheila Finestone
Jack Frazer

Bill Graham

Michel Guimond

Andy Mitchell

(7)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chairman: Michel Guimond

Vice-Chairmen: Denis Paradis
Andrew Telegdi

Sue Barnes
Pierre Brien
Rex Crawford

Ivan Grose
Leonard Hopkins

Charles Hubbard
Yves Rocheleau

Jim Silye
John Williams

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Jag Bhaduria

John Bryden
Mac Harb

Ed Harper
René Laurin

Ian McClelland
Alex Shepherd

TRANSPORT

Chairman: Reg Alcock

Vice-Chairmen: André Caron
Joe Comuzzi

Gerry Byrne
Joe Fontana

Jim Gouk
Ed Harper

Charles Hubbard
Jim Jordan

Stan Keyes
Paul Mercier

(11)

Associate Members

Vic Althouse
Leon E. Benoit
Ivan Grose

Dick Harris
Jake E. Hoepfner
Ovid L. Jackson

John Maloney
Philippe Paré

Bernard Patry
Elsie Wayne

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chairman:

Vice-Chairman:

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Roch Bolduc
Philippe D. Gigantès
Maurice Riel

Peter Adams
Roger Gallaway
Jim Karygiannis
Philip Mayfield

Paul Mercier
Pat O'Brien
Roseanne Skoke

(10)

Associate Member

Ted White

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joint Chairmen: Sen. Jean-Louis Roux
Patrick Gagnon

Vice-Chairmen: Jean-Paul Marchand
Benoît Serré

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons

Gerald A. Beaudoin
Marie-P. Poulin

Jean-Claude Rivest
Louis J. Robichaud

Warren Allmand
Eugène Bellemare

Cliff Breitzkreuz
John Godfrey

(12)

Associate Members

Gaston Leroux

Bob Ringma

Jim Silye

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairmen: **Sen. P. Derek Lewis**
Ghislain Label

Vice-Chairman: **Derek Lee**

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

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

Shirley Maheu
Pietro Rizzuto
Nicholas W. Taylor

Gilbert Fillion
Mac Harb
Gar Knutson

Dan McTeague
Tom Wappel
Ted White

(16)

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

A CODE OF CONDUCT

Joint Chairmen: **Sen. Donald H. Oliver**
Peter Milliken

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

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

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

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

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

(21)

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

Panels of Chairmen of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. PIERRETTE RINGUETTE-MALTAIS

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

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

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

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

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 29, 1996

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Indian Election	
Mr. Lee	3121
Property Rights	
Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	3121
Old Age Security Pension	
Mr. Bernier (Beauce)	3121
Air Canada	
Mr. Dumas	3122
Dr. Jake O'Connor	
Mr. MacDonald	3122
International Kite Festival	
Mr. Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)	3122
Fundy Gypsum Company	
Mr. Murphy	3122
Impaired Driving	
Mr. Lebel	3122
Canadian Wheat Board	
Mr. Thompson	3123
Canadian War Museum	
Mrs. Wayne	3123
The Environment	
Mrs. Brushett	3123
Official Languages	
Mr. Boudria	3123
Chinook Salmon	
Mr. McWhinney	3124
Canadian Parliamentary System	
Mrs. Guay	3124
Parliamentary Service	
Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge)	3124

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Minister of Human Resources Development	
Mr. Gauthier	3124
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	3124
Mr. Gauthier	3124
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	3124
Mr. Gauthier	3125
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	3125
Mr. Duceppe	3125
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	3125
Mr. Duceppe	3125
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	3125
Minister of National Defence	
Miss Grey	3125
Mr. Collenette	3125
Miss Grey	3126
Mr. Collenette	3126

Miss Grey	3126
Mr. Collenette	3126
Varenes Tokamak Project	
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	3126
Ms. McLellan	3126
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	3127
Ms. McLellan	3127
Minister of National Defence	
Mr. Hart	3127
Mr. Collenette	3127
Mr. Hart	3127
Mr. Collenette	3127
Atomic Energy of Canada Limited	
Mr. Canuel	3127
Ms. McLellan	3127
Mr. Canuel	3128
Ms. McLellan	3128
Justice	
Mr. Ramsay	3128
Mr. Rock	3128
Mr. Ramsay	3128
Mr. Rock	3128
Drug Patents	
Mr. Brien	3128
Mr. Manley	3129
Mr. Brien	3129
Mr. Manley	3129
Infrastructure Program	
Mr. Bertrand	3129
Mr. Massé	3129
Taxation	
Mr. Solberg	3129
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	3129
Mr. Solberg	3129
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	3129
Aéroports de Montréal	
Mr. Crête	3130
Mr. Anderson	3130
Mr. Crête	3130
Mr. Anderson	3130
Justice	
Mr. Thompson	3130
Mr. Rock	3130
Mr. Thompson	3130
Mr. Rock	3131
The Environment	
Mrs. Parrish	3131
Mrs. Kraft Sloan	3131
Gliding School	
Mr. Fillion	3131
Mr. Collenette	3131
Mr. Fillion	3131
Mr. Collenette	3131

Republic of Macedonia	
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	3131
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	3131
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	3132
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	3132

Hollinger Incorporated	
Mr. Solomon	3132
Mr. Manley	3132

Agriculture	
Mr. Collins	3132
Mr. Goodale	3132

Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	3133

THE ROYAL ASSENT

The Speaker	3133
-------------------	------

The Late William Kemping	
Mr. Charest	3133
Mr. Collenette	3134
Mr. Leblanc (Longueuil)	3135
Miss Grey	3135
Mr. Blaikie	3135
Ms. Torsney	3136

Points of Order	
Distribution of Literature	
Mr. Blaikie	3136
Mr. Laurin	3136

ROYAL ASSENT

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Zed	3137

Justice	
Mr. Rock	3137
Mrs. Venne	3138
Mr. Ramsay	3139

Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Mr. Zed	3140
Citizenship and Immigration	
Mrs. Bakopanos	3140

Constitution Act, 1867	
Bill C-284. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	3140
Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	3140

Committees of the House	
Scrutiny of Regulations	
Motion for concurrence in first report	3140
Mr. Lee	3140
(Motion agreed to.)	3141

Procedure and House Affairs	
Motion for concurrence in 19th report	3141
Mr. Zed	3141
(Motion agreed to.)	3141

Petitions

Taxation	
Mr. Szabo	3141

Alcohol Consumption	
Mr. Lee	3141

Rights of the Unborn	
Mr. Wappel	3141

Justice	
Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	3141

Abortion	
Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	3141

Human Rights	
Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	3141
Mr. Lee	3141

Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Zed	3142

Motions for Papers	
Mr. Zed	3142

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Civil Air Navigation Services Commercialization Act	
Bill C-20. Motion for third reading.	3142
Mr. Anderson	3142
Mr. Keyes	3142
Mr. Crête	3145
Amendment	3148
Mr. Gouk	3148
Mr. Mercier	3152
Mr. Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	3153

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Income Tax Act	
Mr. Szabo	3155
Mr. Boudria	3158
Motion	3158
(Motion agreed to.)	3158
Mr. Laurin	3158
Amendment	3159
Mr. Silye	3159
Mr. Campbell	3161
Mr. Jackson	3162
Division on amendment deferred	3163

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Quebec Bridge	
Mr. Dubé	3163
Mr. Keyes	3164

Appendix

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**8801320
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canada Communication Group — Publishing

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Groupe Communication Canada — Édition

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :

<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from the Canada Communication Group — Publishing, Public Works and Government Services Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, at \$1.75 per copy or \$286 per year.

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant au Groupe Communication Canada — Édition, Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, à 1.75 \$ l'exemplaire ou 286 \$ par année.