



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 064 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, February 20, 1998

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

All parliamentary publications are available on the
“Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire” at the following address:

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, February 20, 1998

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1000)

[*English*]

CANADA LABOUR CODE

The House resumed from February 19 consideration of the motion that Bill C-19, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Jim Gouk: Mr. Speaker, for clarification, as I understand it, the member from the Liberal Party had just finished speaking at the last period for debate on this bill and is now subject to a period of 10 minutes of questions and comments.

• (1005)

Is it possible to proceed in that way, given that comments can be made by opposition members relative to the speech she made?

The Speaker: Technically speaking it is, if the time is available. I do not know if the member is here.

The hon. member has 10 minutes of questions and comments coming to her. Are there any questions and comments?

Mr. Jim Gouk (West Kootenay—Okanagan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I was reviewing the speech made by the hon. member when this bill was last debated in the House and I would like to comment on a couple of the things she stated.

First of all, and I am quoting from *Hansard*, she said: “I reject the view that collective bargaining is no longer relevant. The freedom of workers to organize and bargain collectively is a cornerstone of our democratic, market based society”.

She went on to suggest that Canadian employers have also benefited from the collective bargaining system. She said: “It helps to ensure stability, predictability and efficiency”. She goes on to state that 95% of collective agreements in Canada are negotiated without a work stoppage.

The problem is not with the 95% of the collective agreements which are settled without a work stoppage. The problem is the overwhelming impact of large national employers that represent the 5%. That is the stoppage we are worried about.

One side says do we penalize the 95% because of the problems created by the 5%? We say no, do not penalize anybody. Who says that something that started 150 years ago should carry on without change? Who says it should not be brought in at least to the 20th century as we approach the 21st?

Strikes and lockouts are not a part of collective bargaining. They are a result of the breakdown of collective bargaining. Strikes and lockouts are a form of coercion used by one side or the other to try to return to real collective bargaining.

What we need is a dispute settlement mechanism which works without causing catastrophic harm to Canadians, to Canadian workers, to Canadian business, to the Canadian economy and to our international reputation of having reliable suppliers.

She uses the words reliability, certainty and efficiency in her speech, but what we need is something which absolutely ensures Canadians that—

The Speaker: I will give the hon. member a chance to respond.

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my hon. colleague. His point is well taken.

There is no doubt that when 5% of the workforce is affected by a strike or a lockout, a disruption in service, there is an impact. However, it must be balanced with the fact that collective bargaining has been and continues to be in some fields a very necessary tool in maintaining safety in the workplace and work standards, in setting hours that are to be worked to avoid inordinate hours and in setting types of pay. Collective bargaining is important in many different aspects.

Government Orders

As the hon. member pointed out, 95% to 97% of all bargaining is settled. That is a heck of a good record. When both sides sit down they have the opportunity to air their complaints and they come to an agreement. That agreement fosters a good working environment. People want to work together and they want the company to do well.

We have to look at all sides of the issue. In this piece of legislation there are a number of riders and conditions concerning strike and lockout rights which will be helpful, such as the provision for a 72 hour advance notice of a strike or lockout which must be given to the other party and filed with the minister of labour. That will avoid surprising the parties and the public.

There are a number of key things such as that in the bill.

The Speaker: My colleagues, if I know how many hon. members want to ask questions or make comments then I can divide the time.

• (1010)

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification from my hon. colleague.

I would say that a lockout or a strike is serious enough as it is. I cannot understand why there is no provision in this Bill C-19 to prevent the employer from hiring replacement workers. When there are disputes, sometimes, there is violence. In Quebec, we have antiscab legislation prohibiting the replacement of strikers.

I wonder why a similar provision was not included in this bill, so that workers cannot be replaced while on strike. I think this would make the rules of the game clearer. This would prevent acts of violence. It would prevent outbursts of anger and fights.

[*English*]

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to answer this question. The reason that the bill does allow for some conditions for replacement workers is that we believe the bill has to be balanced and fair.

We will hear Reform Party members say they want that very strongly. We will hear the NDP and the Bloc say they do not want any.

The reality is that the Liberal Party has always stood for fairness and balance in trying to find a compromise that is workable. That is what we are trying to achieve in this bill, some sort of compromise that allows for employers to continue if it is needed, but that there are safeguards.

There are things in the bill like the formation of the new board which my colleague from Lambton—Kent—Middlesex is going to address later this morning.

They all are an integral part of the bill which will make it work well. I really hope members will support this. I went to Vancouver with the minister and we had about 140 individuals come to speak to us, with very few dissenting votes on this bill.

Farmers pleaded for it. We had labour pleading for it. We had several different types of management pleading for it. I think we really need to get on with this. It needs reform and we are going to try to do that in a balanced way.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one of the aspects of Bill C-19 that we are optimistic about is the composition of the new industrial relations board.

I would like to ask if the parliamentary secretary to the minister could speak a little about how she might see the composition of this new board speeding the backlog of cases currently pending.

One aspect is that, from this point onwards, a single chair or vice-chair might be able to hear certain matters, rather than waiting for the composition of the full three person panel. We would hope that might be able to expedite a backlog of cases.

I would be interested in hearing some targets or goals or ways she might be planning on dealing with that.

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain: Mr. Speaker, it is very kind of my hon. colleague to allow me to elaborate a little on this because I think it is a key part in the good working of this bill.

The bill provides for the establishment of a new representational industrial relations board to replace the non-representational Canada labour relations board. I think that is a key part.

The statute will require that the chair and vice-chairs have experience and expertise in industrial relations. It seems to be common sense, although it was not always there, that the minister consult employer and employee organizations on the appointment of representative members, again a really good thing.

It will make the board more responsive. It will provide flexibility necessary to ensure that applications are dealt with in a timely manner and allow for a more cost effective administration of the code and encourage the use of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, which again is key because we are looking at different ways to solve disputes. That is key when we have problems in this area.

It will address complex labour relations issues in today's changing workplace, a very important part of this bill.

• (1015)

Mr. Jim Gouk (West Kootenay—Okanagan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is West Kootenay—Okanagan. A number of MPs have a bill in to amend the names of ridings. By the time you have got it, it is going to change again. I just thought I would put you on warning.

I am very pleased to rise speak to Bill C-19. There is a lot to be said about it and I believe a lot of people in the House will be speaking about it today.

It is interesting that the Liberal member who just spoke said it was neither fish nor fowl. They like to sit in the middle. They have not really done a lot for this side or that side. They have done a bit here and a bit there. Sometimes that works and other times it does not. This is an example of when that type of approach to things simply does not work. Instead of fixing the problems, they make it a little bad for both sides. In other words, they reduce the problem to the lowest common denominator of a problem.

It is appropriate that I lead off with a reiteration of the Reform Party's written policy on labour, the right of workers to organize democratically, bargain collectively and strike peacefully.

I would like to break that down into three separate parts so we can deal with exactly how the bill relates to our written policy on these things. The first one is the right to organize democratically.

Democracy can refer to the right of an individual or it can refer to the right of a group. In the case of the bill it allows the renamed CIRB to certify a union without the support of a majority of the employees. The bill also allows the CIRB to order an employer to release to the union the name and addresses of employees who work off site without requiring the employees' permission. Both these provisions totally ignore the rights of individual employees and ignore the rights of employee groups.

How can it possibly be said that democracy is being upheld, the question of organizing democratically, if the majority of the bargaining unit or the employee group has not said they want to be part of this union but this new CIRB can go ahead and establish it anyway? That is hardly organizing democratically. It is basically one person or a small group of people making an arbitrary decision for a very large group of people. That is something that flies in the face of democracy.

Likewise, to say that an off site employee, a contracted employee, can have his name and address applied to a union without his permission is also undemocratic. If the Liberal Party is looking for balance, this thing that says we do not want to go too far this way or too far that way, how about making a requirement that the employer pass on to these individuals materials supplied by the unions? These individuals would have an opportunity to see what the union is proposing, what it wants to do and a way of contacting it if that is what they choose to do.

Government Orders

However, to arbitrarily hand out names of non-union people to the union so that they can take whatever action they choose to take, I do not think meets the test of democracy at all.

The second part of our written policy deals with collective bargaining, the right to bargain collectively. Here is where I differ from the member who just spoke and the NDP member who intervened in questions and comments. I do not see taking away the right to strike in certain situations as ending collective bargaining. I do not understand the concept of thinking or lack thereof that goes through someone's head when they say that strikes are what collective bargaining is all about.

Strikes are an indicator of the failure of the collective bargaining system. That is all it is. Collective bargaining involves three things. I have told hon. members this before. Maybe if I tell them enough it will start to sink in. There are three components to collective bargaining: negotiation, conciliation and mediation. Those are the tools of collective bargaining.

When collective bargaining fails we have a strike by the employees or a lockout by the employer. It is pure and simple. Even then that strike or that lockout does not solve the impasse. It drives them back to the other point where either an offer comes through negotiation or they go back to mediation and conciliation. Strikes and lockouts do not solve problems. They are a form of coercion that is used to drive the other side back to one of the three steps of collective bargaining.

• (1020)

Consider the taking away of the right to strike of workers in certain situations, essential services. Let us use an example that everybody accepts. Would we expect to see the police standing on the sidewalk watching someone being beaten, mugged, raped or killed and doing nothing because they were on strike? Of course we would not. We understand that in the public interest we must have the police on duty. Even the NDP accepts that.

Have we done away with collective bargaining? Why can we not allow them to negotiate, to have conciliation, and to have mediation? If all those things broke down, the only difference would be that rather than go on strike and get into the scenario I have just described we would have a dispute settlement mechanism that is as fair as possible.

We will talk a little later, as I am sure many members expect, about final offer arbitration. The point is that during the kind of collective bargaining where the right to strike is not an end result, if something goes wrong we still have the collective bargaining process. During that process any method of settlement could be agreed upon. Right now we can still do that.

When someone is negotiating and things are not going well, if they have the right to strike the decision can be to go on strike or to lock the employees out. They can mutually agree to binding arbitration. They can agree to flipping a coin. They can agree to

Government Orders

just about anything. Under what we have proposed they could still do that.

Final offer arbitration is a dispute settlement mechanism that is used to prevent work disruption that has a catastrophic impact on Canadians, our economy, our business and our international reputation. They can still settle on whatever other method they want. All we want is to have some dispute settlement mechanism that can be used if all else fails and they cannot agree on anything else.

The third part is to strike peacefully. We believe in the right of unions under normal circumstances to strike peacefully if things have not gone well. It is a very inefficient way to settle the problems, but in the normal run of things we agree that under the present process they can strike if they cannot reach a settlement and this is the route they choose to go, as long as it is a peaceful strike.

Maybe the question of what is and what is not peaceful needs to be examined. Peaceful does not necessarily refer only to the lack of violence. A strike, for example in the port of Vancouver, impacts on business and industry across British Columbia because they need products coming in through the port. The strike could involve towns and communities being shut down and workers being laid off.

This could happen in certain small towns in my riding. In one town the principal employer is a smelter. In another town the principal employer is a pulp mill. If they cannot export their products or bring in ore or the different supplies and materials they need to run their plants, they shut down entire towns. It affects farmers right across the prairies.

Is that peaceful? Is it peaceful when the entire economy of a town is thrown into turmoil and some people lose their businesses or their livelihoods? Maybe they have mortgaged their homes to put money into their businesses and they risk losing them. They are not even part of the negotiation process. They are an example of what happens when it goes wrong.

Over the past few years we have had national port strikes and national rail strike. I had the same problem in my riding during the national rail strike. We reached a point where it was almost a shutdown of the economies of entire communities.

We have just had a Canada Post strike, the fourth strike in 10 years. Each time it ends up in legislation. Is this a good process? Should we let them go on strike? Should we say "Yes, you have the right to strike, but when you go out we will legislate you back", or should we come up with something that meaningfully deals with some form of dispute settlement mechanism? It would ensure that workers would not lose their wages and the company would not lose its revenue and ultimately some of its business, which means jobs for the employees. What about all the people who are impacted by mail dependent businesses?

• (1025)

Maybe we need to look at this situation collectively. I realize that each party has different political philosophies and points of view. Instead of standing on our own little hills and saying I am right, maybe we need to sit down together to find some way to address all the problems.

The bill, by singling out the grain industry for special consideration, is acknowledging the need to make special provisions. Why do we not do it across the board? The bill recognizes that there should be some certainty in the ability of farmers to ship grain and in our fulfilling international grain contracts.

In this case we are talking of the ports. What about all the other things that go through ports? A tremendous amount of potash from Saskatchewan used to be shipped internationally through the port of Vancouver. The port was so unreliable that the Saskatchewan potash industry made a deal with the port of Portland, Oregon, to build new facilities. It is shipped by rail down there. It is felt to be a much more certain method of shipment. The port of Vancouver has lost that business.

Workers have lost work because of strikes which have resulted in shippers being concerned about the reliability of that port. That business has gone. They cannot come back and sign a 10 year contract. Those facilities have been built and the contracts have been made down there. That is business lost to Canada. That is revenue lost to Canada. Those are jobs lost to Canadians.

When we start questioning the right to strike, we are not only doing it for business, for taxes, or for things of that nature. We are doing it for jobs, about which I am sure the other parties feel very strongly. They want more jobs for Canadians. They want better jobs for Canadians. We cannot have better jobs for Canadians if Canadians lose their jobs because the people who use the services do not feel confident about them.

Strikes and lockouts hit absolutely everyone. They hit the businesses, employees and jobs I have just described. Everybody is impacted. It is an old, archaic way of dealing with a problem. We have to find a new way.

I would like to touch on one aspect of the bill on which I admit that I differ from my own party's position. Who says at any time that everything is right or everything is wrong? There are always different colours. I want to address the fact that I differ for a very specific reason on the point of replacement workers. I happen not to like the concept of replacement workers. From my point of view I would be quite happy if there were no replacement workers. I know this is at odds with my party. The strength of our party is the fact that we do not all have to stand and sing off the same song sheet.

Government Orders

The whole concept of strikes is stupid. It has to be changed and I have already addressed that at length. Replacement workers tilt the scales to one side. If there is a strike or a lockout employees cannot replace the company. They cannot replace management and go back to work while management stays out because they did not co-operate. How can there be an offset of balance on the other side? They cannot replace the company but the company can replace them.

The collective bargaining system needs to be amended so that we have a better dispute settlement mechanism and there are no strikes. Then the question of replacement workers will not even come up. While it is there, all we are doing is trying to soften some of the impacts of strikes to make like it is not as bad as it is. It is bad.

Some people might find this humorous, but I recently saw a rerun of an old episode of the original *Star Trek* program. A planet had been at war for 300 years. In order to get rid of the carnage and the destruction of its civilization, buildings and everything else, it agreed to fight the war by computer. What happened was another world mounted an attack by computer. The computer decided how effective the attack would be and how many people would have to be killed. Then they just marched 125,000, or however many there were, into destruction chambers. Nice and clean, no carnage, no destruction of their buildings or anything. And because they had done it in this clean way to soften the impact of the real horrors of war, the war had gone on for 300 years.

• (1030)

Good old Captain Kirk went in and destroyed all the destruction chambers so they could not meet their quota and then the real war started. He said that was what was necessary to solve the war because as long as you keep putting band-aids on something, you are never going to have the real impact of problems and consequently you are not going to deal with the real problems.

In this case it is strikes and lockouts. We cannot keep putting in things that tilt the balance of the real horrors of strikes and lockouts. Let it get to its absolute worst and then maybe finally people will realize we have to find a better way to resolve these things.

For the Reform Party the better way is final offer arbitration. I have spoken to union groups and business groups all over the country on this particularly in my own riding. One of the things I say is if there is something better that does not result in a work disruption, I am all for it. If they would rather do something else as long as it does not end up in a work disruption, then I think that is great. But until such time as someone comes forward with a better idea, and given that I am totally opposed to work disruptions because they are bad for absolutely everybody, then I think this is a viable alternative.

Final offer arbitration is something designed first of all to bring the employer and the employee as close together as possible. Hopefully that 95% becomes 96%, 97%, 98%, as close to 100% as can humanly be brought. There are always going to be some difficulties where employees and employers simply will not settle.

Let us talk about wages. Simplistically put if it is a wage item and all the economic indicators in the marketplace suggest that a rightful raise is \$1.50 and the company offers \$1 and the union says it wants \$5, the union is going to end up getting 50 cents less than it would reasonably be entitled to because it was unreasonable in its demands. Likewise if the union says it wants \$2 and the employer says "We do not think you deserve anything and we are not offering anything", the employees are going to get 50 cents more than they were reasonably entitled to. Each side knows it. And if they want to roll the dice and say 'We are going to try for \$5 just in case the arbitrator is sleeping and lets this slide through', it is not going to work.

There are suggestions that it is still a roll of the dice. It depends on how the actual mechanism is designed. It can be designed in such a way so that it cannot be an arbitrary decision of either this package or that package. Rather it has to be weighed against a whole number of economic indicators, the cost of living, past raises, the ability of the company to pay, comparability as to what other industries in comparable workplaces are paying, all of these different factors.

That can be designed into it. There can be a requirement that the arbitrator or arbitration panel, if that is the way it is designed, has to make a decision as to which one is closest to meeting all of the requirements. Then when the arbitrator is finished a report has to be prepared justifying the package that has been chosen against each of those indicators.

We can design something that will work. It will work for both sides. It will work for the employer and it will work for the employee, but every bit as important if not more so, it works for everybody else in Canada who is impacted by these strikes.

A small strike that deals with a store and its employees in a small group and there are alternatives for customers and there is no major impact is one thing. However when there are strikes that shut down the industry of this entire country, we have to recognize that we have globally grown to the point where it is no longer feasible to have work disruptions in certain industries.

• (1035)

This bill recognizes that in the grain industry. Why stop there? If it is recognized that the problems in the grain industry are too overwhelming, then why can it not be seen that this needs to be expanded to others as well, to the mining industry, to the forestry

Government Orders

industry, to all of the other industries so that Canada can once again have a reputation of being reliable.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of points I would like to raise with regard to the speech by the hon. Reform critic.

He started with a comment on what he thought was an unfair aspect of the bill. It had to do with the automatic certification in an organizing drive where the union can demonstrate that there were unfair labour practices, or where the board finds there were unfair labour practices the board may then intervene and grant certification even if the number of union cards signed does not indicate a majority vote.

I challenge the Reform critic's reaction to this. It is very much an issue of basic fairness and natural justice in that where there is interference to the point where the true wishes of the employees cannot be figured out because there has been interference, then it should be the role of the board to intervene just to give them the benefit of the doubt and grant that certification.

The counterbalancing aspect of this is that a year later, after the certification has been granted, if those same employees do not like being represented by a union, they can decertify just as easily as they certified. Many people do not realize that. A group of employees can make application to the board at any time and decertify just as they can certify the union. I really do not think it is an issue and it is one of the fairer aspects of the code.

The member spoke a number of times on how strikes, work lockouts and interruptions are in fact violent figuratively and literally. I would argue that withholding one's services is the most peaceful way of dealing with any kind of an impasse in the bargaining process. In fact it is a form of passive resistance. It is time honoured. All through history groups that have not had access to sources of power traditionally have used the act of withholding their services to add emphasis to their argument.

I do have other things I would like to speak about but lastly, the member and I have had the argument about final offer selection a number of times and I am not going to speak to that at length. In fact I would like to recognize the—

The Speaker: The hon. member for West Kootenay—Okanagan.

Mr. Jim Gouk: Mr. Speaker, I will try to be brief because I know there is another question.

First, I point out to the hon. member that I am not the labour critic. I just happen to be speaking on this bill on behalf of our labour critic.

Second, the hon. member talked about interference in the process of certification by giving them the benefit of the doubt. Why not give them the benefit of the doubt the other way? That cuts two ways. If there is no proof that those employees want to

join, then why not have it conducted by a separate vote individually for those people and find out. Do not just arbitrarily assume that they were interfered with so they would have joined.

The concept that they can just decertify after a year is an absolute crock. The member knows full well that once a union is in place, if those workers step forward and identify themselves as being opposed to that union, boy, if they do not get it decertified they have a major problem inside that bargaining unit.

The second thing the hon. member talked about was passive resistance, the peacefulness of a strike. He totally missed the point which unfortunately is not really surprising.

Where the problem lies, and I used an analogy to violence, is when families are going hungry, when businessmen in small businesses are losing their jobs, are losing their businesses and perhaps are losing their homes. Entire communities are shut down because the services impacted on them. When that happens, that is my understanding of something which is not peaceful, not violent in the physical sense but certainly violent in terms of disrupting good Canadians' lives.

• (1040)

Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I will speak rather specifically and I do not know whether the member will want to respond.

Over the years a number of things have happened in the transportation industry. The statutory freight rate was dropped and rail line abandonments are taking place. All of this was supposed to help western diversification. People were supposed to begin processing agricultural products inland to reduce some shipping charges or things like that. These kinds of things now take place, but under the current regime the things that are protected at port are the unprocessed agricultural products like grain.

My riding happens to have a number of dehy plants. Their concern is that their products are not protected under legislation like this. They ship their products out to the coast. Grain shipments are protected but we are talking about all farm income, not just the grain portion of it.

This legislation is deficient in this regard. It does not really protect farmers' interests the way it is meant to. It protects the grain industry, but it does not necessarily protect the agricultural industry. Small shippers will be left vulnerable because the government would be under pressure to deal with the strike where grains are concerned but it would not be under any pressure to seek a resolution for the smaller shippers like agricultural dehy plants.

I would like to bring that to the attention of the House. Not everything fits into broad definitions. Consequently we need a mechanism that will protect everybody. I believe that the final offer arbitration selection process is the way to go, aside from having to have an exception or something written into every piece

Government Orders

of legislation, such as the grain transportation act and things like that.

I would like to see the House seriously consider what our hon. member is proposing.

Mr. Jim Gouk: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief in my response. The hon. member raises a good point. I brought it up at length during my speech in debate.

It cannot be said too often that government recognizes the need to intercede in the grain industry, therefore why can it not recognize that need in other agricultural areas, in mining and forestry and in all the other commodities that are shipped? There cannot be special treatment for one.

I want to make it absolutely clear that we are not suggesting that grain be taken out. We think the fact that the government recognizes it is a small baby step in the right direction. What we are asking the government to do now is to recognize that it actually, by accident or otherwise, did something right, and to build on that and to do something right, to protect all industries, all agricultural sectors not just one small part.

Mr. Pat Martin: Mr. Speaker, on the subject of FOS, I would like to actually move a little from the arguments that I have had with the previous speaker a number of times on final offer selection. As he is aware, I have used final offer selection in the province of Manitoba and I am well aware of the whole process.

The difference between the legislation in Manitoba and what the hon. member has been putting forward here is that the employees get to vote on whether or not they would use the final offer selection process. Therefore either party, the employer or the employees, can make application in this case to the provincial government to use the process. The labour board would then supervise a vote of all the employees. If the majority of the employees chose to settle the round of bargaining by FOS, so be it. There would be no strike, no lockout and a final selection arbitrator would ultimately choose.

In a situation like that, I have no argument. I think it is a useful tool. We recognize that. I have actually used it in my personal labour relations experience. I will give that.

Mr. Jim Gouk: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his intervention on this point. I understand how it worked in his home province. It worked well but it worked slightly differently.

• (1045)

I hear objections but I do not hear alternatives. If he thinks final offer arbitration is not the best way to proceed, surely he would not say the only viable alternative is economic mayhem in this country, having people from one end of the country to the other who are not part of the strike, are not part of the bargaining group, impacted sometimes catastrophically.

If he would come up with an alternative which would solve the problem of job disruption, which would deal fairly with the—

The Speaker: Resuming debate, the hon. member for Mississauga West.

Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker. I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Lambton—Kent—Middlesex.

I want to talk a bit about some of the issues the previous speaker touched on. I also want to talk about what is the role of government in the area of labour relations.

I suggest that, very important, the role of government is to try to establish a balanced and level playing field which has some fairness. We see that in provincial governments. We have seen it traditionally in the federal government.

When the hon. member opposite talks about final offer arbitration as being the panacea to labour unrest, I think he misses a number of key points.

I do not believe that responsible labour leaders want to lead their people on strike. They want to negotiate the best deal they can for the men and women in the rank and file. They know the hardship of going out on strike. Many have come up through the rank and file. They know the last thing they want to do is lead their people out on strike.

What the hon. member did not mention is that these labour leaders are elected. Indeed they are politicians. I know a bit about it because my father was one for 26 years, the national director of the United Steelworkers of America, a vice-president of the Canadian Labour Congress and the chairman of the ICFTU in Brussels. He has had a bit of experience in the area of labour relations, as have I.

During my previous incarnation in the Ontario legislature I was the labour critic for the Liberal Party when Mr. Rae was in power. Believe me, there were a number of issues which came forward in that regime. It was a bit like shooting fish in a barrel.

Members have talked about a number of issues. They have talked about replacement workers.

An hon. member: What happened to you?

Mr. Steve Mahoney: The member asks what happened to me. Fundamentally, all the labour leaders today, particularly industrial labour leaders, are vice-presidents of the New Democratic Party. That was not the case in the days of Bill Mahoney. That was not the case in the days of Joe Morris. That was not the case in the days of Charlie Mallard. That was because they understood that it was their responsibility to represent the men and women who elected them at every level of government. If they walked into a meeting with John Diefenbaker, Mike Pearson or a Conservative provincial premier they knew that person automatically knew they were a

Government Orders

vice-president of the party whose main goal in life was to destroy the government—

An hon. member: So they were dishonest.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Excuse me. The member is suggesting my dad and those people were dishonest? I find that to be a repugnant comment from the member of the New Democratic Party.

It was quite the opposite. They were honest, dedicated and faithful to the people they worked for, the men and women who elected them.

I want to tell him something else. I believe it was in 1958. I was a fairly young boy and it was Christmas time. We had a large family. My mom and dad had 10 kids. They were both in labour quite often. There was a strike in district 6 which involved the cities of Hamilton and Sault Ste. Marie. It was a big strike. It was a big issue.

• (1050)

My dad was the national director. I remember my family having some pretty good Christmases, but this one Christmas was particularly lean. My mother explained to me that my father was on strike pay and that it would be a difficult Christmas. Is that not interesting?

The member opposite says he would like to see some solutions that would avoid strikes. How about if the head of the union goes on strike pay when he or she leads their membership out on strike? That might make them change their minds. This is just an alternative idea that I throw out to the member.

The problem with final offer selection is that it works only in financial matters. There is a lot more involved in labour negotiations and labour relations than simply the \$1.50 raise the member talked about. There are health and safety issues, conditions in the workplace and the term of the contract. There can be a lot of different issues put forward that simply will not fit in that neat little box that the Reform Party seems to want to wrap up labour relations into.

I heard a member asking if we would expect a police officer to stand by and watch a crime being committed because they were on strike. Everybody knows that the police and firefighters cannot strike. That is a given. That is not what we are talking about.

What we are talking about in this bill is creating a level playing field where labour and management can sit down and negotiate. What are they negotiating? The workers, through their leadership, are negotiating with the only tool they have, their services. Their services are their product. They can go to management and tell it what their services are, that they are underpaid, conditions are bad,

they are concerned about its health and safety track record and they want management to improve things.

Some people will say unions were important back in the 1930s and 1940s but they are not important today. I strongly disagree with that. I did not follow in my dad's footsteps in the labour movement. I went into business. I too have concerns when there are irresponsible strikes, which we have all seen. However, I also have concerns when there are companies that refuse to bargain in good faith.

What we are putting forward are a number of amendments that will bring some form of calm to the labour relations movement in this country and bring clarity to the ability to certify a union. What can possibly be wrong with saying to a new organizing union that it must get somewhere between 35% and 50% of the people to join its union and sign a card before a vote is ordered? If the union gets over 50%, which is not just a matter of submitting cards but a clear indication that men and women who have signed these cards want to form a union, then the board can certify a majority of the people who would be in the union or could call for a vote.

In some jurisdictions such as Ontario we have seen where some unions have said that there was going to be a vote no matter what. Even if 90% of the cards are signed, the union does not care because it is an automatic vote and it is a right of democracy. I understand the rationale behind that, but there are also a lot of problems in the federal area when that occurs simply because many of the jurisdictions we are talking about are right across the country.

When we talk about people who work in the airline industry they can come from all across the country. When they land in Montreal are we going to run up and get them to sign a card or cast a ballot as they leave the airplane and come down the ramp? It is very difficult. There must be more structure just because of the 700,000 men and women who work in the private sector regulated under the federal act. That is what this does.

I would also like to talk briefly about what I think is totally a red herring, the issue of giving out names and addresses to people who work off site.

• (1055)

We live in a different economy today. We see what is happening in the union movement. It is now trying to organize McDonald's, taxi companies and other service industries. In the case of the Canadian Auto Workers, only 25% of the membership of the CAW work in the automobile industry.

It is all over the map. Why? The union is a business. It is a thing called dues. When it gets those dues, it has more money. It has more money, it has more members. It has more members, it has more influence in this place and all legislatures. What is wrong

with that? That is democracy. It is growing its business. Members would say it ties things up.

Am I out of time already?

The Speaker: I am sorry, my colleague, you are. I must tell you it was quite enjoyable listening to you. You had five minutes, as did the previous speakers.

Mr. Jim Gouk (West Kootenay—Okanagan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said labour leaders do not want to go on strike. Fine, let us give them some mechanism so they have an alternative when they cannot settle.

He talked about strike leaders on strike pay. That makes it okay because they suffer? What about the people who are not part of the bargaining agent who are forced out of work? They are not even a part of these negotiations and have no strike pay at all.

He said unions are important. We never denied that. When unions were brought in they started to deal with deplorable working conditions. If unions were done away with in their entirety, the pendulum would swing back, although maybe not all the way. We are not talking about whether there should be unions but whether there should be work disruptions with major impacts on the economy of this country.

In terms of off site workers, what we object to is providing unions with home addresses so that they can actually go to the homes of these people. If they want to send something to them, that is one thing. It can be done through the employer. It can be done in other ways. The provision in this bill is unreasonable and undemocratic.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, on the issue of off site workers it is quite clear that the board can lay down the rules for making contacts. It even says that the most likely way would be through the mail. If there is a situation where an organizer is using unfair aggression or trying to intimidate, which happens from time to time, the board has the ability to put sanctions against the union and to charge it properly with unfair bargaining.

It is totally an overreaction. In the case of off site workers, the company can take the union information and pass it through its electronic system, e-mail. It is all about communication. Why would the company and the union not want to let them know what is going on?

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, so much has been said in reference to this act and how it will alleviate some of the problems within the grain handling industry, specifically for the farmers. It is no secret that the farmers have really had to foot a major bill in the past because grain handlers and others in the union system, which is quite elaborate from the prairie fields to the ports, go on strike. The only people who pay for it are the farmer.

S. O. 31

Section 87.7 talks about the strike and the lockout being prohibited under certain circumstances.

Since the member supports this bill, how will it deal with every entity when it comes to the handling of grain from the country elevator to the port when the bill itself restricts—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Mississauga West.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, I guess it is interpretation. I suggest it is interpretation for the convenience for the member opposite to adopt a position.

• (1100)

The bill is quite clear that if longshoremen go on strike there is still a requirement to load the grain. That is a recognition by this government of the importance of that aspect.

The minister has also said that we are not sticking our heads in the sand on this issue. We are prepared to look at it to make sure it works. There will be committee hearings in which people will have the opportunity to have input and make comments. If adjustments need to be made down the road, this government will make them. We are flexible. This is about creating a level, fair playing field of labour relations between unions and management.

The Speaker: It being 11 o'clock we will now proceed to Statements By Members.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

RURAL CANADA

Mr. Larry McCormick (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to congratulate the federal cabinet for endorsing the rural impact test. The endorsement by cabinet of the rural impact test creates an important tool. The rural lens provides a mechanism to ensure federal departments review the impact of programs and services on rural Canadians. This process will go a long way toward developing federal programs and services that are appropriate for and accessible to rural Canadians.

Nearly one third of Canadians live in rural areas. These areas are made up of small communities which are not all alike. Depending on a number of factors, they experience different needs that require different solutions. For example, those living near urban areas face challenges and opportunities that differ from the challenges and opportunities of rural residents in more remote locations.

The rural lens will also identify whether there is flexibility for decision making at the local level.

S. O. 31

Please join me in thanking the agriculture and agri-food minister whose mandate includes rural development and in thanking federal cabinet for endorsing this initiative.

* * *

DR. CORNELIUS W. WIEBE

Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner (Portage—Lisgar, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to pay tribute to Dr. Cornelius W. Wiebe of Winkler, Manitoba who celebrated his 105th birthday this week. Our world has changed more in this century than it has over the preceding 2000 years. Some people resist change but Dr. Wiebe welcomed it and used it to give people in his community a better life.

Dr. Wiebe was born in a log home in the Manitoba village of Weidenfeld in 1893. Despite an early life of hardships, he excelled at his studies. He went on to become a teacher, a physician and a one term member of the Manitoba legislature.

He is quiet and determined man. His insights into medicine, politics and agriculture have been highly respected. He was instrumental in establishing Winkler's Bethel hospital and the Valley rehabilitation centre.

Today people in our community are still benefiting from his knowledge and his continuing contributions. On their behalf I wish Dr. Wiebe a happy birthday and thank him for all he has done.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BLACK HISTORY MONTH IN CANADA

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, February has been declared Black History Month in Canada.

To encourage Canadian students to explore, promote and celebrate contributions made by black persons and individuals of other cultural backgrounds, in February 1996, the Secretary of State instituted the Mathieu Da Costa Award.

On behalf of all my colleagues, I congratulate this year's young winners. They have distinguished themselves by incarnating some of these values. We welcome them to Parliament Hill today.

Allow me to mention one name in particular, that of Arianne Matte, of Louis-Riel Public High School, in my riding of Carleton—Gloucester.

* * *

LE FINANCEMENT DE LA RECHERCHE

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in the OECD countries, the debate on employment is centred on technology and increased productivity. In the long term, knowledge,

technological knowledge in particular, constitutes the main force that drives economic growth and an enhanced quality of life.

Yet our top researchers are choosing to move elsewhere because there are not enough resources here to fund leading edge research in their fields.

This government thinks it has found the solution to this by creating the Foundation for Innovation and announcing the creation of the Millennium Fund. This is not so, for post-graduate bursary programs have fallen victim to the budget cuts to funding bodies, thus adding considerably to post-graduate students' debt load.

I am therefore calling upon this government to increase the budget allocated to the funding councils, the key mission of which is to fund research, on which the new knowledge-based economy rests essentially.

* * *

[*English*]

MATHIEU DA COSTA

Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we cannot really celebrate black history month in Canada without remembering Mathieu Da Costa, the first recorded black African to set foot in Canada.

• (1105)

Mathieu Da Costa was a navigator, an explorer and a linguist. Through his many voyages to Canada in the late 1500s he made contact with the Mi'kmaq people and learned their language.

In 1603 he was the navigator on the ship which carried Samuel de Champlain on his voyage of exploration. On arrival this black man became the interpreter for Samuel de Champlain with the Mi'kmaq people, thus paving the way for the early settlers; Mathieu Da Costa, navigator, linguist, interpreter.

Congratulations to the many students who today receive the Mathieu Da Costa awards.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MINT

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government owned mint is bullishly proceeding with plans to build a new coin plant in Winnipeg. People in my riding are very upset with this politically motivated decision.

Westaim is a solid diversified company in my riding with a 35 year history of supplying coin blanks to Canada and other countries. Its success is now threatened by unfair competition from the federal government. Westaim can provide all the savings that the mint claims for its new plant and it can provide these savings sooner at no cost to the taxpayer.

Why would the government use \$30 million of taxpayer money to put jobs at risk? Why would it so blatantly attack the successful enterprise of a well run corporation? Why would it build an

expensive new plant to compete in an already saturated world market?

I call on the government to cancel this ill conceived project and avoid disrupting the lives of hundreds of people. I challenge it to save the \$30 million and to enter into a long term agreement as offered by Westaim.

* * *

VIOLENCE

Mr. Carmen Provenzano (Sault Ste. Marie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, something must be done about the growing problem of group violence among young Canadians. My riding of Sault Ste. Marie, like so many across the country, has witnessed a recent example of this brutal and frightening phenomenon. Two immediate courses of action are necessary.

First, we must initiate an in depth study of violence by young people. We need to find out what dark motives compel groups of teens to commit such heinous acts and what anti-social impulses allow others to take a passive role as spectators to these gruesome events.

Second, we need to reform the Young Offenders Act to establish greater deterrents to violent group crime. The Minister of Justice is preparing a response to the government review of young offenders legislation. I ask the minister to pay special attention to the rise of group violence by young people. We need to send a clear message to Canadians that we recognize the seriousness of this problem and that we are ready to take decisive action to address it.

* * *

[Translation]

REFERENCE TO SUPREME COURT

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a poem entitled "Fortier at the bat".

Before the court assembled
Mr. Fortier had his say
What was in the Constitution
Was the order of the day
Not discouraged for a moment
The good people of Quebec
Hastened forth to tell the lawyer
That he simply looked a wreck
For though Plan B he must help save
And Lord he wished he could
The ball was slipping from his grasp
And heading for no good
And though he argued loud and long
The effort was to fail
Before his very eyes alas
He saw Quebec prevail
The lesson learned, a hard one too
Is this, there is no doubt
Quebec knows what it has to do
And will see its own way out

S. O. 31

TÉLÉVISION FRANCO-ONTARIENNE

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on February 10, the web site of Télévision franco-ontarienne, named "Perdus dans les étoiles", received the prestigious Milia d'or.

This award is given by the international market of interactive programs to recognize the programs that combine originality and creativity, and that make interactive media progress.

It is to be noted that TFO's web site was competing against those of such multinationals as Disney and Sony, for the best youth web site.

I congratulate TVOntario and TFO for winning this award. I invite hon. members and their families to visit the site, at www.tfo.org/mega.

We can only hope that all Canadian households, including those in Quebec, will soon benefit from a little marvel, namely TVO's French network.

I urge all Bloc Québécois members to support TFO's efforts in this regard.

* * *

[English]

THE SENATE

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is denying his commitment to an elected Senate. He is not making it happen.

• (1110)

In 1990 the Prime Minister said: "The Liberal government in two years will make the Senate elected. As Prime Minister I will make that happen". But it did not happen.

Twenty-three times he has used Senate seats as political patronage prizes to pay off Liberal political hacks. He allows senators to live in Mexico. Will he refuse to recognize an elected senator?

British Columbia is the most under-represented province in the Senate. It needs to be addressed. The Prime Minister is not making it happen.

In 1991 the Prime Minister said: "To those who live in the west and the Atlantic, a reformed Senate is essential". So we know that he knows Senate reform has to happen. The Prime Minister promised Canadians it would happen. When will it happen?

* * *

FAMILY

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged to see the *Globe and Mail* newspaper

S. O. 31

taking a lead role in recognizing that the time parents spend with their new born babies is critical in child development.

The *Globe and Mail* reports that the International Labour Organization found that while Canada is generous with time off for maternity, the financial compensation is insufficient to permit many working mothers to take enough time to be with their newborns. Canada pays far less than any other industrialized country save the United States.

The growing evidence concerning the importance of a child's first three years is cause for all levels of government and businesses in the private sector to pay closer attention to how much time and choice are built into Canada's programs for parents and their children.

There are a number of ways to expand the options, including turning the child care deduction into a universal child credit which does not discriminate against stay at home parents, and have the private and public sectors increase—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North—St. Paul.

* * *

COLUMBIA MISSION

Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North—St. Paul, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with deep pride to know that Canadian astronaut Dr. Dafydd Williams will be on board the space shuttle *Columbia* as crew medical officer when the STS-90 Neurolab mission is soon launched from the NASA Kennedy Space Centre.

In addition, two Canadian scientists Drs. Barry Fowler and Ian Howard are responsible for 2 of the 26 experiments to be conducted on board.

The results are anticipated to have direct applications to our understanding of neurological diseases and injuries and their treatment and prevention.

We can all take pride that the Canadian Space Agency is very much involved in this historic endeavour.

Exploring the vastness of outer space is a shining example of mankind's tremendous accomplishments.

Exploring the vast inner workings of the human nervous system in outer space extends the limits of mankind's infinite potential in advancing medical science.

* * *

MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT ON INVESTMENT

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today outside the House of Commons Canadians are demonstrating their opposition to the MAI, the multilateral agreement on investment.

Canadians are concerned about the MAI and are showing up in droves at town hall meetings and forums around the country. They

want to know why the government is negotiating this deal in secret, behind closed doors and with no consultation with Canadian people.

They are worried when key spokesmen promoting the deal say that the MAI is necessary because there is a surplus of democracy in the world today which is interfering with the movement of investment and capital.

A surplus of democracy. Some of us were raised to believe there is no such thing as a surplus of democracy. My father went to war to fight for absolute democracy.

The more Canadians learn about the MAI, the more they oppose it. It is a bad deal for Canadians and it is a bad deal for democracy. This government should do more than delay the signing of the deal, it should say no thanks to the MAI.

* * *

[Translation]

CORPORATIONS' PROFITS

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Statistics Canada announced yesterday that Canadian businesses continued to benefit from the 1997 economic expansion. The corporations' seasonally adjusted operating profits increased by 3.1% in the fourth quarter of that year.

According to Statistics Canada, it is the first year since 1994 that profits increased in each of the four quarters. As we can see, Canada's economic life is not as bad as sovereignists would have us believe. In fact, economic growth would be even greater if separatists stopped spreading myths about Quebec's separation from the rest of Canada.

Twice, in 1980 and in 1995, Quebecers chose to remain part of Canada. If sovereignists stopped trying to make us believe that Quebec is always the big loser, it would only benefit our country, both from an economic and political point of view.

* * *

● (1115)

[English]

PAY EQUITY

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, thousands of public servants across Canada did not enjoy a happy Valentine's Day last weekend thanks to the government's so-called refusal to honour pay equity.

While the Treasury Board president ponders salary increases for his former colleagues among the senior management class of the federal public service, he continues to provide steerage class treatment for lower paid public servants.

*Oral Questions***ORAL QUESTION PERIOD***[English]*

This is yet another example of the government's misplaced sense of priorities. The Liberal government spends billions of taxpayer dollars to suit its own political agenda such as Doug Young's highway robbery, Nova Scotia toll highway capers, helicopter fiascos and the Pearson airport debacle, not to mention the ill founded Airbus investigation. The recent reckless supreme court reference is another.

I urge the Liberal government to instead make the right choice for public spending and negotiate a pay equity settlement that is fair for long suffering public service employees.

* * *

*[Translation]***ALCAN**

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a historic agreement has been reached between the management and employees of Alcan that will ensure operational stability in some 10 plants and research centres for the next 18 years.

As the member for Jonquière, I am proud to join with the Quebec premier, Lucien Bouchard, in congratulating both parties and recognizing this rather extraordinary example of solidarity and partnership, which will both protect and maintain jobs, improve working conditions and enable employees to take a greater role in the affairs of the company.

My congratulations, once again, to the unionized workers and the management of Alcan.

* * *

MATHIEU DA COSTA AWARD

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in 1995, thanks to the efforts of the member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Parliament passed a motion to designate February as Black History Month.

The Mathieu Da Costa Award was created to mark this designation and to honour black communities in Canada.

[English]

This year's award winners for best essay, short story, poem or art work come to us from across Canada and we proudly welcome to Ottawa, Julia Forester, Sointula, British Columbia; Kyla Burns, Duncan, British Columbia; Dorian Irwin-Kristmanson, Regina, Saskatchewan; Max Bennett, Winnipeg, Manitoba; Sylvia Mihaljevic, Burlington, Ontario; Caroline Vincent, Kanata, Ontario; Arianne Matter, Gloucester, Ontario; Micaela Sheppard, Halifax, Nova Scotia; Rita Dobosi, St. John's, Newfoundland.

We salute the accomplishments of these young people who inspire us all.

THE ECONOMY

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it was reported last night that this year Canadians could have had debt reduction and tax relief. There would have been a surplus, but it has all been blown on new government spending. The big surplus that the government has been crowing about for months has already been spent before the budget. Canadian taxpayers have been robbed.

Let me ask the junior minister for finance, what about tax relief and debt reduction? Where is it? Gone with the wind?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to give my response to the junior deputy leader.

We have taken a very balanced approach as we have come through these very difficult fiscal circumstances. One thing I will guarantee to this House is that when this government commits to making an expenditure, we will take responsibility for it.

Every household in Canada knows this has to be done. Our government does as well. We will pay as you go. We will not saddle future governments with announcements of investments we are making today.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, every household in this country pays its Mastercard bill when it is due. It is as simple as that.

We have over half a trillion dollars of debt. Canadians are paying the highest income taxes in the industrialized world. They might expect a bit of debt and tax relief, which is what they have been promised for a long time. It is crazy.

Canadians did take the Prime Minister at his word that 50% of the surplus would go to debt and tax relief. That simply has not happened, not with what the finance department has been leaking anyway to the press lately.

• (1120)

Why does the cabinet always get first dibs on any spending? Whose money is this anyhow, Mr. Minister?

The Speaker: Please address your questions to the Chair. It makes it easier that way. The hon. secretary of state.

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, public money belongs to Canadians and this is why we have been stewards of that money. This is why we have adopted a balanced approach of reinvesting in Canada's social and economic infrastructure, a balanced approach

Oral Questions

of paying down the debt and a balanced approach of reducing taxes.

We are going to meet the Reform Party's targets for deficit reduction, but we will do so without ripping apart the social fabric of this country. We have done this at the same time as we have reduced taxes.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Well, Mr. Speaker, talk about responsible stewards. These are the so-called "stewards" over there that ran us into debt in the first place back in the 1970s.

The budget surplus is being blown on new spending, \$2.2 billion worth. That money should have gone back to taxpayers. It should have gone to pay down the debt. Oops, not the deficit but the debt. That is what this government promised and that is what we are trying to hold it accountable for.

Why is it so easy to say yes to new spending and so easy to say no to debt and tax relief? Why is that?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wonder why the Reform Party finds it so easy to say no to more spending on health, no to more spending on children and no to more spending on a better quality of life for Canadians. Why does it say no to what Canadians want and need?

I say let Reformers wait for the budget. Canadians I submit will be very satisfied with the budget as they are satisfied with the government's performance now as demonstrated by a poll on the CBC last night.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the senior Deputy Prime Minister.

The surplus does not belong to the Liberals no matter how much they would like to think it does. It belongs to Canadian families. Budget after budget this finance minister sucked billions of dollars more out of Canadian households than Brian Mulroney ever did. This was supposed to be the taxpayers' surplus.

Why is the Prime Minister treating the budget surplus like the property of the Liberal Party when it belongs to weary Canadian taxpayers?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when the budget is presented next week it will be seen that we are responding to the needs and concerns of Canadians and responding to what they want us to do with the funds that they have provided.

It is pointless to speculate at this point on the details of what we are going to be doing. However, I can assure members that it will not be a smash and grab attack on the well-being of Canadians as is set out in every pronouncement by the Reform Party since it came into existence.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about what Canadians really want. Canadians know

how they want to spend the surplus. They are responsible even if this government is not. They want to cut taxes and they want to pay down the national credit card. A majority of Canadians say to pay down the debt. Millions of Canadians want immediate tax relief. They have all been robbed this year by this government.

Why will the Prime Minister not give Canadians what they really want: tax relief and debt reduction?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am told that in an Environics poll this morning 87% of Canadians support the government's 50:50 formula, a division between tax reduction and debt and deficit reduction and spending on key investments, on education, on young people, on innovation and the like.

We have already begun cutting taxes. We have cut employment insurance premiums. We have been cutting taxes for young people taking post-secondary education and their parents. We have been cutting taxes for people who are disabled.

Why is the Reform Party unwilling to recognize what we are already doing? I am willing to recognize that this shows our commitment to what—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Témiscamingue.

* * *

[Translation]

REFERENCE TO SUPREME COURT

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the constitutional farce begun by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs came to an end yesterday.

As it played out, we saw the government pile up contradiction on contradiction, as the support for this strategy of attempting to manipulate the court melted away like an icicle in the sun.

• (1125)

After a week of hearings, does the minister bow to the evidence that his strategy, which he borrowed from Guy Bertrand, is heading straight for a dead end, and that he is even losing the support of his traditional allies?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, would the PQ government, which would like to unilaterally proclaim itself the government of an independent state, have the legal justification to be so considered by citizens and governments?

The Bloc says yes. We say no, there is no such right. The court will provide an opinion, which we shall respect, and which will provide information that will be useful to everyone.

Oral Questions

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the federal government claimed it was going to the supreme court to seek clarification.

Yet, in less than one week, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and the Minister of Justice have contradicted each other. The government's counsel and the Minister of Justice have also contradicted each other. In short, we have moved from contradiction to further contradiction.

Does the minister realize that his strategy has led to total confusion, even right within his own government?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the attorney general has made a statement to that effect.

Now, let us speak of contradictions. This week, former Parti Québécois leader Jacques Parizeau came up with a legal theory. He stated, in legal terms, that secession had a basis in law and that the explanation of why Quebec is indivisible yet Canada is divisible was a question of narrow legalism. That is a legal theory. In our opinion, this is a wrong theory. What we need to find out is whether it is right or wrong.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the main thing to remember about this week is the great confusion in the federalist camp.

The Minister of Justice says one thing, only to have it contradicted by her lawyer the next day. The lawyer, Yves Fortier, argues one thing in the morning, does a kind of legal flip-flop over the lunch hour, and argues the opposite in the afternoon, this time contradicting his boss, the Minister of Justice.

This is my multiple-choice question for the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs: What does he call this performance: a) legal contradiction; b) constitutional confusion; c) political panic; or d) the sinking of his constitutional *Titanic*?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the attorney general has issued a statement. Now, speaking of clear answers, the Bloc has some answering to do.

Does the PQ government have a legal right to be considered an independent government just because it declares itself to be one? Will citizens be legally obliged to obey this self-proclaimed government of an independent state? Are governments obliged to recognize it as a legally independent government?

We are waiting to hear what the Bloc has to say, when it has finished with all its sound and fury and proclamations to cover up the fact that it does not have an argument to stand on.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister has not answered my question, but I can understand, because all the answers were right.

Does the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs not realize that he is the prime architect of this fiasco and that his strategy has completely and utterly isolated the Liberal government opposite?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, notice how carefully the Bloc Québécois always avoids getting too deeply into an issue it finds extremely embarrassing.

As a Quebecker, I do not want to see my society plunged into a situation where a government would act outside the law and ask us as citizens to obey its laws anyway. No democratic society has ever been subjected to such a situation and that is why we need to go through this exercise of clarification regarding the plan to unilaterally secede hatched by a government, by a party that does not believe in the rule of law and democracy for everyone.

* * *

[English]

CHILD POVERTY

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

While we heard news today about the balanced budget, there are countries like Denmark where virtually no children are forced to live in poverty. As of this morning 1.5 million children in Canada are living in poverty. Has the Liberal government finally decided to stop forcing Canadian children to live in poverty? Is the government not embarrassed by this fact?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member forgets the more than \$800 million we have already committed ourselves to for the improvement of the child tax credit system. We have also made a commitment to add the equivalent amount over the next few years to deal with the needs of children in poverty.

• (1130)

My hon. friend's question is without foundation or substance. We are concerned about the poverty of Canadian children and we are working to deal with this serious problem.

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is not only my concern. Canada's catholic bishops had this to say "Canada's failure to eliminate child poverty is akin to child abuse". They go on to say "If a parent denies a child food, clothing and social security, it is considered child abuse but when our government does the same, it is simply balancing the budget". When will this government stop child abuse as declared by Canada's catholic bishops?

Oral Questions

The Speaker: My colleague, as you know, we cannot use words from another source or another person to say what we cannot use in the House. I would ask all members to be very judicious because we are coming very close to using unparliamentary language.

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I reject totally the unwarranted premise and allegation in the hon. member's question.

We have been working actively to deal with the issue of child poverty. We intend to continue doing so and we invite the provincial and local governments to join with us in this worthwhile objective. And I invite the hon. member from the NDP to drop his unwarranted rhetoric and join with us as well in this worthy cause.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Greg Thompson (Charlotte, PC): Mr. Speaker, there are more than 30,000 hepatitis C victims looking to the health minister for compensation. I have asked the minister in the past to act unilaterally and we know the minister is reluctant to act unilaterally.

These are innocent victims. How much longer do they and their families have to suffer this torturous wait? Will the minister exercise his constitutional and more importantly his moral responsibility to assist these innocent victims?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, no one would be happier than I with a compensation package for hepatitis C victims who are after all bearing notwithstanding their innocence, the consequences of this tragedy.

I also believe strongly that the interests of those victims are best served with a package of compensation that involves both levels of government. So I am prepared to wait a little longer to see if we can get an agreement with the provincial ministers.

I do tell the House in response to the member's question that this government will not walk away from its responsibilities and at the end of the day will discharge those responsibilities.

Mr. Greg Thompson (Charlotte, PC): Mr. Speaker, this is incredible. We have heard this story before. We have heard this line before.

I want to remind the House and the Canadian people that the minister did not seek provincial agreement when he chopped \$6 billion out of health care, but now he is just simply waiting it out, ignoring the plight of these innocent victims. Again, will the minister show some leadership and act unilaterally and act now to help these people?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unlike the hon. member, my interest is not in scoring cheap political points. My interest is in serving the victims' interests.

If this member would speak to his Tory cousins in Ontario, speak to his Tory cousins in Manitoba, if he would communicate with the Tories across this country, maybe we could get together and do something for the victims.

This is not a debate about fiscal federalism. This is about serving the interests of innocent victims. The member ought to be part of the solution and not part of the problem.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing we have learned over the past year it is that economic conditions can change. Interest rates, the dollar's value, foreign crises, many things can make an expected surplus disappear.

We need to attack our huge debt now. Canadians need that tax relief now. Job creators need some running room now. Instead the Prime Minister grabs our surplus to build a personal memorial and says debt pay down and tax relief will come later. Why is he setting us up for another broken Liberal promise?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if I can revert to the matter of the poll that was on the CBC last night, more than 70% of Canadians strongly support the concept of the millennium scholarship fund.

The hon. lady is right when she says that economic conditions can change. For example it was announced this morning that a strong performance in December pushed retail sales to their largest annual increase since 1988. This in my view is due to the restoration of the country's finances since this government took office. It has almost eliminated the \$42 billion deficit.

• (1135)

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister should look at not just the facts he wants to look at but the real facts. Our debt is way too high, taxes are way too high, our unemployment is double that of the U.S. The responsible thing to do with the surplus would be to pay down our debt and give Canadian families tax relief now while the economy is still strong. Why does the Prime Minister not do that now?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if we can return to the facts, there is more to be done in unemployment, but it is down considerably from what it was when we took office. The interest rates are down. There is almost no inflation. We have just about eliminated the \$42 billion deficit left us by the Conservative government. I do not know why the hon.

Oral Questions

member in her questions does not recognize those facts. If she did, she would have a lot more credibility.

* * *

[Translation]

BILL C-28

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Saint-Eustache—Sainte-Thérèse, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Prime Minister did not respond to the four opposition parties' request for a special committee to investigate the apparent conflict of interest in the case of Bill C-28. He referred us to the Standing Committee on Finance, claiming that is where our questions will be answered.

My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. Does the Deputy Prime Minister recognize that the Liberal majority on the Standing Committee on Finance systematically refused to hear expert witnesses who could have shed light on this issue?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member admit that no specific objection was raised concerning these amendments and that the bill was simply carried on division in committee?

If there was something wrong with these amendments, why did the hon. member and his colleagues not oppose them? This goes to show that his allegations are unfounded and that the Minister of Finance is not in a real or apparent conflict of interest.

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Saint-Eustache—Sainte-Thérèse, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if indeed the Minister of Finance has nothing to hide, why is this government afraid to shed light on this matter with the help of a special committee?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the facts have already been disclosed in the evidence given by the ethics counsellor before the Standing Committee on Finance. Questions have been asked and answers given on this matter in the House. So, there is nothing to hide. The facts are clear: there is no conflict of interest, either real or apparent.

* * *

[English]

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is pretty obvious that we would have a surplus in the budget this year if it were not for the free spending ways of some of the Liberals across the way.

Zachary, one of my constituents, paid attention to the promise in the red book that 50% of the surplus would go to debt and tax reduction. I am asking the question for Zachary. Why are the Liberals breaking another one of their red book promises?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I direct my hon. friend to page 28 of the red book where it says in bold type "We will allocate our budget surpluses so that over the course of our mandate one-half will be spent to improve our programs and one-half will go to tax cuts and reduction of the debt". Over the course of our mandate. That is our promise and I say we are going to keep it.

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government tried to weasel out of the GST promise by finding fine print. The real reason the government is going in this direction is that the Prime Minister wants to build a monument to himself. He actually physically wants to spend the surplus before he leaves office.

This is not a question from me, this is a question from Zachary, that little tiny guy in my riding. Why is it that the Liberals are trying to break their promise by finding fine print again?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member to take back a message to Zachary. That is not to put his trust in the member who just spoke because he does not know what he is talking about.

* * *

• (1140)

[Translation]

RESEARCH FUNDING

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, granting councils are facing major cuts. They are having a hard time funding new researchers and maintaining current projects. To each of our questions on this issue, the Minister of Industry responds simply that \$800 million is available for the innovation foundation.

Does the minister realize that these funds subsidize only the research infrastructure and not the researchers themselves, thus allowing the brain drain to continue unchecked?

[English]

Mr. Walt Lastewka (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the member opposite realizes the investment in the CFI innovation fund. That is only the beginning.

I am sure the member realizes the budget is due next week. If she has some patience, hopefully in the budget there will be more items on research and the research council, which the government has supported in the past and will do so in the future for the good of Canadians.

[Translation]

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, how can the minister say that research in Canada is in good shape, when he can see that the MRC, the Medical Research Council, could

Oral Questions

approve only 216 projects out of the 1,103 applications made and could renew only 41% of the current ones?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have already shown we are fully aware of the importance of research here in Canada.

As my colleague has just said, please wait until next week when we bring down the budget. We will then have an opportunity to show what the government does. We are obviously very aware of the importance of research in Canada.

* * *

[English]

BILL C-28

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the ethics commissioner has admitted that he was unaware of all the facts when he made his decision on the issue of the conflict of interest swirling around the finance minister and his Bill C-28.

Will the Prime Minister ensure that the ethics commissioner does a review now of his decision based upon all the facts?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the ethics commissioner told me in a conversation I had with him on the telephone a few days ago that he found no conflict of interest and therefore no appearance of conflict of interest.

I would like to ask my hon. friend why his party has joined the NDP and the Conservatives in getting into bed with the Bloc on yet another issue.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the admission by the ethics commissioner that he was unaware of all the facts at the time he made his decision invalidates that decision. That is a well known principle of law.

I ask the minister one more time whether he will ensure that the ethics commissioner conducts a review of his decision, this time based upon all the facts.

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first I want to check to see whether the premise of the hon. member's question is factually correct.

Second, I repeat my question. Is what he has just asked a sign that the Reform Party is now going to get into some type of ménage à quatre in bed with the NDP and the Conservatives when it comes to the Bloc raising issues? If so, they ought to be ashamed of themselves.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL AID

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie.

According to the UN, developed countries such as Canada should earmark at least 0.7% of their gross national product for development assistance. Yet, with additional cuts of \$150 million, the Canadian government's budget for international assistance is a dismal 0.3% of GDP. This is a disgrace.

Since we will soon have a deficit-free federal budget, will the minister pledge to cancel the planned \$150 million cut to international assistance?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we said and we will continue to say that we want to increase the moneys earmarked for programs in developing countries.

We also said that we will do so when our fiscal house is in order. I am convinced that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance will see to it that this financing is restored over the years.

* * *

• (1145)

[English]

TRADE

Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry.

While Canada's international exports have grown by nearly 11% this decade, internal trade among the provinces has grown by only 2.8%. Governments have talked about this issue for years with little action.

Could the parliamentary secretary tell the House what the government will do to tear down Canada's internal trade barriers and stimulate interprovincial trade?

Mr. Walt Lastewka (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe the member knows that ministers and officials of the provinces and territories have been meeting for two days concerning the issue of internal trade. We know how crucial internal trade is to Canada and Canada's competitiveness.

There has been consultation. The working groups have been working very hard to come up with an agreement. There has been a lot of discussion. I hope as they conclude their meetings there will be some positive results. I wish them well in their deliberations. Hopefully together, in co-operation, we can tear down the barriers.

* * *

BILL C-28

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the deputy finance minister.

Even the government's own so-called ethics counsellor, the same ethics counsellor that has whitewashed every other scandal for the government over past years, has said that this matter was con-

ducted improperly. He told a parliamentary committee that he should have been informed but he was not.

Why was the finance minister's name on a bill which could benefit him?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is good to remind the House of the facts.

The amendments in question were prepared and handled exclusively by the previous secretary of state for financial institutions. The Minister of Finance had no involvement whatsoever, no knowledge of, no participation in and no handling of these amendments.

It could well be that for technical parliamentary reasons the minister's name was on the bill so it could be tabled in the House, but this does not mean that he did anything improper. He did nothing improper. He had no involvement in this matter. There is no conflict of interest and no appearance of conflict of interest.

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this party along with all other members of the House have a right to know on behalf of their constituents the answer to this question. Why was the finance minister's name on a bill that could benefit him?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister's assets are in a blind trust. He has no way to have any knowledge of the management of the assets in the trust. He has already confirmed that he has had nothing to do with the matter.

I want to ask my hon. friend a question. If these amendments are wrong, why are members of his party not opposing them? Or, do they really recognize that these amendments came from an agency of the British Columbia government? What do they say to the British Columbia government if they think these amendments are wrong?

Obviously these amendments have nothing to do with the Minister of Finance and in view of where they originated obviously there is no conflict of interest.

* * *

HOUSING

Ms. Louise Hardy (Yukon, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister responsible for the housing deficit in the country.

In December the minister took an off reserve housing society, the Meen-Sga-Nist, to court. Under his direction the employees have not been paid for three months. They want to know if they will be paid.

Will the minister stop using these underhanded tactics on other off reserve housing societies? The one that comes to mind is the Tintina housing society in Watson Lake, Yukon.

Oral Questions

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately this case is before the courts and I cannot comment.

Ms. Louise Hardy (Yukon, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Tintina group in Watson Lake, Yukon, is not before the courts. The housing situation in the country has become unbelievably severe. People are homeless.

What are you going to do about that? Are you going to—

• (1150)

The Speaker: My colleagues, please address your questions through the Chair.

Ms. Louise Hardy: Mr. Speaker, thank you for your direction.

What is the minister going to do to improve the situation in housing when it comes to off reserve people? He sits very close to the aboriginal affairs minister who gave clear direction to negotiate, not litigate.

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the members would have read their correspondence they would have realized that on January 30 I announced the extension of RRAP for the next five years at a cost of \$250 million.

There is an aboriginal housing component in that program. She should read the press release to learn more about it.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

The minister is aware of the dire straits the east coast fishery faces. As the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans he has to know that an active licence buy back is one tool in his command.

Once again I ask the minister to commit his department to an active licence buy back.

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have once again in two days the support of the Conservative Party for this measure.

I believe licence buy backs are an important tool that we should use. I remind him that on the Atlantic coast we have had a licence buy back programs to the tune of approximately \$100 million and on the west coast to the tune of approximately \$80 million.

I will note his support for this program. When discussions arise as to what might be done in the future with respect to the east coast fishery, I will bear his views in mind.

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for that answer.

Oral Questions

The minister has to know that most of the \$100 million spent on the east coast of Canada in licence buy backs did not buy back active licences. That is the problem with the original program.

We need an active licence buy back program and we need input in that program from grassroots fishermen who are actually out there fishing the resource and wanting to have some input.

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again I could agree with the hon. member on both counts.

He is correct that the buy back of licences which are not being used does not immediately affect fishing capacity. On the other hand, a licence which is not currently being used could be used in the future. The buy back of even those licences is important.

With respect to the second aspect of his question, the need to have the involvement of fishermen and of the industry, I assure him that is being done and will continue to be done.

I would add that the positive approach he is adopting would mean he also could play a useful role in this activity.

* * *

[Translation]

FRENCH AND THE INTERNET

Mr. Jacques Saada (Brossard—La Prairie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State responsible for Science, Research and Development, and it could be put by any francophone or francophile member of this House.

As we all know, access to the Internet is overwhelmingly in English. Could the secretary of state tell us what he is doing to facilitate access to the Internet in French for Canada's francophone communities and for all Canadians who wish to avail themselves of this service?

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel (Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) (Western Economic Diversification), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a number of initiatives are supported by organizations such as SchoolNet, including Calliopée, La Course Destination Monde and la Boîte à outils francophone.

A contest organized through the community access program will give us 171 French-language projects prepared with the help of 200 communities across the country. SchoolNet's digitized collections will provide 82 projects, both in French and in English. Through the DHRD, Schoolnet and PAC, we are hiring young francophones all over the country to provide services in French.

[English]

SENATE OF CANADA

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the House the Prime Minister said:

We would like to reform the Senate and the best way is to try to convince the provinces to do so.

• (1155)

Premier Klein of Alberta wrote the Prime Minister seeking a commitment to hold off on filling the vacant Alberta Senate seat until Alberta had an opportunity to have a Senate election.

The Prime Minister says he is keen on bringing the provinces on side to reform the Senate. Why then did he ignore Premier Klein's request to appoint an Alberta senator who had been duly elected?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the problem with the hon. member's suggestion is that once somebody is elected, assuming that the government through the prime minister appoints that person, the person is there until the age of 75 and nobody can do anything if that person does not do a proper job.

That is why when the Prime Minister said he wanted to have the consent of the provinces he was talking about a constitutional amendment which would deal with the issue of Senate reform in a meaningful way.

We have every respect for the views of Premier Klein, but the Prime Minister has constitutional responsibilities under the constitution as it exists today.

* * *

[Translation]

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

On February 22, 1996, the National Transportation Agency accepted CN's application to abandon the rail line along the St. Lawrence to Lévis. Since then, there have been numerous postponements, while petitions with more than 11,000 signatures have been presented in the House of Commons expressing opposition to this and calling for the station at Lévis to be maintained.

It being no longer possible under the Transport Act to delay the decision past February 21, what does the minister intend to do concerning the station and rail line at Lévis?

[English]

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. On behalf

of my colleague, the Minister of Transport, I know his concern and the concerns of his constituents in this area.

The concern of Transport Canada is essentially for safety and for the best service possible that can be offered.

I assure the hon. member that an announcement has not been made but one will be made in the very near future.

* * *

BANKRUPTCIES

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

Statistics Canada today announced nearly 91,000 business and personal bankruptcies, a record level of human tragedy. These bankruptcies demonstrate the failure of the Liberals' policies to help these people who are struggling to make ends meet.

How can the minister justify this tragedy and what hope can the minister give to these people who in record numbers have lost their savings, their homes and their dreams?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, bankruptcies are high but they are coming down. This is the sign of the economic recovery that we are undergoing.

Over the course of the last four years we have put in place the basis for a very solid economic recovery. This is why unemployment has fallen from over 11% to under 9%. This is also why the OECD predicts that Canada will have the highest economic growth rate and the highest growth rate in jobs this year.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, with the passage of Bill C-4 in the House this week, the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board must think that the political heat is off. Think again. The United States government is poised to demand an audit of the Canadian Wheat Board, the first one since 1993.

My question is for the minister of agriculture. In light of the MAI and in light of the WTO, does he honestly believe that Bill C-4 as it now stands will stand the test of time, or will he honestly admit that we will be back in the House in the near future revamping the Canadian Wheat Board?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first I congratulate the member for being chosen by his party to be the agriculture critic.

Oral Questions

Bill C-4, which is now before the other place on the Hill, will certainly make some great evolution in the activities of the Canadian Wheat Board. It will be directed by farmers and the majority of the directors will be chosen by farmers. Those people will be best placed to deal with the future of the Canadian Wheat Board in the marketing of grains in western Canada.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Paul Steckle (Huron—Bruce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

Given the recent statement of the minister of fisheries for Newfoundland and Labrador, the hon. John Efford, that seal populations are at an all time high and may be affecting the recovery of groundfish stocks, could the minister tell us today what measures he is prepared to take to deal with these all time high seal populations.

• (1200)

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question and the quote from Mr. Efford who has certainly brought this matter to the attention of Canadians.

Yes, the population of harp seals is high and has increased and the grey seals have increased even faster.

I would like to quote the statement from the scientific council of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization: "It is possible that the marine mammal consumption of juvenile cod is impacting their recovery". In other words, seal predation is impacting recovery.

Essentially the same point was made by the Fisheries Resource Conservation Council of Canada in its November report: "The council believes that their consumption of juvenile cod and other species is a threat to the rebuilding of groundfish stocks"—

The Speaker: That brings to a conclusion our question period for today.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I bring to your attention that question period started three minutes late today and we still have some important questions.

The Speaker: I thank the member for bringing that to my attention and I will see if I can make it up the next time.

Mr. Jim Gouk (West Kootenay—Okanagan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, earlier this week while attending a meeting of the Standing Committee on Public Works and Government Services, I made reference to a report referred to as the Dobson report.

Routine Proceedings

A Liberal member of that committee raised a point of order requesting that since I had referred to the report I should be required to table it either with the committee or in the House of Commons.

In order to do this, I need clarification on this tabling request. Do the Liberal members really need the Reform Party to supply them with copies of a report that was commissioned by the Liberal Party?

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, a number of order in council appointments which were made by the government.

Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 110(1), these are deemed referred to the appropriate standing committees, a list of which is attached.

* * *

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

[*English*]

PATENT ACT

Mr. Jim Gouk (West Kootenay—Okanagan, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-361, an act to amend the Patent Act (life of patents pertaining to medicine).

He said: Madam Speaker, this bill is in response to a growing number of constituents both in my riding and across this country who say that drugs in this country should be affordable. Bill C-91 in a previous government increased the patent protection, doubled it in fact, from 10 years to 20 under the understanding that this would result in an increase in drug research in this country.

• (1205)

Evidence since that time has not shown that it has increased any. My bill seeks to provide a balance by reducing the patent protec-

tion from 20 years to 15 years over a 5 year period, 1 year at a time, so that Canadians can afford drugs in this country.

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

* * *

FIREARMS ACT

Mr. Jim Gouk (West Kootenay—Okanagan, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-362, an act to amend the Firearms Act and the Criminal Code (no registration of firearms that are not restricted or prohibited firearms).

He said: Madam Speaker, this bill seeks to remove the most objectionable part of Bill C-68. At the time it was introduced, the Reform Party specifically asked the government to split the bill so that it could deal with registration and crack down on criminal misuse of firearms separately. It did not do this.

My bill seeks to revoke the most offensive part of Bill C-68, the one requiring law-abiding citizens of this country to register rifles and shotguns at a tremendous cost which is growing daily according to the government's own figures.

That way Canadians can have a little peace and quiet and some responsibility in this law so that the Criminal Code can be used to crack down on those who break law, not the law-abiding citizens of this country.

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

* * *

PETITIONS

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. Jim Gouk (West Kootenay—Okanagan, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I have a petition signed by members of my constituency pointing out their great concerns about nuclear weapons and the threat to the health and survival of civilization.

They call on Parliament to support the immediate initiation and conclusion by the year 2000 of an international convention which sets out a binding timetable for the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

CRTC

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I rise in this Chamber as a courtesy to my colleague from Edmonton Southwest and 50 of his constituents.

I am pleased to discharge this favour by presenting to this House a petition. This petition asks for a very prudent review of the mandate of the CRTC to discourage the propagation of pornography and rather to encourage the broadcasting of ecclesiastical programming to support morality and wholesome family lifestyles.

The petitioners ask this House to heed their words and I concur.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the pleasure to present three petitions. The first has 167 signatures from all over British Columbia. It is from the physicians for global survival and it calls for a binding international convention to abolish nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

TAXATION

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the second petition has 210 signatures from Vancouver and Victoria. It calls for the elimination of sales taxes on reading material.

CYPRUS

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the third petition with 240 signatures from B.C. calls for the Canadian government to use its influence to ensure that Turkey abides by UN security council resolutions on Cyprus.

CRTC

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present two petitions to the House today.

Four hundred and seventy-five petitioners ask that Parliament review the mandate of the CRTC and direct the CRTC to administer a new policy encouraging the licensing of religious broadcasters.

The petitioners hold that the CRTC presently licenses programs of a sexually explicit or violent nature and yet it has refused to license one Roman Catholic and three multi-denominational programmers.

• (1210)

Given that Canadians have a constitutional right to freedom of religion, conscience and expression, these petitioners ask that the CRTC be required to exhibit an openness toward religious programming and to support its existence on Canadian stations.

MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT ON INVESTMENT

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is my honour to present a petition pursuant to Standing Order 36 from residents of Kamloops, Celista, Chase, Anglemont, Clearwater, Logan Lake, Savona, Vanenby, Avola, Adams Lake, Blue River, Little Fort, Magna Bay, Falkland, Barriere, Tappen, Sorrento, Salmon Arm and Deadman's Creek. They draw to the attention of the House that the multilateral on investment is a direct attack on Canadian sovereignty.

They point out that it will expand and entrench the unprecedented rights of transnational corporations. It will severely limit national, provincial and regional governments' ability to promote social, economic and job creation strategies. It will give foreign corporations the right to sue Canadians governments, and it will lock us into the closet for 20 years.

Routine Proceedings

They are calling on Parliament to direct the government not to sign the multilateral agreement on investment. There are hundreds of names attached to this petition.

SENIORS BENEFITS

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Madam Speaker, I present another petition with hundreds of names from the communities of Vancouver, Victoria, New Westminster, Port Coquitlam, Port Alberni, Hartsville, Nanaimo, Burnaby, Surrey, Richmond, Vavenby, Avola, Red Lake, Paul Lake, Westwood, Pritchard, Chilliwack, Prince George, Terrace, Port Hardy and Grand Forks.

It is a long, complicated petition but fundamentally it says not to proceed at this point with the proposed seniors benefit package to be introduced sometime in March or April, and that adequate time be given for all Canadians to comment with the government on the kind of retirement system Canada ought to have in the distant future.

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Carmen Provenzano (Sault Ste. Marie, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I rise to present a petition to the House signed by 47 residents of Sault Ste. Marie.

The petitioners believe that explicit nudity in public is becoming more common and that such displays are harmful to children. They call on Parliament to amend the Criminal Code to make public female toplessness an indecent act.

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 39 and 47.

[Text]

Question No. 39—**Mr. John Duncan:**

What percentage of current "The Atlantic Groudfish Strategy" recipients were sent letters of commitment regarding the benefits they would receive for the original five year program to May 1999, and how much money does the twelve month commitment between May 1998 and May 1999 represent for those receiving letters?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development), Lib.): The Atlantic Groudfish Strategy, TAGS, was announced on April 19, 1994 as a transitional measure to assist east coast and Quebec fishers and fishplant workers, who lost their jobs due to the closure of the Atlantic groudfish fishery.

Some 40,000 individuals qualified for TAGS. Originally, each TAGS recipient received a letter which confirmed their eligibility and duration on TAGS. The letter also indicated that in order to maintain one's continuing entitlement to TAGS, clients were required to actively participate in adjustment interventions such as counselling and career planning and to have in place an agreed

Government Orders

upon action plan. A minimum duration of two years was given to all TAGS recipients.

Since this initial letter, there have been a number of changes to the TAGS program including changes to duration and active measures. At each change clients have been kept informed by letter.

All TAGS recipients were offered the opportunity to participate in a variety of adjustment measures to assist them to adjust out of the groundfish fishery. TAGS clients participated in approximately 16,500 interventions.

The administration of TAGS is dependent on funds being appropriated by Parliament. In order to maintain income support benefits at current levels, and to remain within the original \$1.9 billion budget, it was announced in July 1996 that TAGS would end earlier than expected. This was anticipated to be in May 1998.

On December 16, 1997, the Minister of Human Resources Development Canada announced that the Government of Canada will continue paying income support until the end of August 1998, when it is now expected that funds will be exhausted.

In May 1998 approximately 27,000 clients would remain eligible for TAGS. Of these, some 18,000 or 67% would have remained eligible until May 1999. Based on current projections, to continue TAGS from May 1998 to its original end date of May 1999 would require another \$170 million to \$200 million in additional funding over and above the \$1.9 billion budgeted for the program.

Question No. 47—Mr. John Williams:

What safety concerns about NAV Canada have been brought to the attention of NAV Canada's Office of Safety and Quality by Transport Canada?

Mr. Stan Keyes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Prior to the transfer on November 1, 1996, the Transport Canada/NAV Canada Safety Oversight Committee, SOC, was set up. The purpose of this committee is to provide a focal point between both organizations for the exchange of information and resolution of matters relating to the safety performance of NAV Canada.

Members of the Committee include: the assistant to the president, Safety and Quality, NAV Canada; the manager, Safety Policy, NAV Canada; the director, Air Navigation Services and Airspace, Transport Canada; and the chief, Air Navigation Services and Airspace Safety Oversight, Transport Canada.

As of November 25, 1997 the SOC has met nine times to discuss issues raised by Transport Canada as follows:

November 29, 1996

Issues
Development of NAV Canada's safety management program.
Decrease in CADORS reports.
Development of risk indicators.
December 20, 1996

Issues
Information on high profile events.
Reports on Sioux Lookout.
February 7, 1997

Issues
Power outage at Toronto's Lester B. Pearson International Airport.
Lack of details in CADORS report.
February 19, 1997

Issues
Follow-up to power outage at Toronto's Lester B. Pearson International Airport.
Information on power outage at Ottawa.
Power outage at Kelowna

March 12, 1997

Issues
Reinforcement of pilot/controller "read-back" procedures.
Glide path anomalies at Calgary.
FMS database/chart congruence.
Controller proficiency checks.

May 14, 1997

Issues
Review of "ATC Radar Display Systems Safety/Reliability Review".
Status of recommendations of Uncontrolled Aerodrome Advisory Working Group.
Final report on Lester B. Pearson International Airport power failure—NAV Canada to act on identified deficiencies.

July 9, 1997

Issues
Safety Report on Calgary Terminal Relocation.
Handling of ad hoc reductions in service.
Follow-up FMS—charting harmonization.
ASTRA Report 1/97 follow-up.
Controller/Flight Service Specialists language testing. Report on Gander Moncton Airspace consolidation, implementation and contingency plans.

September 30, 1997

Issues
Transport Canada's involvement in future NAV Canada Safety Reviews.
NAV Canada to comment of Transport Canada's FFB/OII observer protocol.
NAV Canada's security plans.
NAV Canada's plans on Aeronautical Information Services.

October 31, 1997

Issues
Monitoring of language/phrasology anomalies.

Government Orders

NAV Canada to develop policy on other ad hoc situations that do not fall under regular NOTAM/CADOR notification.

Year 2000—Millennium Bug.

[Translation]

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADA LABOUR CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-19, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The hon. member for Mississauga West has one minute left in the questions and comments period.

Mr. Carmen Provenzano (Sault Ste. Marie, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member how Bill C-19 might impact on private sector unions in my riding of Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I thank the member from my home town for that question.

Bill C-19 is designed to deal with federal private sector unions. We are talking about the 700,000 men and women across Canada who come under that jurisdiction.

The steelworkers at Algoma, for example, would come under the provincial labour laws, but they meld together. Generally we will find that the provincial labour laws tend to work together in a positive way with this federal law. The amendment is levelling the playing field to make collective bargaining and organizing within the labour movement fair, and to give the proper information to all the men and women who would become organized within a new union.

It is a very positive bill that will help the labour movement and management work co-operatively.

• (1215)

Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak in support of Bill C-19 which would amend part I of the Canada Labour Code regarding industrial relations and makes the Canada industrial relations board more effective. I have met with constituents on this bill. They have encouraged me to support C-19 and hope the House passes it forthwith.

This bill contains a number of important and timely amendments to part I of the Canada Labour Code. This part of the code applies to over 700,000 workers and their employers in the federally regulated private sector. This includes industries such as banking, interprovincial and international transportation, airports and airlines, broadcasting, telecommunications, port operations and grain handling.

Members in this House know that at a time when the global economy is becoming increasingly competitive, it is crucial that governments lead the way with forward looking legislation such as C-19 put forward by the Minister of Labour.

It is also essential that the strategically vital infrastructure industries that I have mentioned are able to operate as efficiently as possible. This means that we must invest capital in these industries. But just as important, it means that we must invest in our labour relations institutions.

Our dispute resolution process must be as modern, as effective and efficient as possible. This is precisely the objective of this legislation, to modernize part I of the Canada Labour Code and improve labour relations in the federal workplace.

As members from the previous Parliament will know, this bill is almost identical to Bill C-66 which was approved by the House last April.

It is my belief that the new C-19, as was the former bill, is a legislative initiative which achieves the exceedingly difficult task of balancing the interests of workers with the interests of employers. It accords certain rights to each party but also demands that both sides act in the interests of their own membership and in the interests of the general public.

I firmly believe that this bill is a model of how labour legislation should be developed. During each stage of the legislative process, labour and management have been at the heart of it all expressing their opinions and offering their considerable expertise.

It is useful to point out that consultations began almost three years ago when the Minister of Labour asked the task force to review part I of the Canada Labour Code and then to offer recommendations or needed changes. The task force was led by Mr. Andrew Sims, a respected and non-partisan labour relations expert. He and his colleagues criss-crossed the country meeting with labour and business representatives, labour law practitioners, academic experts and ordinary citizens concerned about what was going on in our workplaces.

In terms of identifying issues in areas in which agreement between management and labour was possible, the task force certainly benefited from the excellent contributions of a labour-management consensus group. Membership in this group included representatives of the Canadian Labour Congress, the Confederation of National Trade Unions, the Canadian Federation of Labour, the Federally Regulated Employers, Transportation and Communications, the Western Grain Elevator Association and the Canadian Bankers Association.

The Sims task force compiled the results of the consultations and resulting recommendations in its final report entitled "Seeking a

Government Orders

Balance". There is a significant and recurring theme in this report. It is that the Canada Labour Code is generally regarded by labour and management groups as an effective labour relations framework which has facilitated collective bargaining in the federally regulated private sector. Of course I must add that there is still room for improvement.

In the remainder of my time I would like to focus on one such area where changes are required. It is in the structure and role of the Canada Labour Relations Board.

The task force examined many aspects of the board, including its non-representational structure. Since 1973 the board has been made up entirely of public appointees. None of these members is designated as either representing labour or management. In this regard the structure of the board differs from labour boards in almost every other Canadian jurisdiction. This must change.

Fortunately the Sims task force achieved a consensus between management and labour on this very item. All sides agreed that a representative board would have at least four related benefits.

First, for those appearing before the board, they would have more confidence in the process knowing that their cases are fully understood and properly reviewed. Second, decisions made by the board would generally be more acceptable to both labour and management. Third, it would provide some assurance that when the board exercises discretion, as it often must, that it would be on the basis of practical real world industrial relations experience. Fourth, the presence of a friendly viewpoint of the board would help the parties involved in the dispute to feel more comfortable about offering and accepting compromised solutions.

• (1220)

This bill adopts an approach recommended by the Sims task force. The non-representational Canada Labour Relations Board will be replaced by one that does represent each side. The new more credible board will consist of a neutral chair and vice-chair and equal numbers of board members representing labour and management groups.

A second aspect examined by the task force was regional representation. It is not credible to have all members from the national capital region. Regionally based members will help to improve the visibility, accessibility and credibility of the board.

The task force examined whether the board members should be committed on a full time or part time basis. The report noted that many provincial boards have part time members which is cost effective while it enables the boards to benefit from the expertise and experience of people still active in labour relations and not stuck in Ottawa as full time bureaucrats.

However concerns were expressed about part time regional members. Some suggested that regional decisions would be made by part timers with other large demands on their schedules and would not be available for long drawn out cases.

In the Canadian way, the task force recommended a balanced blend. A core of full time adjudicators located in the national capital region will be joined by part timers located in the regions. This seems to gain the best of both worlds.

On these questions the government has listened to the respected members of the Sims task force. The bill provides for the appointment of part time and regional members. This will significantly improve the cost effectiveness of the board. It will give the board access to labour relations experts and it will improve the links between the board and the labour relations community.

The consultation that led to this bill identified the inflexibility of the Canada Labour Relations Board in responding to routine and urgent cases. One approach recommended was to move from the system of a three person panel to a one person panel. Many routine cases can be adequately conducted by a one person panel.

I stress that as a result of this legislation the major criteria for appointment as chair or vice-chair will be competence, as it should be. A clause will be inserted into the code to reiterate that these people must have experience and expertise in industrial relations.

In addition, the flexibility of the board will be enhanced by the repeal of the provision that requires the parties to obtain ministerial permission before they file an allegation of bad faith bargaining. This will be particularly significant in cases where an immediate board hearing is needed to break a deadlock.

The board's remedial powers will be expanded to ensure good faith bargaining. An amendment will confirm the ability of the board to direct one side to include or withdraw specific terms in a bargaining position in order to rectify a failure to bargain in good faith.

Time does not allow me to outline the many more improvements to the Canada Labour Relations Board contained in Bill C-19. It is fitting that the government, which has consulted broadly, is proposing a board that can take full advantage of the skills of the labour relations community. Labour relations boards are extremely important agencies. Their work affects thousands of employees and thousands of businesses.

I congratulate the minister on the work thus far and for looking forward in establishing a labour relations system that will instil confidence in Canadians.

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I would like to comment on a labour relations problem which occurred recently in my riding of Edmonton East. It was the result of the intransigence between labour and management. For months

and months I worked with other political and elected people from the community. We talked to the company and union representatives but it was all to no avail.

The real concern at these meetings was the very realization of the threat by the company that the plant would close if the union went on strike. That was understood and crystal clear to the union management to the point where they even admitted they knew the owner would close the plant if there was a strike. Prior to this the union had asked for a mediator's report. The company accepted the mediator's report but the union would not.

• (1225)

My concern is that yes, controls must be in place for this but I believe that the union by calling the strike closed this plant. Now 1,000 people are out of work in Edmonton East, 1,000 people who worked at the plant, possibly affecting up to 10,000 people in the community. This is all caused by the intransigence of the union management.

I have to agree with my colleague that there should be final offer selection in order to prevent this tragedy from ever being repeated and happening again. Had that been in place, as sure as I am standing here that plant would be open today and those workers would be at work.

Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur: Madam Speaker, I can see where the hon. member's concerns are coming from. Being from the government side we may differ a bit on his perception and what his concerns are. Perhaps the issues he has brought forth could be discussed further at committee. Some of these issues could be discussed and perhaps changes could be made.

The new composition of the board will probably address some of the concerns my hon. colleague has brought forth. The task of achieving this new board will protect the interests of the workers as well as those of the employers. That is an added benefit. Also, with this new composition of the Canada Labour Relations Board it will have a co-operative working relationship. Collective bargaining legislation must have fair and balanced rights and obligations for employers, employees and unions, as my hon. colleague has brought forth. I take his question with due respect.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate at second reading of this important bill.

I am especially pleased to do so since I also participated in the debate when the bill was called Bill C-66 and since I was involved with a major central labour body in Quebec for many years. This is indeed a matter of great importance to me and it is from these various perspectives that I look at this bill.

Government Orders

I would like to start by saying—and I hope that government members will listen—that when this bill was first introduced in the House and referred to committee, the parliamentary process was short-circuited. Second reading was cut short to refer the bill to committee, where it was bulldozed through.

However, in dealing with this bill, it is extremely important that parliamentarians have the time to consider every clause. This act is not like any other act that usually goes through this House. Most acts we pass are not likely to be challenged in court. In fact, they are often akin to a government decree on some issue. A labour code, on the other hand, must be scrutinized line by line, word by word, and even between the lines. Jurisprudential decisions will be rendered. In the end, this code will regulate all labour relations.

It is essential that parliamentarians be given the time to examine the bill on their own, consult experts and form an opinion. Otherwise, regardless of whether they are on the government or the opposition side, parliamentarians may think of this process as nothing but red tape.

• (1230)

That having been said, and I hope it will be repeated, people were initially pleased with the intention of the bill. But when we saw this bill—I think I can speak of “we” meaning not just the unions, but labour relations people from both the management and union sides—a great many of us were worried.

We were worried for a number of reasons that I will give, bearing in mind that we are at second reading. I hope that the committee will hold substantial hearings during which these questions and objections can become amendments supported by the government, because we know that, if they are not, it will be difficult for the opposition, regardless of party.

First of all, I want to say that the minister, whether this one or the one before, kept telling us that the Industrial Relations Board would be representative. The idea is an interesting one. The problem is that the bill does not give us a representative board.

A reading of the bill reveals that the minister appoints “after consultation”. This means that the final decision is his. He does not make appointments from a joint list supplied by the unions and management. These persons, if selected in this fashion, might be representative. They could then play a role that was more active, with a greater impact on the respective parties.

A supposedly representative board is being deprived of some of the powers it could otherwise have. I am convinced that the parties will make representations on this important issue.

The bill, which comes after years under the existing act, should modernize labour relations, or at least adjust the legislation to the changes in that sector. It is a fact that globalization and the new economy, which has some advantages but also many drawbacks in

Government Orders

terms of distribution and levels of income, including salaries, have changed labour relations.

I know that the unions have also taken a long look at the whole issue. I am a member of the Bloc Québécois. I can attest to the fact that, since the eighties, the Quebec union movement has changed considerably and is now much more active in identifying the interests of businesses, not by ignoring those of workers, because a democratic union protects the interests of its members, but by getting involved, by knowing that jobs are created by the businesses, and by realizing that the more productive businesses are, the more competitive they will be and the greater the chances of preserving jobs and getting decent salaries. At least this is how it should be.

After some tough battles when conditions were difficult, the unions have changed some of their attitudes.

• (1235)

There have been some major changes in the world of labour relations, in labour organization. The exceptional agreement that was reached between Alcan and its employees testifies to that. In similar situations, the labour code has to help the parties, not hinder them.

Even more striking in this supposed reform of the Canada Labour Code is the fact that it provides less flexibility for the law and the minister to intervene. Instead of promoting dialogue and negotiation, even in the context of a balance of power, the supposed new code does the opposite. I have to say I have never understood why the departmental experts produce some of these provisions, including those pertaining to determination of the right to strike and ministerial intervention.

I would remind those watching us that the Canada Labour Code applies to only about 10% of unionized workers across Canada, and the situation is essentially the same in Quebec. I take this opportunity to point out something that is important in this House. The Privy Council in London finally decided in 1927 that labour relations were a provincial matter. In London, they often sided with the provinces, unlike the Supreme Court, which always upheld the federal government.

Some 10% of unionized workers are covered by the Canadian code, but these unions are rather special. Most of them are national or involved in areas under federal jurisdiction, such as shipping. The unions are often big ones that need time to conduct a vote.

I know our colleagues in the West are very concerned about what is happening with grain. As the critic during the rail strike, I realized the importance not only of labour relations and the union movement, but of the use of the powers of the minister and the House in connection with wheat.

It is essential that the committee look at the provision in the code requiring a union that has obtained the right to strike to exercise

that right within 60 days of obtaining it. This is an extremely limiting provision, which is almost guaranteed to prevent a settlement. Why?

I said that many of these unions are big ones. Many of them are national and need time to obtain the right to strike. Sometimes the period between obtaining the right to strike and reaching a settlement can go well beyond 60 days.

• (1240)

Sight must not be lost of the fact that, often, a settlement is reached when management or the union is close to resorting to a strike or lock-out. However, when there is a cut-off point and the union does not want to find itself without a mandate, what will it do? It will break off negotiations before they are too far advanced and go after another strike mandate. This strikes me as sensible.

The only exception to the 60 days would be when both parties agreed to a postponement. If a dispute is intense, it is dangerous to think either party would agree.

This provision worries me, as does the one requiring 72 hours' notice of a lock-out or strike. This time, I will look at it from management's point of view.

An employer that intends to lock out its employees in 72 hours and so informs the union may find itself in the rather difficult situation of having to pay employees to do precious little because they know they are going to be locked out in 72 hours anyway.

If I look at it from the union's point of view, that of longshoremen, for instance—there are many of them—if they have to warn management that they are going to strike in 72 hours, what will happen? Ships that were scheduled to dock for unloading will have taken another route.

So, instead of making settlement easier, instead of using the imminent arrival of a ship for instance, they are taking away flexibility, taking away from the relationships of power for reaching a settlement.

When a strike or lockout occurs, it is because no agreement has been able to be reached. Of course this is always a sort of admission of failure, but at the same time it must be seen as the start of something new. Very often we have seen businesses, where labour relations had been difficult for years, go through a real conflict and then, afterward, the workers, the union representatives, the employer and its representatives start talking and a new and far different era in labour relations begins, because both sides have understood that to do otherwise was not in their best interests. They agree to listen to each other, and perhaps to take the concerns of both sides more into account. This was a common occurrence in the 1980s.

If this is to happen, the labour code must help make it happen. The code must not give one party an advantage, one which I would call an undue advantage, over the other. But what do we see here? The Canada Labour Code, while claiming to be modern, does not

accept that employers should be forbidden to use scabs during a labour conflict.

There is one thing I can guarantee. When a company has used replacement workers, to use the euphemism, settlement may be difficult, but the subsequent return to work is far more difficult. I am arguing in favour of not losing sight of what will happen after the return to work, of ensuring an atmosphere that will lead to a proper organization of the work afterward.

There is no business anywhere that can thumb its nose at what the workers think—at any time, but particularly during and after a conflict—because those workers are the ones responsible for production, whether they use sophisticated machines or a hammer, they are the ones that make the company viable, the ones that make it profitable. This also applies to services.

• (1245)

The Canada Labour Code cannot not be seen as a piece of machinery with metal gears. It must respond to the current labour, business and economic situation. It must equip the parties to resolve their differences readily and then to start on a new footing, leaving the dispute behind as quickly as possible in order to move on to a new phase where work is assured and the business is competitive.

The committee has an important job to do. I will close by repeating that I hope it has the time to do it and pointing out that this legislation is not ordinary. It is legislation that becomes the law of the parties in its codicils and commas and therefore both its content and form must give both employees and businesses the means to resolve disputes and to play a role in this changeable economy, which is a challenge to everyone.

[*English*]

Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the Bloc member for whom I have considerable respect. We sit on some committees together and I am always interested to hear her comments.

I have a couple of questions which I would like to pose to her, but I would like to give some background before I pose them. I come from a business environment in which I was involved in labour situations.

One particular part of the bill serves to illustrate the importance of what our party has been putting forward. That has to do with the fact that the bill allows the government to require grain vessels to be serviced at port. That is probably a good thing, in recognition of our international standing and serving the vessels which come to port. However I think it is tragic that it does not deal with getting the grain to the port.

Government Orders

We are in the information age. We move information around but few people actually produce a product. When we boil down all the moving of information around, where are the people who are actually producing something? It is our Canadian farmers who are doing that. Much of the information age rests on the foundation of people who are actually producing a product. That is why it is so critical those people not be subject to hindrances due to labour stoppages.

My concern is that we have a government which recognizes the need to maintain our international standing at ports for vessels but ignores or seems to put secondary the needs of Canadian farmers and Canadian producers.

The rail system knit the country together in the beginning. The rail system was a very important factor in building this nation and carrying product to port so we could participate in the international market. When Canadian farmers suffer, I suggest to the House and to those watching that all Canadians suffer. That goes to my point that the information age has been built on top of those who actually produce.

If we can do this for the international community, why can we not also specifically entertain new ideas such as final offer arbitration that our party has put forward? If it cannot be embraced by all venues, why not for venues like Canadian farmers who are so desperately in need of getting this product to market to ensure a strong Canadian economy?

• (1250)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Francine Lalonde: Madam Speaker, my colleague has reminded me of the rail strike, when the Bloc Quebecois was the official opposition and I was the critic in this area. I can tell the House I have more pleasant memories than those from that period of time when the rest of Canada was accusing us of holding up quick passage of the bill, while we simply insisted on the usual three days between the bill's introduction and its passing. We had proposed a perfectly acceptable amendment, which the government rejected. The next time around it agreed. We were told we were threatening Canada's economy.

I said two things at the time "If the Canadian economy cannot afford the Canadian Labour Code, then change it. Until then, we will defend those who abide by the code".

I also learned at the time that workers were prepared to load and unload the grain anywhere. It is the employers that locked them out to force the government to pass special back-to-work legislation.

Labour relations are a complex issue. I understand your point of view, but potential disputes cannot be solved overnight. When workers feel they are not getting their fair share of the profits,

Government Orders

when companies do not listen at all, some confrontation is bound to take place. When the economy is doing better, of course.

Does the final offer solve the problems? I have often heard members from this side express satisfaction that a final offer was made. I reviewed the issue, and I am prepared to do so again, but I am not convinced it would solve the problem at all. Indeed, if the final offer that is accepted is such that, afterwards, workers are so upset that they keep the company from operating at full capacity, nothing will have been solved.

I do not think this is the right solution. In any case, my colleague should realize that when unions are dynamic, strong and democratic, as most of them are, nothing can replace discussions between the workers' representatives and those of the employer. The code must keep such talks alive.

Again, I believe Quebec was the first to undergo this change in labour relations. Since the province was hard hit by the 1981-82 recession, unions had to adjust to the new reality.

A similar adjustment was also made in the rest of Canada. It is good for the union if a company does well, but the union must be recognized. A company should be willing to make compromises when the union is taking its needs into account. We must facilitate this kind of approach in Quebec and in Canada.

There is nothing better than a business whose employees feel truly involved. But for unions to be recognized, they must have a role to play; they must know that their proposals will be taken into account.

[English]

Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member might have a comment on the issue surrounding replacement workers.

• (1255)

In the bill replacement workers cannot be used, but the concern is whether or not it is for union busting. Businesses have the right to continue operating. They can bring in replacement workers to continue keeping the business open but they cannot use them for the purpose of union busting.

In the province of Quebec I believe replacement workers are not allowed under any circumstances. Would the member have a comment on the difference between the two situations?

[Translation]

Mrs. Francine Lalonde: Madam Speaker, we can certainly come back to that. I would just like to tell my hon. colleague that, at first, when the antiscab legislation was passed in 1977, busi-

nesses were very angry and could not wait for the Liberals to be back in government to revoke the antiscab legislation.

When his government was voted in again in 1985, Robert Bourassa told the companies whose concerns were voiced in the business magazines of the time "You are enjoying labour peace. Why do you want to change that?" While this legislation is intended to prevent the hiring of scabs by a company looking to undermine a bargaining unit, it leaves the door wide open.

How can one think that, even if the company claims to recognize and not to dispute their position, striking employees will not get furious when scabs are hired and will not try, by every means available, to resolve the dispute in their favour? This will lead to problems down the road. The use of scabs is a source of problems after a strike. The company can never resolve its labour relations problems.

[English]

Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have the chance to speak to the bill to amend part I of the Canada Labour Code.

I am proud to support the legislation because I believe strongly in collective bargaining. The bill does not create any unfair advantage for anyone. In fact it balances the needs and interests of workers, employers and the Canadian public. Therefore it is good for the Canadian economy of today and tomorrow.

Canada has been well served by its system of collective bargaining. We know that labour and management groups in the federally regulated private sector view part I of the Canada Labour Code as a viable framework which has facilitated the process.

We are also beginning to see a new level of co-operation between management and labour and new styles of negotiation. These new developments challenge us to find the proper balance between a number of goals and objectives. A balance must be found between social and economic goals. Work is a form of personal social expression and a source of economic security.

A balance must also be found between instruments of labour policy. Property rights, for example, must be balanced against protection of freedom of association. A balance must also be found between rights and responsibilities.

While our system of collective bargaining conveys certain rights to management and labour, it is also based on the expectation that labour and management will meet the responsibilities to bargain fairly and in good faith.

We are also facing global economic challenges and increasingly competitive markets. Our collective bargaining system must be flexible enough to ensure that labour disputes can be resolved speedily and positively. Enhanced co-operation will lead to greater

Government Orders

productivity, increased employment security and more participation by workers in workplace decisions.

The legislation contains a number of important reforms and innovations which together accomplish the difficult task of finding the proper balance between the interests of workers, employers and the Canadian public.

The following reforms and innovations will prepare us for the economy of the 21st century.

First, a new Canada industrial relations board will replace the Canada Labour Relations Board.

• (1300)

The new board will include a neutral chairperson and vice-chairperson and equal numbers of members representing employers and employees. The new board will be more flexible and able to act more quickly and its powers will be more clearly defined. This will ensure that complex labour-management disputes can be fully addressed and it will be possible for appropriate actions to be taken in the event of unfair labour practices.

Second, the federal mediation and conciliation service will be strengthened and its neutrality will be enhanced by defining its role by statute. These amendments will help to emphasize the fact that dispute resolution and prevention are important aspects of our collective bargaining policies.

Third, the right to strike or lockout will be subject to the holding of a secret ballot within the previous 60 days and the provision of 72 hours notice.

Fourth, replacement workers will not be banned outright. Rather, the board will be given the power to stop their use if it finds that they are being used as an unfair labour practice to undermine a union. At the same time, the legitimate rights of employers to continue their operations during a stoppage of work is recognized without undermining the strength of the union.

Fifth, employees will be entitled to insurance and benefit programs during work stoppages.

Each of these measures will ensure that part I of the code contributes to an effective and efficient collective bargaining system which is responsive to the needs of both employers and employees.

I will discuss the consultations that led to this legislation and the consensus that exists on the bill presently. This is important to better appreciate and understand why the bill is as it is today. Consultations began with preliminary discussions led by senior government officials with the labour movement, business groups and representatives of other groups with an interest in the federally regulated private sector. These discussions identified major areas

of agreement and disagreement concerning required amendments to part I of the Canada Labour Code.

Following these preliminary discussions, a task force of exceptionally able and credible labour relations experts was established to examine part I of the code and to make recommendations to the Minister of Labour. The three person task force was led by Andrew Sims, an Edmonton labour lawyer recognized for his accomplishments as former chair of the Alberta Labour Relations Board. Mr. Sims was joined by Paula Knopf, an accomplished arbitrator and mediator based in Toronto, and by Rodrigue Blouin, a professor at Laval University and a distinguished labour arbitrator.

The task force held public consultations in many cities, Halifax, Montreal, Ottawa, Winnipeg, Edmonton and Vancouver. More than 90 written submissions were received from close to 50 groups and individuals including major labour and business organizations. In most of the cities it visited, the task force also met informally with labour lawyers and labour law administrators. Full day meetings were held at the universities of Laval, Toronto and Calgary. These meetings provided academic experts in labour law and administration an opportunity to express their opinions.

The task force also benefited from the work of a labour-management consensus group made up of representatives of the Canadian Labour Congress, the Confederation of National Trade Unions, the Canadian Federation of Labour, the federally regulated employers, transportation and communication, the Western Grain Elevator Association and the Canadian Bankers Association. The work of this group was important in identifying issues in areas in which consensus was possible.

The Sims task force produced its report which included extensive recommendations early in 1996. The recommendations of the task force received strong support from both business and labour groups. An additional round of consultation involved meetings held by the Minister of Labour in April 1996 with representatives of labour, management and other groups in Vancouver, Regina, St. John's, Montreal, Toronto and Ottawa. These meetings gave the minister a chance to hear in person reactions to the recommendations of the task force.

• (1305)

Finally, the public had a chance, through the work of the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development, to express its views on Bill C-66, which was passed by the House of Commons in April 1997 and which was awaiting third reading in the Senate when the 35th Parliament was dissolved for the general election of June 2, 1997.

The concerns raised during the study of Bill C-66 have been taken into account in Bill C-19 now before the House. The amendments to part I of the Canada Labour Code are important and necessary.

Government Orders

They will not radically alter the current system but rather will encourage co-operative and productive labour-management relations and provide a framework for collective bargaining.

The legislation will establish a fair and balanced set of rules which will allow management and labour to define their own problems and to find their own solutions to the challenge of global economic change.

The legislation is the combination of extensive consultations with all parties with an interest in mounting a collective bargaining system for the 21st century.

I hope all members of this House will agree that the bill deserves their support because this bill is a fair and a balanced package of amendments based on recommendations of an independent task force of labour relations experts.

It has the general support of labour and management organizations subject to the code which have devoted considerable time and resources to a lengthy review and consultation process.

In conclusion, modernization of part I of the code is needed to improve the administration and functioning of the industrial relations in the federal private sector and to address changing workplace issues.

Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to speak on Bill C-19, the Canada Labour Code bill, as amendments have been presented.

Our party reviewed the consultation that has taken place in this country with many stakeholders. This has certainly given us an opportunity to speak in favour of the amendments.

I would like to speak on some of the initiatives that the amendments are focusing on, an enlightening departure from some of the practices of the past in this country. One is successor rights improvements. In the province of Saskatchewan successor rights have been legislated provincially.

I would like to speak on the issue of grain transportation as well, a major industry and a major concern to the many producers in my province.

In recent years in grain transportation rail companies have been reviewing and downsizing their short line operations. They have abandoned rail lines and also have sold off to other interests.

My concern is that a lot of the reasoning CN and CP have been using is the labour relations, the collective agreements they are bound by.

When they transfer rail lines to other operations, to American interests or to other small operators, the first to be compromised are of course the collective agreements.

One of the many issues raised is the concern that grain exports have been compromised by labour disruption in some of the ports, labour disruption by the grain handlers and grain transportation.

• (1310)

A couple of winters ago there were major disruptions in grain transportation that had nothing to do with labour. This country has to revisit its transportation strategy. Labour has a major responsibility to make sure the job is done on a daily basis, that the quality of work is done, that the safety and the health of the workers are not compromised, that democratically they represent themselves at negotiation tables with employers.

The overall strategy of grain and rail transportation in this country has been compromised year by year. It is going to take leadership from this country. This kind of leadership might come with an industrial relations board where grievances can be brought to the table and addressed.

There are issues such as anti-scab and replacement workers. This is recognized in an amendment to the labour code now before us. It recognizes that employers cannot use scab workers to compromise union positions, or union busting as the hon. member mentioned. This is a major concern to the union leaders in this country.

The other issue labour leaders have raised is the whistleblower legislation. This is the ability of a worker to raise an issue with federal, provincial or local powers or the public at large concerning worker health and safety within the workplace.

We also have seen the file increase on environmental issues such as hazardous wastes which are being used by the manufacturing industry and the transportation industry which compromise our environment. This past week we heard evidence that hazardous wastes from offshore enter this country through our ports. This has been a major contributor to hazardous wastes in this country.

Environment Canada, through its cutbacks, reorganization and harmonization of its responsibilities with the provinces and other departments in recent years has confessed its inability to check all ports of entry for hazardous wastes.

The other issue is its ability to depend on intelligence by working with with customs officers, the RCMP and the provincial police in Quebec and Ontario. There is also the opportunity to work with the workers and the labour organizations in this country. They work the ports, the railroads, the manufacturing plants, the incineration plants where a lot of these hazardous wastes are located. There is a lot of underground illegal activities with hazardous wastes.

If we mobilized and protected our workers through whistleblower legislation we would have a much safer environment, a much safer community and more transparency from an industry which is expected to police itself. Sometimes in policing, when it comes

Government Orders

down to an economic or financial decision, industries will put labour, safety and environment at the bottom of the list.

In grain transportation we are losing miles and miles of rail transportation in light of our commitments to the environment in Kyoto, and to labour. The Crow rate was taken away from western grain producers. This issue is still a concern. The rate cap that was created for grain transportation will be up for review. The price of grain transportation will go right through the roof.

• (1315)

The issue is can the employers talk with labour? Can they talk with those in grain transportation? Is there any kind of leadership this country can create, aside from our running to southern railways, to address port access to international markets? Why can we not as Canadians keep our Canadian ports, keep our Canadian railroads, keep our Canadian labour standards and keep our Canadian labour industry in this country? Why can we not keep it truly Canadian Pacific or Canadian National?

That issue is very dear to the hearts of many grain producers. This is especially so in the northern part of our provinces. The industry and the producers are far away from their markets and have to transport their grain many miles. There are small family farm operations that cannot afford a semi-tractor trailer operation to take their grain to the nearest inland terminal.

In light of all of this and hindsight being 20:20, it is the relationship we have with labour and employers and the leadership of this country. This country has to provide leadership from coast to coast to coast.

The proposed amendments now in the Canada Labour Code, the industrial relations board that is being restructured, are a positive move. It represents interests on both sides. It provides opportunities for issues to be rectified regionally or locally and more expediently. The limited prohibition of replacement workers and scabs is being recognized. It is not wholehearted but at least it is in the right direction. Successor rights have been taken a step further. The preference for grain exports is also being recognized. I think western grain producers are being heard.

Overall when future amendments are being brought forward, I would like to see the issue of whistle blower legislation brought forward so that workers can have the protection to bring out the health and safety and environmental issues.

The Canadian Labour Congress has publicly made it known through the consultation process that these amendments are being supported by the labour community. However, in light of the concerns that hon. members from the Bloc Québécois have raised, some of these issues are not taken far enough.

What our party is saying is that at least it is one step. It may not be a whole jump through the door but future amendments might be an evolution to seeing that which the hon. members from the Bloc are envisioning.

I thank the House for allowing me to speak on this most important issue. I welcome any questions.

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the hon. member spoke so eloquently on this bill. He is right. It is a step and I think it is a good step.

I was just in the back of the lobby a couple of minutes ago talking to some staff. There were a couple of letters from farmers who desperately want this approved.

It is so important today that we move this bill along. It is going to be sent to committee. Why does the member think the Reform and Bloc members, which I really do not understand, and the Conservative members are holding it up in a log jam? If we quickly move this bill on to committee, then we would have an opportunity for more input. Does my colleague have any thoughts on that?

Mr. Rick Laliberte: Madam Speaker, I guess the question rightfully should be placed with the parties from which she wants the answers. I cannot speak for the other parties of this House.

• (1320)

The grain transportation issues were raised especially with the grain producers in the west. The ports cater to the offshore markets. Farmers must have the ability to move their grain through the mountain passes. The operation of the railroads must be transparent to the producers which is something that has not been addressed. We quickly lay the blame of grain not being moved on labour disruptions, but the operation of the railroads is not transparent to the grain handlers and the producers.

The transparency of the operation of the railroads is compromised when amendments are made to the Canadian Transportation Act, such as those which have been brought forward in recent years. It is as if rail transportation is on one side and the producers and the people who use the railroads are on the other side.

We have lost our head. Somebody took time off and we have lost our head on this issue. There is no vision. There is no foresight. There is no thought. The railroads are selling off our Canadian interests when the rail beds are on Canadian property and title belongs to the Canadian nation.

Many capital investments have been made by CN and CP over the years for improvements and line extensions. Now they are selling it off to Omnitrax out of Denver and rail transportation out of Texas. What are we left with?

Government Orders

We realize now the detrimental effect which greenhouse gas emissions will have on our environment in the future. Rail transportation is the way to go because it is cheaper.

We were told in northern Saskatchewan to build a highway. It costs \$180,000 to build a kilometre of highway. Why not build a kilometre of rail bed at \$18,000? The rail bed is mechanized and is very efficient.

The people of northern Saskatchewan, northern Manitoba, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon eventually will have to negotiate with firms in Denver and Texas to get rail transportation into the far north.

We are losing our vision of the entire country for the benefit of industrial labour relations. The farmers feel alienated. They sit at their kitchen tables and talk about the issues of this nation. We have to bring those issues to the House of Commons because the vision of this country should be debated here.

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I certainly want to zero in on what the hon. member had to say about grain transportation. I want to assure him that not only in northern Saskatchewan, northern Alberta and northern Manitoba is this a concern. It is a concern right across Canada.

I come from a constituency which grows a lot of wheat. The farmers there will openly tell you that they have been betrayed on three counts. First, they were betrayed when they got one year's free freight out of the Crow rate. Second, the practice of the grain companies and the railway companies getting together to plan the mass rail line abandonment is a betrayal of the farmers. The third betrayal is our inability to go to the railways and say "Your cost of operating is 50% what it used to be, or it certainly will be. We are not going to be talking about freight increases, we are going to be talking about freight reduction".

Would the member agree with that?

Mr. Rick Laliberte: Madam Speaker, I hope there is foresight in the hon. member's comment and that his prophecy will some day come true.

The hon. member is talking about decision making. The decisions are made at the board tables of the rail transportation companies. They are made for profit margins and shareholder interests. However, the shareholders have lost sight. The shareholders are Canadians. We are the shareholders of the railroads.

Someone got their way. They lobbied the right person at some point in time and now the railways are private organizations.

• (1325)

Speaking of privatization, there was a recent decision made in Great Britain. The chief executive officer of Virgin Records, Mr.

Branson, challenged an American interest that has operations of all the lotteries in Great Britain. But lotteries as we know them in Canada are state run and non-profit intensive. However one person took it to court and has stopped privatization of railroads and privatization of the subway departments in all the major cities.

That is what we have to look at in this country. Stop the privatization move. Let us look at the national vision and bring in the shareholders, Canadians, those people at their kitchen tables from southern and northern Saskatchewan, from Quebec, from Ontario, from B.C., from the Yukon. Make these people a part of the decision making process and the vision of this country.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today. I see by the hour on the clock that my debate time is unfortunately going to be cut short. I will have to continue on Tuesday or whenever the government screws up the courage to bring the legislation back again.

This is the government's second kick at the can for this legislation. That has become clear thus far. Certainly we in the opposition ranks have become well accustomed to seeing reruns in this 36th Parliament, leftover, retread legislation from the last Parliament that did not meet the bill, so to speak. The government has insisted on dredging it up, repackaging it, giving it a different number and bringing it back in the hopes that the Canadian public is going to be somehow fooled by this and give it a fresh look.

It is unfortunate on the government's part that it did not invoke closure on the old C-66 from the last Parliament to ram it through the House like it did with so much other legislation. But I suppose it must have had a little bit of a twinge of conscience at one point about doing that with every piece of legislation in the closing days of the last Parliament.

Even after this government is told by Canadians that its bills are flawed, it just keeps reintroducing and recycling them. Often, as in the case of C-19, some minor cosmetic changes are made but we are really right back where we began.

The problems that existed in Bill C-66 are still found in the present Bill C-19 that we are debating today. When I look at this bill I have to look at it through the eyes of my constituents, through the eyes of farmers and through the eyes of those Canadians who will be most affected when the government undoubtedly uses its majority in the House, as it did recently with Bill C-4, and just rams it through despite the pleas of Canadians from coast to coast that it simply does not do the job.

Some groups have told me that they are content with C-19 and they have encouraged me to support it. Even when those same people have expressed supreme disappointment at the considerable

flaws in the legislation, they have basically said that it is better than nothing.

It is our job as official opposition and as MPs to strive to ensure that Canadians do not have to be content with something that is better than nothing. We believe that it should be a whole lot better than nothing. So we have to look at each piece of legislation on balance and we have to weigh the pros and cons. While some clauses may have some merit, we have to consider that the flawed clauses of the legislation, or the legislation that is missing altogether, may cause significant problems or consequences later on.

The fact is that when it comes to C-19 those problems and consequences far outweigh any benefits that may arise from the passage of C-19. From my point of view as the chief official opposition agricultural critic, farmers who already contend with unstable weather patterns and many other challenges beyond their control, increasing input costs for one, will not find solace in this legislation. They will continue to have one or more unstable factors threatening their livelihoods.

Grain farmers need guarantees that their grain will get to its destination. Despite government claims to the contrary, Bill C-19 will not guarantee that grain will be transported to its destination.

• (1330)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I must interrupt the hon. member. It being 1.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

PATENT ACT

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): moved that Bill C-248, an act to amend the Patent Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Madam Speaker, I am pleased to stand in the House today to speak to Bill C-248, a bill that will attempt to basically make prescription drugs affordable to those who need it most.

I commence my remarks today by thanking my colleague, the member for Yukon, for seconding my bill.

Bill C-248 basically reduces the patent life of a new drug from 20 years to 17 years. It also reduces the period of market exclusivity on a new drug from 20 years to 4 years. Market exclusivity is the patent holder's monopoly on sales.

The largest increases in sales volume of a new drug typically occur during the first four years. After that the largely Canadian generic firms would have the right to manufacture copies on

Private Members' Business

payment of a royalty to the brand name patent holding firms, a system called compulsory licensing.

In essence Bill C-248 provides for competition among prescription drug manufacturers that now have monopoly pricing authority under government Bill C-91.

This bill is supported by literally tens of thousands of seniors and thousands of other people in Canada who are ill and require prescription drugs. It is supported and endorsed by the Canadian Health Coalition, by the Government of Saskatchewan, by the Canadian Labour Congress and by many other organizations.

Debate on the patent drugs issue has often confused the two ideas of patents and market exclusivity. The two points were only made synonymous when the pharmaceutical bill, Bill C-91, was introduced in 1991. Bill C-22 in 1987 did not eliminate compulsory licensing. It simply extended the period of market exclusivity from four years to seven years.

Bill C-248 includes the best of the pre-Mulroney regime on prescription drug royalties and pricing. It respects so-called intellectual property rights by establishing a royalty payment to the patent holder, but it does not intervene in the market to create a monopoly for an undue length of time.

It is different from the 1987 system in that instead of a flat royalty rate Bill C-248 would allow for a sliding royalty scheme that rewards brand name pharmaceutical firms that actually did the majority of the research on a particular drug in Canada as opposed to now when they do it outside the country.

This proposal was adopted by the federal NDP as part of its platform in the last election. The NDP is the only party to consistently support competition in the prescription drug industry. This bill fulfils part of our campaign commitment to continue the fight for fair prescription drug prices.

I want to talk for a few minutes about costs and benefits. I believe it is time that we as parliamentarians admit that the current government policy of granting generous patent rights to foreigners as an enticement to establish a Canadian pharmaceutical industry just has not worked.

The policy sees public funds used to pay for these generous patent rights through billions of dollars in drug costs from our provincial medicare and drug plans. The drug companies get a five year average return on capital of over 14%. In return for this generous ROI, layoffs, a trade deficit in pharmaceuticals, less R and D per sales in the U.S. and expensive drugs for those who need them most are the rewards for Canadians.

We have not even begun to pay the worst of the costs yet. Health economists like Stephen Schondelmeyer and Queen's health policy group have examined the costs of Bill C-91. If we take their most conservative estimate and compare the situation under Bill C-91 to the case under Bill C-22, which was by no means perfect, the cost

Private Members' Business

to consumers is between \$4 billion and \$7 billion over a 10 year period.

• (1335)

Most of that \$7 billion will be paid after the year 2000, which as everyone knows is the new millennium. If you catch the millennium bug, the millennium drug prices are going to kill you. That is because the last of the drugs approved with a seven year market exclusivity under Bill C-22 will be able to go generic in 1999. We have not even begun to feel the pain, in other words.

In return for \$4 billion to \$7 billion in additional drug costs, we have received maybe \$500 million in additional R and D which was already required to meet Canada's drug approval regulations. We lost over 2,000 jobs as well. We sustained huge cutbacks in transfer payments and social programs to pay down the debt and deficit, along with all the hardship and unemployment they entailed.

People say that the Patent Medicine Prices Review Board is there to protect against price gouging or skyrocketing prescription drug costs.

What exactly has been done by the PMPRB, the great defender of the people of Canada? The Patent Medicine Prices Review Board lacks accountability, which is a bit of a problem. It lacks transparency, which is a bit of a problem. It has no mandate to serve the public interest. It serves the interest of large multinationals across the world. Its methodology is skewed to give the appearance of price control while it permits drug cartels to charge the highest drug prices in the industrialized world.

Why do I say that? For example, they use in their formula for checking price controls seven OECD countries such as Britain, France, U.S., Switzerland and Sweden that have the highest costs of living anywhere in the world. They are more expensive than Canada. Yet the PMPRB uses as a reference retail prices which are never charged to the citizens of those countries or their drug plans because they always buy at discounts of up to 40%. It is very clear that we pay the highest prices anywhere in the world.

Our view is that the PMPRB has to make some changes. It needs a legislated mandate to protect the public interest, not large corporations. It should make drug comparisons of all twenty-nine OECD countries, not the seven most expensive countries in which to live in the OECD.

Drug price comparisons should be made against the real price, the 40% discount price, and not the retail prices charged in these countries. Finally, some due diligence should be exercised and the price data from large drug cartels in European countries should be independently verified to determine for sure whether or not the prices are accurate.

My bill will basically restore competition and perhaps encourage the PMPRB to do the job it was supposed to do at the outset.

The Liberals opposite have said that they will work within the system, will go to the industry committee meeting and will fire tough questions at large multinationals written by the Minister of Industry, the Minister of Health and their colleagues to make drug companies look good.

Working within that system has not really paid off. There have been no tangible results. I say this with some sympathy for colleagues in the Liberal government who faithfully toiled away in the industry committee last year on Bill C-91. They lobbied their caucus and they lobbied their Minister of Industry. They had every expectation that some minimal response would be provided. As we know, nothing actually happened. The Liberal government was able to slide into another election because the review was being done until the election call last spring.

What reward did they get for this? The biggest defender of the large multinationals, the chair of the industry committee, David Walker, got his reward. He was defeated by my colleague, the NDP member for Winnipeg Centre, for all the great work he did misleading the people of his constituency and not doing his job to stand up for the public interest when it came to price gouging by large multinational drug companies.

What about those who did not get defeated? Not very many of those who supported the drug companies were not defeated by an NDPer. They simply got humiliated by the cabinet's complete capitulation to the multinational drug companies just last month.

I argue that the only way to fix Bill C-91 is to scrap it and to support Bill C-248. That is why I am asking for support of the bill. It will make some definite changes, bring competition to drug pricing and help those who need it most.

• (1340)

Large foreign drug companies wanted 20 years of market exclusivity on new drugs for four reasons. First, they said it would create jobs. In fact there are 2,000 fewer people working in our pharmaceutical industry as a result.

Second, they said that it would keep drugs affordable. In fact costs for brand name drugs have skyrocketed since 1987, forcing provincial government drug plans to pass on more of the cost to the sick and elderly.

Saskatchewan is the best example. It has been unable to defend its citizens who require prescription drugs to maintain their health because of skyrocketing costs of brand name drugs and the

exclusion of generic companies from manufacturing competitively priced drugs for those who require them.

It has also driven the cost of medicare extremely high. Prior to 1987 prescription drugs accounted for less than 8% of Canada's medicare costs and now it is over 12%, a 50% increase in medicare costs for prescription drug purchases alone.

The third idea they put forward to allow Bill C-91 to pass was to generate funds for research. Although most research money is spent on company directed clinical trials that are required by law anyway, only one new breakthrough drug has been developed in Canada since 1987, the AIDS drug 3TC. Even now it is being manufactured in Ireland. How many jobs did that create in Canada? Probably none but maybe one or two to sell it.

A commitment by large foreign drug companies to help fund pure research through the Medical Research Council was scaled back and still remains unmet. The shortfall in the MRC's budget is having drastic consequences for Canadian medical scientists.

To use the R and D pitch by the drug pharmaceuticals in Saskatchewan as an example, there were approximately 123 requests for clinical drug trials in Saskatchewan. The international pharmaceuticals approved none of the 123 requests, not one. Yet they are travelling from province to province claiming to be spending billions and trillions of dollars on more and more R and D. It is all a big lie by the pharmaceuticals.

Fourth, they said they needed Bill C-91 and could not change its provisions because of international trade obligations under the WTO. Members of the House who sat on the industry committee will recall that witness after witness, including international economic advisers and lawyers, appeared and said that the WTO permitted member countries to pass laws to seek to protect the public interest.

If the public interest is being gouged by large pharmaceuticals or any other company unfairly, any government can take the decision under this clause to protect its public from unfair pricing practices. The government does not want to do that because it would jeopardize its contributions from companies like Glaxo Wellcome which gave the Liberals \$90,000 in contributions. Another pharmaceutical, Merck Frosst, gave the Liberals about \$16,000 to help buy this protection under Bill C-91 and not to support a bill like Bill C-248 which I am putting forward in the House today.

It is clear the policy has not worked for the Liberals. The Liberals in opposition agreed with abolishing Bill C-91. Their critic, Ron MacDonald, the former member for Dartmouth, would not even run in the last election because he was so embarrassed by the flip-flop of the Liberal Party. The Prime Minister stood in the House as leader of the opposition under the Mulroney government and said "The Prime Minister of Canada always sides with the

Private Members' Business

multinationals and not the sick and poor. When are you going to repeal Bill C-91?"

Now that the former leader of the opposition is Prime Minister of Canada, he should look in the mirror and ask the same question. Perhaps he should answer it by taking some initiative to help people who are suffering under unfair prescription drug pricing practices by multinational companies.

Today bankruptcy statistics were announced: 91,000 personal and business tragedies, a record number in the country.

• (1345)

This is something, in my view, that is going to hurt those families even more when they require prescription drugs to maintain their health.

The Liberals were persuaded very unanimously by their lobbyist, Judy Erola, the chief lobbyist for the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association of Canada. Judy Erola is very persuasive because she is a former Liberal cabinet minister under Prime Minister Trudeau. They bought this line of sustaining Bill C-91 hook, line and sinker.

The cost and benefits of the current government policy on patent drugs does not add up. I challenge parliamentarians in this House to say that the emperor has no clothes and that the process that we have under Bill C-91 does not work. If we do not fix it soon the future of medicare is on the line and certainly the lives and future of all Canadians.

Mr. Walt Lastewka (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to respond to the private member's bill sponsored by the hon. member for Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre.

The Canadian drug patent policy has three main objectives, to ensure that consumers have access to patent drugs at reasonable prices, to support the development of the pharmaceutical industry and to ensure that Canada conforms with its international obligations which, for example, require a minimum of 20 years of patent protection.

These objectives are fulfilled by striking a balance between ensuring that generic drugs can hit the market immediately after patent expiry and effective enforcement of patent rights. However, the bill put forward by the hon. member would negate this balance.

In contrast, the package of regulatory reform proposals, which the minister announced on January 24, 1998, would maintain this balance and improve the regulatory framework for drug patents.

Let me explain why the bill is inappropriate. The hon. member wishes to turn back the clock. He wants to restore compulsory licensing of patented drugs. This would allow generic drug companies to manufacture and sell a generic equivalent four years

Private Members' Business

into a patent term. The hon. member also proposes to shorten patent terms.

The hon. member proposes these measures to combat the spectre of increased health care costs. He lays the blame for these costs at the feet of Canada's drug patent policy. However, the facts do not bear him out.

We are making sure drugs are available at reasonable prices through price controls on patented drugs. This regime has been very effective. Canadians paid over 24% less for patented drugs in 1995 than they would have in the absence of the federal price regulation. Total estimated savings to Canadians from limiting price increases over the years 1988 to 1995 were over \$3 billion.

When we look at the latest report of the Patented Medicine Prices Review Board, which administers price controls on patented drugs, we find that prices of patented medicines declined by 2.1% in 1996. I remind the House that the consumer price index increased by 1.6% over the same period.

Overall, Canadian prices for patented drugs have declined significantly relative to foreign prices on average by 30%. Canadian prices were 23% above the median of foreign prices in 1987 but dropped to 10% below in 1996.

Of course, even though patented drug prices have fallen, we are concerned about health care costs. Pharmaceutical companies, through their extensive investments in research and development, have come up with new drugs to help improve the health of Canadians. Not only are Canadians reassured because there is an increasing number of ailments that can now be treated with drugs, these new medicines can reduce hospital stays. This helps reduce overall health care costs.

We are also firmly committed to making sure Canadians continue to have the best available drugs at the best possible prices.

• (1350)

We want to strengthen the PMPRB's mandate. The PMPRB released a discussion paper and is concurrently consulting with the public about its mandate. I hope the member opposite has made his presentation.

Also, as announced on January 21, 1998, federal, provincial and territorial ministers of health are working collaboratively on a number of pharmaceutical issues, including drug prices.

The government also acknowledges the importance of the generic industry in keeping drug costs down. We want Canadians to be able to access generic drugs as soon as the patent expires. In fact, we provide early working exceptions to patent infringement which enable generic manufacturers to enter the market as soon as possible upon patent expiry. This has been an integral feature of our patent framework along with the link between the patent status of a brand name drug and the regulatory approval of its generic equivalent.

Recently the EU has challenged Canada's compliance with our international obligations in light of the exceptions I have just referred to. It is Canada's intention to vigorously defend these exceptions. We believe we are in full compliance with our international obligations.

I would also like to point out that the government's proposed changes would further reduce any delays in getting less expensive generic drugs to market while maintaining effective patent protection.

I would like to turn to my second reason for opposing Bill C-248. Patent protection is a prerequisite for innovation, R and D and investment, and Bill C-248 would severely limit this protection, jeopardizing investment and jobs in Canada.

Since 1993 the brand name industry has spent over \$2 billion in research and development across the country and that has meant jobs for Canadians. We are speaking here of high paying, knowledge intensive jobs. We are speaking about economic growth in one of the most dynamic sectors in the global economy, where investment in research and development roams the world looking for the best place to make a home.

In Canada the pharmaceutical industry is a major R and D performer. While the pharmaceutical industry accounts for only 1% of manufacturing sector shipments it performs 10% of all industrial R and D. Of the top 100 R and D spenders in Canada 26 are pharmaceutical companies.

I remind the House that when the Patent Act was amended in 1987 the Pharmaceutical Manufacturer's Association of Canada made a public commitment that the brand name pharmaceutical industry would increase its annual R and D expenditure as a percentage of sales to 10%. That is the period on which the PMPRB has now reported.

Have these companies lived up to their commitments? Indeed they have. In 1996 their R and D to sales ratio was not just 10%. It was 12.3%. For patentees as a whole the ratio was 11.4%.

Spending on basic research was \$136.6 million or 21.7% of the total in 1996. Applied research accounted for 62.9% of the total. This includes clinical and preclinical trials and manufacturing process R and D.

It is clear that the Canadian pharmaceutical industry has been making a significant contribution to the Canadian economy under modern effective patent protection. The hon. member seems to acknowledge somewhat the importance of research and development performed by the drug industry in Canada.

Under the compulsory licensing system in Bill C-248 the royalty rate would take into account the amount of medical research carried out in Canada by the applicant and the patentee. Perhaps the hon. member believes these provisions would be sufficient to encourage companies to continue research in Canada. Perhaps he thinks Canada would continue to attract the same level of R and D

investment under these terms. Perhaps he thinks that these measures would be suitable in today's knowledge based economy.

• (1355)

This brings me to my third reason for opposing Bill C-248. The measures proposed by the hon. member would contravene Canada's international obligations.

Let me conclude by saying the proposed improvements underline the government's commitment to encourage investment through modern competitive framework laws that are consistent with the international obligations and support innovative growth and development of new improved drugs.

These frameworks provide a stable investment climate for the pharmaceutical industry, which would further encourage R and D which, as I mentioned earlier, plays a vital role in the Canadian economy. The regulations have been gazetted. There is a 30 day time spell which will be completed next week.

In short, our proposed package of changes improves the system and gets the job done.

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.): Madam Speaker, what a delight it is on the last half hour on a Friday with everybody just brimming for his speech to come. I am sure that you will find it very exciting, probably one that you would rather forget.

I want to commend the hon. member who introduced this bill. I appreciate this bill's coming forward. I do not entirely agree with everything in the bill but it has merit.

It also gives me the opportunity to inform the hon. member for Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre that I was not part of a government in Saskatchewan in 1982, as he said the other day. I was part of a local government which was perhaps as important.

It is with ease that I talk about this because the pharmaceutical industry has been very much a part of our family. I had an older brother who made his career in this area. He was a Canadian. He took his Canadian experience and travelled around this world. That was a Canadian influence. I suppose we might say he was multinational, but he was Canadian born, Canadian trained and for the most part represented Canadian pharmaceutical people.

I have a doctor who is still practising, so drugs are very much part of the repertoire when I visit with him.

I wonder if anyone here has ever visited one of our large pharmaceutical research stations. The one I was at has hundreds of acres, thousands of employees. I would not want to guess—

Private Members' Business

An hon. member: It was probably a generic firm.

Mr. Roy Bailey: No, it was not. It was in Michigan, so the member can guess from that.

We have a tendency to take these important issues and make them too simplistic. Most of us will have to go to the history books for this, although a few might remember. Around the turn of the century, in 1918, a terrible flu hit this country.

I remember visiting a small village in northern B.C.. The flu of 1918 wiped out the whole village. This winter a new strain of flu, the Sydney A, has already claimed 10 Canadian lives. I mention this because to this end Canadians have learned to depend on medicine to protect us. Even more so Canadians rely on an industry that produces and makes available the prescription drugs that maintain their health. With that neither member who has spoken would interfere.

In this respect the pharmaceutical industry is one of the most important and most lucrative industries worldwide. In any country with a major pharmaceutical interest, the health of the industry as well as the health of its citizens must be considered a factor.

Because the industry is so lucrative and a significant portion of the economy relies on the industry's success, namely employment and investment in research and development, governments around the world are presented with a difficult task of balancing economic interests with very important social interests.

• (1400)

We are here today debating my colleague's bill because many Canadians feel that the balance has shifted. The hon. member who introduced the bill will say that it has shifted too far in one direction. He will say that it has shifted toward the interests of the industry and no longer considers the interests of Canadians. That is basically what he is saying in his bill.

I repeat that there is some truth to this. But whether it is good for the economy or meets our social objectives, we must remember that first and foremost the pharmaceutical industry exists to provide prescription drugs to Canadians. Huge profits, jobs, research and development are important spinoffs, as the Liberal member mentioned.

In Canada people say that they take pride in our health care system. We believe it is the best in the world and we want to keep it that way. Canadians find great solace in the fact that barring everything else which concerns them, an affordable medical system must be kept in place.

We know it matters not whether we are rich or poor, illness is illness and the requirement for medication should know no bounds. We also know that the chronically ill, seniors or children are vulnerable and therefore must have access to affordable medical

Private Members' Business

assistance. This is particularly true for seniors and the chronically ill. They cannot afford to live in a country where the cost of medicine is too high. I commend my colleague for recognizing this and for putting forth his efforts to improve the situation.

However in debating this bill I would like to make certain recommendations which I feel would accomplish our goal more efficiently and more effectively. In saying this I am indicating that I have certain problems with my colleague's bill and I will lay these out for the consideration of the House.

My colleague says that the 20% patent protection for brand name pharmaceuticals is the cause of the cost of drugs being too high. I would suggest that is being a bit too simplistic. There are clear benefits to patent protection, not the least of which is the contribution made to research and development both in the performance of it and in the generation of it that goes into this country. It is precisely this kind of research which brings Canadians the breakthrough they need to counter the effects of the flus we are seeing right now, such as the Sydney A.

Important commitments have been made by the brand name pharmaceutical companies. A program between the PMAC and the Medical Research Council was initiated for research and development with a budget of around \$250 million. That is a huge sum of money. Such agreements among sectors make an important contribution by fostering basic research in the pharmaceutical and biotechnical fields in Canada's universities and research industry.

PMAC member companies have also made commitments toward an R and D to sales ratio. As a result they have made a contribution to applied research, an important tool in achieving Canada's economic well-being.

However these commitments have not produced a perfect system. My colleagues are seriously concerned that the commitments made by the brand name pharmaceutical companies to invest in research and development are in no way assured. The Liberal government has not ensured that these agreements are binding. That is a problem for the people of Canada. It is certainly a problem for the Reform Party.

We believe that the generous patent protection given to the brand name companies must be incumbent upon the willingness of the PMAC to make binding commitments to the research and development of new drugs in Canada. Not only do pharmaceuticals gain from a competitive patent protection, they also gain from the most generous R and D tax write-offs in the world.

Based on this we believe the government should be seeking a binding commitment from this sector. We do not have that. That to me is the real guts of this bill. I agree with the hon. member on that point. The participation of the pharmaceutical industry in Canada

is so important in building a strong knowledge based economy, but we must have some proof that this is happening. I would like to see the member's bill emphasize this.

● (1405)

Maintaining the 20 year patent protection is in keeping with the patent protection of our global competitors. By ensuring this applies in Canada we can compete in the investment made by the pharmaceutical industry which enhances our economy. But in entering into this relationship we must ensure the integrity within this agreement by seeking binding commitments. Today we do not have that.

I would suggest to the originator of this bill that rather than tinker with the number of years on the patent protection that exists now, accept the 20 year patent protection to ensure Canada's competitiveness, but also ensure that the promises are binding. The government has the responsibility to see that they produce real benefits as a result of the initiatives of this industry.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The hon. member's time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Madam Speaker, in a speech on October 2, I said "Research and development is a key component for any society wishing to be fully prepared for the 21st century. Economic prosperity is increasingly the result of research and technological development, rather than the development of natural resources". That quote fits in well with the very basis of today's debate on drug patents.

Private Member's Bill C-248, an act to amend the Patent Act, introduced by the hon. member for Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, is not votable, but it is very timely. The hon. member certainly had good intentions in introducing this bill to reduce the cost of health insurance and drugs for consumers, but the arguments, and the amendments my hon. colleague wants to make to the Patent Act, are weak and open to dispute.

I am, of course, opposed to the way this bill greatly weakens the present regulations as far as a 20-year drug patent protection is concerned. The Bloc Québécois has always stressed the importance of maintaining that twenty years of protection, and I will defend that position in my speech. I will take this opportunity to counter the arguments advanced by the sponsor of the bill.

First of all, a study published on February 27, 1997 by the Patented Medicine Prices Review Board shows that federal regulation of the price of patented medicines saved Canadians and Quebecers between \$2.9 billion and \$4.2 billion between 1988 and 1995. In 1995 alone, the savings were between \$846 million and \$1.1 billion. I would point out that the board was created in 1987

under Bill C-91, which enacted amendments to the Patent Act, increasing the protection for drug patents.

As well, the price of patented medicines has risen an average of 1.6% since 1988, compared to a 3.1% increase in the consumer price index. In 1995, the average price of patented medicines in Canada dropped to a level 7% lower than the mean in other countries. In 1994, the cost of patented drugs represented 2.5% of the total expenditure of the Canadian health system, while generic ones and other non patented medicines accounted for 3.7%.

It is therefore totally wrong to say that the regulations passed under Bill C-91 caused a catastrophic increase in the cost of drugs when the bill became law, as the NDP member would have us believe.

• (1410)

Following the introduction of Bill C-91, drug manufacturers, especially those with their head offices abroad, invested substantially in research programs in both Canada and Quebec. This support helped Canada and primarily Quebec to narrow the ever widening gap between us and our competitors, such as those in the G-7 countries, in the levels of investment in basic research.

In 1988, investments in the health sector by pharmaceutical companies producing patented drugs represented 18% of the total. In 1995, the figure reached 37%. There is no doubt that, if Canada does an abrupt about face and once again offers less patent protection than other developed countries, the growth in the pharmaceutical industry in recent years will be reduced to nil.

Bill C-91 was intended to protect intellectual property, and any amendment that would limit its application could well harm the industry in Canada, and thus the pharmaceutical industry in Quebec. Because this is my responsibility, my concern is and must be to consolidate one of the largest industrial clusters.

Our economy is becoming a knowledge-based economy, particularly technological knowledge, which is the main force behind growth in the economy and improvement in quality of life. Technology and increasing productivity are therefore now at the very heart of the job debate.

Unlike the generic drug industry, the patent drug industry funds basic research, which, by the way, has been underfunded since the Liberals came to power. Cutting funding further would dry up the source for the development of new drugs, which help us improve our quality of life.

The question that arises is this: Would the generic drug industry be thriving if this basic research were not being done? Would there be anything for it to copy?

Private Members' Business

It is therefore wrong to say that the regulations that came into effect as a result of passage of Bill C-91 have resulted in a catastrophic increase in the cost of drugs.

Once again, this bill is an attempt to use the cost of drugs as an excuse for weakening the 20-year protection. This bill is becoming less important because, just under a month ago, the Minister of Industry introduced proposals to amend the regulations. Consultations are presently under way and anyone wishing to intervene on this subject may do so.

Therefore, because we have not forgotten the poor and the ill, because we want a better quality of life for our fellow citizens, and for all the other reasons given, the members of the Bloc Québécois will be voting against Bill C-248.

[English]

Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk—Brant, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I wanted to take a few minutes before the hon. member finished his five minutes to talk about Bill C-248. I have been in the House 10 years now and as a result have been through this debate on a number of occasions.

I chair the subcommittee on foreign affairs and trade disputes. One of the issues we look is issues like this bill. It worries me that the intent of the bill would contravene some of the international agreements under the World Trade Organization.

Agreements such as those under the WTO, I think all members would agree, contribute to Canada's economic growth and help Canada in terms of its exports around the world. Certainly in terms of our policy we would not want to support legislation that contravened very important trade agreements that have been very beneficial to Canada.

• (1415)

Being part of the global marketplace brings significant benefits to Canadians. There is investment in Canada in new plants and in research and development which is critical for creating direct new jobs. We also have good access around the world.

The WTO requires a 20 year patent protection. A pre-1993 compulsory licensing regime and a 17 year patent term would not be in line with the WTO—

An hon. member: You missed my point.

Mr. Bob Speller: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will be given an opportunity to speak to this later.

For these reasons I know that most members on this side of the House would be in disagreement with this bill. Bill C-248 as a

Private Members' Business

whole would upset the balance in our system between the benefits of having generic drugs reach the market as soon as possible after patent expiry and the need for effective enforcement of patent rights.

As other hon. members from this side of the House have stated, we are committed to this principle. When we responded to the industry committee's report on Bill C-91 we reaffirmed our commitment to the principle of the proposed changes to the drug patent regulations announced January 21, 1998 and which were published on January 24 in the *Canada Gazette*.

The government's proposed changes will continue to provide effective enforcement of patent rights while reducing delays in getting generic drugs to market. The length of the regulatory stay on insurance of a health and safety approval for a generic drug would be reduced from 30 months to 24 months. Members on this side of the House believe that the improvements we proposed will also discourage litigation and make the system fair.

We have concerns. We have worked on them for the last number of years since this bill was brought in by the Tories under the Mulroney government years ago. We believe we have made significant changes. We believe the system now in place is fair to all sides.

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, I wish to respond to my colleagues who made some comments with respect to Bill C-248. The parliamentary secretary read that speech exactly like Judy Erola and the Ministry of Industry wrote it. So congratulations. There is nothing new in that speech. The people of Canada know that and they will make their judgments come the next election.

With respect to my Bloc colleague, I am absolutely shocked at what the Bloc member said with regard to the pharmaceutical industry. This member said: "They don't care about the poor and the sick. It is a matter of the welfare of the wealthy and the other corporations that produce those pharmaceuticals in Quebec". This is going to be a real surprise and wake-up call for all those poor and sick Quebecers come the next referendum. If the Bloc and the PQ do not want to support them on an issue like this, why should they support Quebec on a referendum issue? We will see what happens when that comes along. I thank them for that comment.

With respect to the member for Haldimand—Norfolk—Brant, I am glad he stood in this House and indicated there are some concerns about it, but he did not catch the words I said earlier with respect to the World Trade Organization.

During the review in the industry committee, witness after witness, including international economists and lawyers, came before us and said there is a public interest clause in the WTO that if the government deems it in the public interest to contravene one of the WTO regulations because it is abusing that country, it can make amendments with respect to Bill C-91 or drug patents.

• (1420)

I ask the member to please consider those representations by the lawyers and economists, who are internationally renowned and who all share the same view that the WTO in the public interest can be changed in respect to issues pertinent to their country.

I thank my colleague from Souris—Moose Mountain for his constructive comments. He did say he would like to have some binding commitments with respect to Bill C-91.

I like my colleague's recommendation and I do support it, but I remind him that we did have commitments from the industry under Bill C-22 in 1997 and under Bill C-91. They were going to increase the number of jobs. Wrong. There are fewer jobs. They were going lower prices on prescription drugs. Wrong. Drug prices are higher. They made a commitment to increase R and D. Guess what? They are increasing a lot of their expenses in terms of marketing, going to doctors and hospitals, giving them computers and trips to Barbados and all these places for using their prescription drugs and they call that R and D, research and development.

I guess they research the doctor and develop him or her into selling their prescription drugs and in return they spend R and D money by giving them new computers, trips to the Bahamas or trips to Australia or wherever they want to go. That is not R and D, that is marketing. That should not be in any kind of regulations, whether it is under the Bill C-91 regulations or any other commitments.

I admire and thank the member for his constructive criticism. I will pursue that.

I want to make one other comment with respect to what happened in Argentina and Chile. I had a visit from an Argentinian politician who came here because of the work I was doing on Bill C-91. His name was Ernesto Algaba.

He told me that the people in Argentina were very concerned. They are all fanning out around the various countries of the world that are WTO co-signatories on Bill C-91. They are being forced by the American ambassador who is being told by the American Pharmaceutical Association to get the 20 year patent monopoly pricing in Argentina or else they would do something economic like maybe even pull out their ambassador from Argentina.

Ernesto Algaba told me he went to Chile, which had the same commitments that we had in Canada. After Chile passed the 20 year patent protection it lost jobs, closed plants, drug prices skyrocketed and health care costs skyrocketed.

We have international examples. There may have been a misunderstanding when the member for St. Catharines said we need this because of competitive pricing requirements. Bill C-91 is not competitive. It is a monopoly to charge whatever they want for prescription drugs for 20 years. That is not competition.

Private Members' Business

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired and this item is dropped from the Order Paper.

[*English*]

Mr. John Solomon: Madam Speaker, I request unanimous consent to refer this bill to committee for further study.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Does the member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. John Solomon: Madam Speaker, I would request unanimous consent, even though the Liberals declined the previous request, for this bill to be votable today.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Does the member have unanimous consent.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): It being 2.25 p.m., this House stands adjourned until next Monday at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2.24 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. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. GILBERT PARENT (CHAIRMAN)

HON. DON BOUDRIA, P.C.

HON. ALFONSO GAGLIANO, P.C.

MR. STÉPHANE BERGERON

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. PETER MACKAY

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

MR. CHUCK STRAHL

MR. RANDY WHITE

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

First Session – Thirty-sixth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay — Columbia	British Columbia	Ref.
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary — Nose Hill	Alberta	Ref.
Adams, Peter, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Peterborough	Ontario	Lib.
Alarie, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	Quebec	BQ
Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	Lib.
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Alberta	Ref.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Victoria	British Columbia	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Quebec	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	Quebec	BQ
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon — Rosetown — Biggar	Saskatchewan	NDP
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Bachand, André	Richmond — Arthabaska	Quebec	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Bailey, Roy	Souris — Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Baker, George S.	Gander — Grand Falls	Newfoundland	Lib.
Bakopanos, Eleni, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Ahuntsic	Quebec	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Ontario	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West — Mississauga	Ontario	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Timmins — James Bay	Ontario	Lib.
Bélangier, Mauril	Ottawa — Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	Quebec	BQ
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton — Gloucester	Ontario	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon E.	Lakeland	Alberta	Ref.
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Tobique — Mactaquac	New Brunswick	PC
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure — Gaspé — Îles-de-la-Madeleine — Pabok	Quebec	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Quebec	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan — King — Aurora	Ontario	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	Quebec	BQ
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg — Transcona	Manitoba	NDP
Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Ontario	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon — Souris	Manitoba	PC
Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Ontario	Lib.
Bradshaw, Claudette, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Moncton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Alberta	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	Quebec	BQ
Brison, Scott	Kings — Hants	Nova Scotia	PC
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Ontario	Lib.
Bryden, John	Wentworth — Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale — High Park	Ontario	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Newfoundland	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	British Columbia	Ref.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin — Peel — Wellington — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane	Quebec	BQ
Caplan, Elinor	Thornhill	Ontario	Lib.
Carroll, Aileen	Barrie — Simcoe — Bradford	Ontario	Lib.
Casey, Bill	Cumberland — Colchester	Nova Scotia	PC
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Alberta	Ref.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West — Nepean	Ontario	Lib.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec)	Outremont	Quebec	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Guelph — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Richmond	British Columbia	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies	Quebec	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 — Mégantic	Quebec	BQ
Clouthier, Hec	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Ontario	Lib.
Coderre, Denis	Bourassa	Quebec	Lib.
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor — St. Clair	Ontario	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Ontario	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Nipigon	Ontario	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Ontario	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière-du-Loup — Témiscouata — Les Basques	Quebec	BQ
Cullen, Roy	Etobicoke North	Ontario	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta — South Richmond	British Columbia	Ref.
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	Quebec	BQ
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	British Columbia	NDP
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	Quebec	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	Quebec	BQ
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	Manitoba	NDP
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière	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, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of National Revenue	Vancouver South — Burnaby	British Columbia	Lib.
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	Quebec	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Discepolo, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil — Soulanges	Quebec	Lib.
Dockrill, Michelle	Bras d'Or	Nova Scotia	NDP
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	Newfoundland	PC
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Drouin, Claude	Beauce	Quebec	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	Quebec	BQ
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska — Restigouche	New Brunswick	PC
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	Quebec	BQ
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification)	Saint Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau	Quebec	BQ
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	British Columbia	Ref.
Earle, Gordon	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	NDP
Easter, Wayne, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo — Cowichan	British Columbia	Ref.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Alberta	Ref.
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Quebec	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Ontario	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Quebec	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Coquitlam — Burnaby	British Columbia	Ref.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	Quebec	BQ
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-Léonard — Saint-Michel	Quebec	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Quebec	BQ
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Ontario	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	Quebec	BQ
Gilmour, Bill	Nanaimo — Alberni	British Columbia	Ref.
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	Quebec	BQ
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	Quebec	BQ
Godin, Yvon	Acadie — Bathurst	New Brunswick	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Alberta	Ref.
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	West Kootenay — Okanagan	British Columbia	Ref.
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre — Rosedale	Ontario	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Ontario	Lib.
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	British Columbia	Ref.
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	Alberta	Ref.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Orléans	Quebec	BQ
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	Ref.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Hardy, Louise	Yukon	Yukon	NDP
Harris, Dick	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Coquihalla	British Columbia	Ref.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Charleswood — Assiniboine	Manitoba	Lib.
Harvey, André	Chicoutimi	Quebec	PC
Herron, John	Fundy — Royal	New Brunswick	PC
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Alberta	Ref.
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	British Columbia	Ref.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk — Interlake	Manitoba	Ref.
Hoepfner, Jake E.	Portage — Lisgar	Manitoba	Ref.
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	New Brunswick	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity — Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Iftody, David	Provencher	Manitoba	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton — Strathcona	Alberta	Ref.
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce — Lachine	Quebec	Lib.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	Ref.
Jones, Jim	Markham	Ontario	PC
Jordan, Joe	Leeds — Grenville	Ontario	Lib.
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	Nova Scotia	PC
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	Ref.
Kerpan, Allan	Blackstrap	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont — Dundas	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin — Middlesex — London	Ontario	Lib.
Konrad, Derrek	Prince Albert	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York North	Ontario	Lib.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	Saskatchewan	NDP
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	Quebec	BQ
Lastewka, Walt, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry	St. Catharines	Ontario	Lib.
Laurin, René	Joliette	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Henri	Quebec	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Quebec	BQ
Lee, Derek	Scarborough — Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	Quebec	BQ
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	British Columbia	Lib.
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	NDP
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Longfield, Judi	Whitby — Ajax	Ontario	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	Quebec	BQ
Lowther, Eric	Calgary Centre	Alberta	Ref.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich — Gulf Islands	British Columbia	Ref.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Minister of Labour	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
MacKay, Peter	Pictou — Antigonish — Guysborough	Nova Scotia	PC
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Ontario	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton	Ontario	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie — Lincoln	Ontario	Lib.
Mancini, Peter	Sydney — Victoria	Nova Scotia	NDP
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
Manning, Preston, Leader of the Opposition	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg	Quebec	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec East	Quebec	BQ
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister for International Trade	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin — Swan River	Manitoba	Ref.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	Ref.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	Manitoba	NDP
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.
Matthews, Bill	Burin — St. George's	Newfoundland	PC
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	British Columbia	Ref.
McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Ontario	Lib.
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	Nova Scotia	NDP
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Edmonton West	Alberta	Lib.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney — Alouette	British Columbia	Ref.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering — Ajax — Uxbridge	Ontario	Lib.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	Quebec	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne — Blainville	Quebec	BQ
Meredith, Val	South Surrey — White Rock — Langley	British Columbia	Ref.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Newfoundland	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	Ref.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Ontario	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches — East York	Ontario	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Parks)	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Ontario	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Muise, Mark	West Nova	Nova Scotia	PC
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food (Fisheries and Oceans)	Bellechasse — Etchemins — Montmagny — L'Islet	Quebec	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Ontario	Ind.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
O'Brien, Lawrence D.	Labrador	Newfoundland	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat	London — Fanshawe	Ontario	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Victoria — Haliburton	Ontario	Lib.
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	Alberta	Ref.
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North — St. Paul	Manitoba	Lib.
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Paradis, Denis	Brome — Missisquoi	Quebec	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Quebec	Lib.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Alberta	Ref.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Ontario	Lib.
Perron, Gilles—A.	Saint—Eustache — Sainte— Thérèse	Quebec	BQ
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	Ontario	Lib.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister of Human Resources Development	Papineau — Saint—Denis	Quebec	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	Quebec	BQ
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Kent — Essex	Ontario	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Ontario	Lib.
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	Quebec	BQ
Power, Charlie	St. John's West	Newfoundland	PC
Pratt, David	Nepean — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Price, David	Compton — Stanstead	Quebec	PC
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	Saskatchewan	NDP
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Hillsborough	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	Lib.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Alberta	Ref.
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Reed, Julian, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Halton	Ontario	Lib.
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver — Sunshine Coast	British Columbia	Ref.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence	Perth — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops	British Columbia	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords — Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Westmount — Ville—Marie	Quebec	Lib.
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois—Rivières	Quebec	BQ
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Saada, Jacques	Brossard — La Prairie	Quebec	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	Quebec	BQ
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	British Columbia	Ref.
Scott, Hon. Andy, Solicitor General of Canada	Fredericton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	British Columbia	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — Cochrane	Ontario	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Ontario	Lib.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Alberta	Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden — Lake Centre	Saskatchewan	NDP
Speller, Bob	Haldimand — Norfolk — Brant	Ontario	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma — Manitoulin	Ontario	Lib.
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	Quebec	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	Quebec	PC
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi	Quebec	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Minister of the Environment	Northumberland	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Brant	Ontario	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	British Columbia	Ref.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville — Eastern Shore	Nova Scotia	NDP
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	British Columbia	Ref.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Ontario	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew	Kitchener — Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Saint-Lambert	Quebec	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	Charlotte	New Brunswick	PC
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	Ref.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Mitis	Quebec	BQ
Turp, Daniel	Beauharnois — Salaberry	Quebec	BQ
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Kent — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Valeri, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	Stoney Creek	Ontario	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Prince Edward — Hastings	Ontario	Lib.
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour — Petitcodiac	New Brunswick	NDP
Vellacott, Maurice	Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno — Saint- Hubert	Quebec	BQ
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Eglinton — Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Ontario	Lib.
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	New Brunswick	PC
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Ontario	Lib.
White, Randy	Langley — Abbotsford	British Columbia	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	British Columbia	Ref.
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Ontario	Lib.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Alberta	Ref.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Ontario	Lib.
VACANCY	Port Moody — Coquitlam	British Columbia	

N.B.: Under Political Affiliation: Lib.—Liberal; Ref.—Reform Party of Canada; BQ—Bloc Québécois; 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

First Session — Thirty—sixth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALBERTA (26)		
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary—Nose Hill	Ref.
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Ref.
Benoit, Leon E.	Lakeland	Ref.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Ref.
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Ref.
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Ref.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Ref.
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Ref.
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	Ref.
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Ref.
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Ref.
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton—Strathcona	Ref.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Ref.
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	Ref.
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast	Lib.
Lowther, Eric	Calgary Centre	Ref.
Manning, Preston, Leader of the Opposition	Calgary Southwest	Ref.
McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southwest	Ref.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Edmonton West	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Ref.
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	Ref.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Ref.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Ref.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Ref.
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Ref.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Ref.
BRITISH COLUMBIA (34)		
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay—Columbia	Ref.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Victoria	Lib.
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	Ref.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia—Pacific)	Richmond	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta—South Richmond	Ref.
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	NDP
Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of National Revenue	Vancouver South—Burnaby	Lib.
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	Ref.
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo—Cowichan	Ref.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster—Coquitlam— Burnaby	Ref.
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	Lib.
Gilmour, Bill	Nanaimo—Alberni	Ref.
Gouk, Jim	West Kootenay—Okanagan	Ref.
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	Ref.
Harris, Dick	Prince George—Bulkley Valley	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan—Coquihalla	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Hill, Jay	Prince George—Peace River	Ref.
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	Lib.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich—Gulf Islands	Ref.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	Ref.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo—Chilcotin	Ref.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney—Alouette	Ref.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Meredith, Val	South Surrey—White Rock—Langley	Ref.
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast	Ref.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops	NDP
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby—Douglas	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	Ref.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	Ref.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan—Shuswap	Ref.
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	Ref.
White, Randy	Langley—Abbotsford	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	Ref.
VACANCY	Port Moody—Coquitlam	

MANITOBA (14)

Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg—Transcona	NDP
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon—Souris	PC
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	NDP
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification)	Saint Boniface	Lib.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Charleswood—Assiniboine	Lib.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk—Interlake	Ref.
Hoepfner, Jake E.	Portage—Lisgar	Ref.
Iftody, David	Provencher	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River	Ref.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North—St. Paul	Lib.
Wasylcia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	NDP

NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

Bernier, Gilles	Tobique—Mactaquac	PC
Bradshaw, Claudette, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Moncton	Lib.
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska—Restigouche	PC
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	NDP
Herron, John	Fundy—Royal	PC
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	Lib.
Scott, Hon. Andy, Solicitor General of Canada	Fredericton	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	Charlotte	PC
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour—Petitcodiac	NDP
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	PC

NEWFOUNDLAND (7)

Baker, George S.	Gander—Grand Falls	Lib.
------------------	--------------------	------

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Byrne, Gerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	PC
Mathews, Bill	Burin—St. George's	PC
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Bonavista—Trinity—Conception	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence D.	Labrador	Lib.
Power, Charlie	St. John's West	PC
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (2)		
Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
Karetak—Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Lib.
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brison, Scott	Kings—Hants	PC
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester	PC
Dockrill, Michelle	Bras d'Or	NDP
Earle, Gordon	Halifax West	NDP
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	PC
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	NDP
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough	PC
Mancini, Peter	Sydney—Victoria	NDP
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	NDP
Muise, Mark	West Nova	PC
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Eastern Shore	NDP
ONTARIO (103)		
Adams, Peter, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Lib.
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West—Mississauga	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Timmins—James Bay	Lib.
Bélanger, Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton—Gloucester	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan—King—Aurora	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe—Grey	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Lib.
Bryden, John	Wentworth—Burlington	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale—High Park	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Caplan, Elinor	Thornhill	Lib.
Carroll, Aileen	Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West—Nepean	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Guelph—Wellington	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Clouthier, Hec	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	Lib.
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor—St. Clair	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay—Nipigon	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	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 of National Defence	York Centre	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia—Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre—Rosedale	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Lib.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Lib.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity—Spadina	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce—Grey	Lib.
Jones, Jim	Markham	PC
Jordan, Joe	Leeds—Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont—Dundas	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York North	Lib.
Lastewka, Walt, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Lib.
Longfield, Judi	Whitby—Ajax	Lib.
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie—Lincoln	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister for International Trade	York West	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Sudbury	Lib.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview—Greenwood	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches—East York	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Parks)	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark—Carleton	Lib.
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo—Wellington	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora—Rainy River	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South—Weston	Ind.
O'Brien, Pat	London—Fanshawe	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Victoria—Haliburton	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga Centre	Lib.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Lib.
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Lib.
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Kent—Essex	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Lib.
Pratt, David	Nepean—Carleton	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie	Lib.
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre	Lib.
Reed, Julian, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Halton	Lib.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence	Perth—Middlesex	Lib.
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming—Cochrane	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Lib.
Speller, Bob	Haldimand—Norfolk—Brant	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma—Manitoulin	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron—Bruce	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Minister of the Environment	Northumberland	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Brant	Lib.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew	Kitchener—Waterloo	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Lib.
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	Lib.
Valeri, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	Stoney Creek	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Prince Edward—Hastings	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Eglinton—Lawrence	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Lib.
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Lib.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Lib.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)

Easter, Wayne, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Minister of Labour	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Lib.
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Hillsborough	Lib.

QUEBEC (75)

Alarie, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	BQ
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier—Montcalm	BQ
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	BQ
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	BQ
Canuel, René	Matapédia—Matane	BQ
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec)	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies	Lib.
Charest, Hon. Jean J.	Sherbrooke	PC
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac—Mégantic	BQ
Coderre, Denis	Bourassa	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques	BQ
Dalphonde—Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	BQ
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière	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—Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Claude	Beauce	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil—Papineau	BQ
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard—Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	BQ
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans	BQ
Harvey, André	Chicoutimi	PC
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Lib.
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Laurin, René	Joliette	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun—Saint-Henri	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec East	BQ
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle—Émard	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Hull—Aylmer	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga—Maisonnette	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food) (Fisheries and Oceans)	Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny—L'Islet	Lib.
Paradis, Denis	Brome—Missisquoi	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Lib.
Perron, Gilles—A.	Saint—Eustache—Sainte—Thérèse	BQ
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister of Human Resources Development	Papineau—Saint—Denis	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	BQ
Price, David	Compton—Stanstead	PC
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Westmount—Ville—Marie	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois—Rivières	BQ
Saada, Jacques	Brossard—La Prairie	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	BQ
St—Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	BQ
St—Jacques, Diane	Shefford	PC
St—Julien, Guy	Abitibi	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Saint—Lambert	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac—Saint—Jean	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski—Mitis	BQ
Turp, Daniel	Beauharnois—Salaberry	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint—Bruno—Saint—Hubert	BQ
SASKATCHEWAN (14)		
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	NDP
Bailey, Roy	Souris—Moose Mountain	Ref.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	Ref.
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Lib.
Kerpan, Allan	Blackstrap	Ref.
Konrad, Derrek	Prince Albert	Ref.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	NDP
Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	Ref.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Qu’Appelle	NDP
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Ref.
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords—Lloydminster	Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre	NDP
Vellacott, Maurice	Wanuskewin	Ref.
YUKON (1)		
Hardy, Louise	Yukon	NDP

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of February 20, 1998 — 1st Session, 36th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: Guy St-Julien

Vice-Chairmen: John Finlay
Derrek Konrad

Claude Bachand
John Bryden
Gordon Earle
Ghislain Fournier

David Iftody
Nancy Karetak-Lindell
Gerald Keddy

Judi Longfield
Grant McNally
Lawrence O'Brien

Bernard Patry
Mike Scott
Bryon Wilfert

(16)

Associate Members

Cliff Breitzkreuz
René Canuel
Bill Casey

Pierre de Savoye
Reed Elley

Maurice Godin
Rick Laliberte

John Maloney
Maurice Vellacott

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chairman: Joe McGuire

Vice-Chairmen: Murray Calder
Jay Hill

Leon Benoit
Paul Bonwick
Rick Borotsik
Gerry Byrne

Jean-Guy Chrétien
Denis Coderre
Odina Desrochers

John Harvard
Jake Hoepfner
Larry McCormick

Dick Proctor
Paul Steckle
Rose-Marie Ur

(16)

Associate Members

Peter Adams
Garry Breitzkreuz
Pierre Brien
Rick Casson

Michelle Dockrill
Howard Hilstrom
Allan Kerpan
Réjean Lefebvre

John Maloney
Lorne Nystrom
Denis Paradis
Gilles Perron

John Solomon
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chairman: Clifford Lincoln

Vice-Chairmen: Jim Abbott
Mauril Bélanger

Paul Bonwick
Sarmite Bulte
John Godfrey
Joe Jordan

Wendy Lill
Dennis Mills
Mark Muise

Deepak Obhrai
Pat O'Brien
Jim Pankiw

Jacques Saada
Caroline St-Hilaire
Suzanne Tremblay

(16)

Associate Members

André Bachand
Claude Bachand
Carolyn Bennett
Rick Borotsik
Cliff Breitzkreuz
Pierre Brien
Denis Coderre

Antoine Dubé
Maurice Dumas
Gordon Earle
Christiane Gagnon
Albina Guarnieri
Monique Guay
David Iftody

Rick Laliberte
Francine Lalonde
Eric Lowther
Peter G. MacKay
Inky Mark
Rey Pagtakhan
Louis Plamondon

George Proud
Carmen Provenzano
Nelson Riis
Benoît Sauvageau
John Solomon
Elsie Wayne
Bob Wood

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE INDUSTRY OF SPORT IN CANADA

Chairman: Dennis Mills

Jim Abbott	Albina Guarnieri	Pat O'Brien	Nelson Riis	(9)
Denis Coderre	Peter G. MacKay	George Proud	Suzanne Tremblay	

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chairman: Stan Dromisky

Vice-Chairs: Raymonde Folco
John Reynolds

Jean Augustine	Louise Hardy	John McKay	Maria Minna	(16)
Sarmite Bulte	M. Sophia Leung	Grant McNally	Deepak Obhrai	
Norman Doyle	Steve Mahoney	Réal Ménard	Jacques Saada	
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold				

Associate Members

Claude Bachand	Libby Davies	Patrick Martin	Diane St-Jacques
Pierre Brien	Monique Guay	Benoît Sauvageau	Daniel Turp

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: Charles Caccia

Vice-Chairmen: Bill Gilmour
Gar Knutson

Sarkis Assadourian	Aileen Carroll	Roger Gallaway	Karen Kraft Sloan	(16)
Gérard Asselin	Rick Casson	John Herron	Rick Laliberte	
Bernard Bigras	Yvon Charbonneau	Joe Jordan	David Pratt	
Chuck Cadman				

Associate Members

Peter Adams	John Duncan	Louise Hardy	Nelson Riis
Hélène Alarie	John Finlay	Clifford Lincoln	Benoît Sauvageau
Leon Benoit	Paul Forseth	John Maloney	Peter Stoffer
Pierre Brien	Maurice Godin	David Price	Stéphan Tremblay

FINANCE

Chairman: Maurizio Bevilacqua

Vice-Chairs: Monte Solberg
Paddy Torsney

Mark Assad	David Iftody	Gary Pillitteri	Gerry Ritz	(16)
Scott Brison	Yvan Loubier	Karen Redman	Paul Szabo	
Roger Gallaway	Gilles Perron	Nelson Riis	Tony Valeri	
Dick Harris				

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy	Odina Desrochers	Jason Kenney	Lynn Myers
Rob Anders	Nick Discepola	Francine Lalonde	Bob Nault
André Bachand	Norman Doyle	René Laurin	Lorne Nystrom
Sue Barnes	Antoine Dubé	M. Sophia Leung	Pauline Picard
Carolyn Bennett	Raymonde Folco	Peter MacKay	Charlie Power
Rick Borotsik	Joe Fontana	Steve Mahoney	Yves Rocheleau
Claudette Bradshaw	John Herron	Larry McCormick	Alex Shepherd
Pierre Brien	Dale Johnston	Alexa McDonough	John Solomon
Jocelyne G. Bujold	Jim Jones	Bob Mills	

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chairman: George Baker

Vice-Chairmen: Charles Hubbard
Gary Lunn

Yvan Bernier	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Bill Matthews	Yves Rocheleau	(16)
John Duncan	Gar Knutson	Lawrence O'Brien	Paul Steckle	
Wayne Easter	M. Sophia Leung	Carmen Provenzano	Peter Stoffer	
Howard Hilstrom				

Associate Members

Gilles Bernier	Ghislain Fournier	Philip Mayfield	Mike Scott
René Canuel	Bill Gilmour	Svend Robinson	Angela Vautour
Paul Forseth			

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chairman: Bill Graham

Vice-Chairs: Colleen Beaumier
Bob Mills

Sarkis Assadourian	Maud Debien	Denis Paradis	Benoît Sauvageau	(18)
Jean Augustine	Raymonde Folco	Charlie Penson	Bob Speller	
André Bachand	Gurmant Grewal	Julian Reed	Daniel Turp	
John Cannis	Ted McWhinney	Svend Robinson		

Associate Members

Claude Bachand	Aileen Carroll	Keith Martin	Karen Redman
Sue Barnes	Monique Guay	Paul Mercier	Nelson Riis
Eugene Bellemare	Joe Jordan	Bob Nault	Jacques Saada
Bill Blaikie	Jason Kenney	Lorne Nystrom	John Solomon
Paul Bonwick	Gary Lunn	Deepak Obhrai	Diane St-Jacques
Claudette Bradshaw	Gurbax Malhi	Charlie Power	Pierrette Venne
Sarmite Bulte	Richard Marceau	George Proud	Bryon Wilfert

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair: Colleen Beaumier

Jean Augustine Paul Bonwick	Claudette Bradshaw Maud Debien	Raymonde Folco Keith Martin	Svend Robinson Diane St-Jacques	(9)
--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

Chairman: Bob Speller

Bill Blaikie Scott Brison	Sarmite Bulte Raymonde Folco	Robert Nault Charlie Penson	Julian Reed Benoît Sauvageau	(9)
------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----

HEALTH

Chair: Beth Phinney

Vice-Chairs: Elinor Caplan
Reed Elley

Carolyn Bennett Aileen Carroll Claude Drouin Maurice Dumas	Grant Hill Dan McTeague Lynn Myers	Pauline Picard Greg Thompson Rose-Marie Ur	Maurice Vellacott Joseph Volpe Judy Wasylcyia-Leis	(16)
---	--	--	--	------

Associate Members

Pierre Brien Libby Davies Pierre de Savoye Michelle Dockrill	Antoine Dubé Christiane Gagnon Sharon Hayes John Herron	M. Sophia Leung Keith Martin Réal Ménard	Caroline St-Hilaire Paul Szabo Stéphan Tremblay
---	--	--	---

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chairman: Reg Alcock

Vice-Chairs: Bonnie Brown
Dale Johnston

Diane Ablonczy Rob Anders Carolyn Bennett Claudette Bradshaw	Brenda Chamberlain Paul Crête Libby Davies Nick Discepola	Jean Dubé Christiane Gagnon Albina Guarnieri Larry McCormick	Bob Nault Stéphan Tremblay Bryon Wilfert	(18)
---	--	---	--	------

Associate Members

Yvan Bernier Pierre Brien Jocelyne G. Bujold Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral Antoine Dubé	Reed Elley Yvon Godin Sharon Hayes Wendy Lill	Inky Mark Patrick Martin Réal Ménard Maria Minna	Lorne Nystrom Yves Rocheleau Diane St-Jacques Angela Vautour
---	--	---	---

INDUSTRY**Chair:** Susan Whelan**Vice-Chairmen:** Eugène Bellemare
Werner Schmidt

Chris Axworthy	Marlene Jennings	Walt Lastewka	Jim Pankiw	(16)
Bonnie Brown	Jim Jones	Eric Lowther	Janko Perić	
Antoine Dubé	Francine Lalonde	Ian Murray	Alex Shepherd	
Tony Ianno				

Associate Members

Peter Adams	Pierre Brien	Jean Dubé	Réal Ménard
Hélène Alarie	Jocelyne G. Bujold	Joe Fontana	Nelson Riis
Carolyn Bennett	Sarmite Bulte	Christiane Gagnon	Benoît Sauvageau
Bernard Bigras	Chuck Cadman	Rahim Jaffer	John Solomon
Paul Bonwick	Nick Discepola	Philip Mayfield	Peter Stoffer

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS**Chair:** Shaughnessy Cohen**Vice-Chairmen:** Paul E. Forseth
John Maloney

Eleni Bakopanos	Nick Discepola	Peter MacKay	John McKay	(16)
Michel Bellehumeur	Sheila Finestone	Peter Mancini	Jack Ramsay	
Garry Breitreuz	Derek Lee	Richard Marceau	Andrew Telegdi	
Paul DeVillers				

Associate Members

Carolyn Bennett	Christiane Gagnon	Howard Hilstrom	Svend Robinson
Cliff Breitreuz	Michel Guimond	Allan Kerpan	Caroline St-Hilaire
Pierre Brien	Louise Hardy	Keith Martin	Diane St-Jacques
Chuck Cadman	Dick Harris	Réal Ménard	Myron Thompson
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Sharon Hayes	Mark Muise	Stéphan Tremblay
Pierre de Savoye			

LIAISON**Chairman:** Bill Graham**Vice-Chair:** Susan Whelan

Peter Adams	Ray Bonin	Derek Lee	Beth Phinney	(20)
Reg Alcock	Charles Caccia	Clifford Lincoln	Brent St. Denis	
George Baker	Shaughnessy Cohen	Gurbax Malhi	Guy St-Julien	
Robert Bertrand	Stan Dromisky	Joe McGuire	John Williams	
Maurizio Bevilacqua	Sheila Finestone			

Associate Members

Stéphane Bergeron	Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	André Harvey
-------------------	---------------------------	--------------

SUB-COMMITTEE ON BUDGET**Chairman :** Bill Graham

Peter Adams	Maurizio Bevilacqua	Susan Whelan	John Williams	(7)
George S. Baker	Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral			

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chairman: Robert Bertrand

Vice-Chairmen: Art Hanger
Bob Wood

Leon Benoit
Hec Clouthier
Maurice Godin
Peter Goldring

Judi Longfield
Pat O'Brien
John O'Reilly

David Pratt
David Price
Dick Proctor

George Proud
John Richardson
Pierrette Venne

(16)

Associate Members

Pierre Brien
Denis Coderre
Monique Guay

Jim Hart
John Maloney
Peter Mancini

Patrick Martin
Bob Mills

Daniel Turp
Elsie Wayne

NATURAL RESOURCES AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chairman: Brent St. Denis

Vice-Chairmen: David Chatters
Ben Serré

Réginald Bélair
Gilles Bernier
Jocelyne G. Bujold
Gerry Byrne

Roy Cullen
Pierre de Savoye
Yvon Godin

Jim Gouk
Ovid Jackson
Jerry Pickard

Carmen Provenzano
Darrel Stinson
Bob Wood

(16)

Associate Members

Hélène Alarie
Chris Axworthy
Bernard Bigras
Pierre Brien
René Canuel

Jean-Guy Chrétien
Ghislain Fournier
Bill Gilmour
Jim Jones

Gerald Keddy
Derrek Konrad
René Laurin
Réjean Lefebvre

Gilles Perron
Nelson Riis
Angela Vautour
Maurice Vellacott

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chairman: Peter Adams

Vice-Chairs: Marlene Catterall
Chuck Strahl

George Baker
Stéphane Bergeron
Yvon Charbonneau
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral

Ken Epp
Mac Harb
André Harvey

Bob Kilger
Rey Pagtakhan
Carolyn Parrish

John Richardson
John Solomon
Randy White

(16)

Associate Members

Michel Bellehumeur
Bill Blaikie
Don Boudria

Garry Breitkreuz
Michelle Dockrill
Norman Doyle

Jay Hill
René Laurin
Bill Matthews

Réal Ménard
Suzanne Tremblay

SUB-COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

Chairman: Randy White

Garry Breitkreuz
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral

Norman E. Doyle

Bob Kilger

John Solomon

(6)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chairman: Yvon Charbonneau

William Blaikie Ken Epp André Harvey Carolyn Parrish (6)
 Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Chairman: Bob Kilger

Stéphane Bergeron Don Boudria André Harvey Randy White (6)
 Bill Blaikie

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chairman: John Williams

Vice-Chairmen: Ivan Grose
 Andrew Telegdi

Mark Assad Gurmant Grewal Steve Mahoney Lorne Nystrom (17)
 Sue Barnes Mac Harb Philip Mayfield Rey Pagtakhan
 Elinor Caplan Jason Kenney Lynn Myers Elsie Wayne
 Odina Desrochers René Laurin

Associate Members

Roy Bailey Rick Casson Michel Guimond Gilles Perron
 Garry Breitkreuz Bev Desjarlais Jim Jones Alex Shepherd
 Scott Brison Michelle Dockrill Derrek Konrad Peter Stoffer
 Jocelyne G. Bujold Antoine Dubé Denis Paradis

TRANSPORT

Chairman: Raymond Bonin

Vice-Chairmen: Roy Cullen
 Lee Morrison

Roy Bailey Bev Desjarlais Ivan Grose Inky Mark (16)
 Murray Calder Claude Drouin Michel Guimond Paul Mercier
 John Cannis Joe Fontana Stan Keyes Carolyn Parrish
 Bill Casey

Associate Members

Chris Axworthy Pierre Brien Ghislain Fournier Yves Rocheleau
 Yvan Bernier Paul Crête Rick Laliberte Elsie Wayne
 Rick Borotsik John Cummins John Maloney

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint–Chairmen: Philippe D. Gigantès
Gurbax Malhi

Joint Vice–Chairman: Philip Mayfield

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Roch Bolduc
Eymard G. Corbin
Mabel M. DeWare

Richard J. Doyle
Jerahmiel S. Grafstein
Louis J. Robichaud

Marlene Catterall
Hec Clouthier
John Finlay
Deborah Grey
Howard Hilstrom
Jim Karygiannis
Raymond Lavigne

Wendy Lill
Paul Mercier
Louis Plamondon
David Price
Karen Redman
Jacques Saada
Brent St. Denis

(23)

Associate Members

Libby Davies

Maurice Dumas

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joint Chairs: Sen. Rose–Marie Losier–Cool
Sheila Finestone

Joint Vice–Chairmen: Denis Coderre
Rahim Jaffer

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Gérald A. Beaudoin
Jean–Robert Gauthier
Noël A. Kinsella
Jean–Claude Rivest

Fernand Robichaud
Louis J. Robichaud
Lucie Pépin
Jean–Maurice Simard

Eugène Bellemare
Claudette Bradshaw
Cliff Breitzkreuz
John Godfrey
Yvon Godin
Bob Kilger
Dan McTeague

Ted McWhinney
Val Meredith
Mark Muise
Denis Paradis
Louis Plamondon
Suzanne Tremblay

(25)

Associate Members

Pierre Brien
Lorne Nystrom

Angela Vautour

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: Céline Hervieux–Payette
Derek Lee

Joint Vice–Chairman: Ted White

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Michael Cogger
Marisa Barth Ferretti
Normand Grimard
William M. Kelly

P. Derek Lewis
Léonce Mercier
Wilfred P. Moore

John Bryden
Bill Casey
Paul DeVillers
Ken Epp
Marlene Jennings
Ghislain Lebel
Gary Lunn
Gurbax Malhi

John Maloney
Inky Mark
Ian Murray
Lorne Nystrom
Alex Shepherd
Caroline St–Hilaire
Tom Wappel

(25)

Associate Members

Chris Axworthy
Michel Bellehumeur

Michel Guimond
Richard Marceau

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

CHILD CUSTODY AND ACCESS

Joint Chairs: Landon Pearson
Roger Gallaway

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Peter Bosa
Erminie J. Cohen
Anne C. Cools

Mabel M. DeWare
Marisa Ferretti Barth
Duncan J. Jessiman

Eleni Bakopanos
Carolyn Bennett
Robert Bertrand
Madeleine Dalphond–Guiral
Sheila Finestone
Paul E. Forseth
John Harvard
Nancy Karetak–Lindell

Judi Longfield
Eric Lowther
Gary Lunn
Peter Mancini
Denis Paradis
Caroline St–Hilaire
Diane St–Jacques

(23)

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

Panels of Chairmen of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
The Hon. Herb Gray	Deputy Prime Minister
The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. David M. Collenette	Minister of Transport
The Hon. David Anderson	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale	Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board
The Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. Sergio Marchi	Minister for International Trade
The Hon. John Manley	Minister of Industry
The Hon. Diane Marleau	Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie
The Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton	Minister of National Defence
The Hon. Marcel Massé	President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure
The Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
The Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Health
The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay	Minister of Labour
The Hon. Christine Stewart	Minister of the Environment
The Hon. Alfonso Gagliano	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
The Hon. Lucienne Robillard	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
The Hon. Fred Mifflin	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
The Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
The Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
The Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew	Minister of Human Resources Development
The Hon. Don Boudria	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. Alasdair Graham	Leader of the Government in the Senate
The Hon. Lyle Vanclief	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
The Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal	Minister of National Revenue
The Hon. Andy Scott	Solicitor General of Canada
The Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
The Hon. Raymond Chan	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
The Hon. Martin Cauchon	Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development – Quebec)
The Hon. Hedy Fry	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)
The Hon. David Kilgour	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)
The Hon. Jim Peterson	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
The Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) (Western Economic Diversification)
The Hon. Andrew Mitchell	Secretary of State (Parks)
The Hon. Gilbert Normand	Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food)(Fisheries and Oceans)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Rey D. Pagtakhan	to Prime Minister
Ted McWhinney	to Minister of Foreign Affairs
Stan Keyes	to Minister of Transport
Wayne Easter	to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Gerry Byrne	to Minister of Natural Resources
John Godfrey	to Minister of Canadian Heritage
Julian Reed	to Minister for International Trade
Walt Lastewka	to Minister of Industry
Claudette Bradshaw	to Minister for International Cooperation
Tony Valeri	to Minister of Finance
John Richardson	to Minister of National Defence
Ovid L. Jackson	to President of the Treasury Board
Eleni Bakopanos	to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Joseph Volpe	to Minister of Health
Brenda Chamberlain	to Minister of Labour
Karen Kraft Sloan	to Minister of the Environment
Jerry Pickard	to Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Maria Minna	to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
George Proud	to Minister of Veterans Affairs
Bernard Patry	to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Paul DeVillers	to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Robert D. Nault	to Minister of Human Resources Development
Peter Adams	to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
John Harvard	to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Sue Barnes	to Minister of National Revenue
Nick Discepola	to Solicitor General of Canada

CONTENTS

Friday, February 20, 1998

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada Labour Code	
Bill C-19. Second reading	4199
Mr. Gouk	4199
Mr. Gouk	4199
Mrs. Chamberlain	4199
Mr. Canuel	4200
Mrs. Chamberlain	4200
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	4200
Mrs. Chamberlain	4200
Mr. Gouk	4201
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	4204
Mr. Gouk	4204
Mr. Konrad	4204
Mr. Gouk	4205
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	4205
Mr. Gouk	4205
Mr. Mahoney	4205
Mr. Mahoney	4206
Mr. Gouk	4207
Mr. Mahoney	4207
Mr. Hanger	4207
Mr. Mahoney	4207

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Rural Canada	
Mr. McCormick	4207
Dr. Cornelius W. Wiebe	
Mr. Hoepfner	4208
Black History Month in Canada	
Mr. Bellemare	4208
Le financement de la recherche	
Mrs. Gagnon	4208
Mathieu Da Costa	
Ms. Augustine	4208
Royal Canadian Mint	
Mr. Epp	4208
Violence	
Mr. Provenzano	4209
Reference to Supreme Court	
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral	4209
Télévision franco-ontarienne	
Mr. Bélanger	4209
The Senate	
Mr. Grewal	4209
Family	
Ms. Carroll	4209
Columbia Mission	
Mr. Pagtakhan	4210
Multilateral Agreement on Investment	
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	4210

Corporations' Profits

Mr. Bertrand	4210
--------------------	------

Pay Equity

Mr. MacKay	4210
------------------	------

Alcan

Ms. Girard-Bujold	4211
-------------------------	------

Mathieu Da Costa Award

Ms. Catterall	4211
---------------------	------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

The Economy

Miss Grey	4211
Mr. Peterson	4211
Miss Grey	4211
Mr. Peterson	4211
Miss Grey	4212
Mr. Gray	4212
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	4212
Mr. Gray	4212
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	4212
Mr. Gray	4212

Reference to Supreme Court

Mr. Brien	4212
Mr. Dion	4212
Mr. Brien	4213
Mr. Dion	4213
Mr. Bellehumeur	4213
Mr. Dion	4213
Mr. Bellehumeur	4213
Mr. Dion	4213

Child Poverty

Mr. Riis	4213
Mr. Gray	4213
Mr. Riis	4213
Mr. Gray	4214

Health

Mr. Thompson (Charlotte)	4214
Mr. Rock	4214
Mr. Thompson (Charlotte)	4214
Mr. Rock	4214

The Economy

Mrs. Ablonczy	4214
Mr. Gray	4214
Mrs. Ablonczy	4214
Mr. Gray	4214

Bill C-28

Mr. Perron	4215
Mr. Gray	4215
Mr. Perron	4215
Mr. Gray	4215

The Economy

Mr. Hill (MacLeod)	4215
Mr. Gray	4215
Mr. Hill (MacLeod)	4215

Mr. Gray	4215
Research Funding	
Ms. Alarie	4215
Mr. Lastewka	4215
Ms. Alarie	4215
Mr. Rock	4216
Bill C-28	
Mr. Ramsay	4216
Mr. Gray	4216
Mr. Ramsay	4216
Mr. Gray	4216
International Aid	
Mrs. Guay	4216
Ms. Marleau	4216
Trade	
Mr. Mahoney	4216
Mr. Lastewka	4216
Bill C-28	
Mr. Bailey	4216
Mr. Gray	4217
Mr. Bailey	4217
Mr. Gray	4217
Housing	
Ms. Hardy	4217
Mr. Gagliano	4217
Ms. Hardy	4217
Mr. Hardy	4217
Mr. Gagliano	4217
Fisheries	
Mr. Keddy	4217
Mr. Anderson	4217
Mr. Keddy	4217
Mr. Anderson	4218
French and the Internet	
Mr. Saada	4218
Mr. Duhamel	4218
Senate of Canada	
Mr. Gilmour	4218
Mr. Gray	4218
Rail Transportation	
Mr. Dubé (Lévis)	4218
Mr. Mifflin	4218
Bankruptcies	
Mr. Solomon	4219
Mr. Peterson	4219
Canadian Wheat Board	
Mr. Borotsik	4219
Mr. Vanclief	4219
Fisheries	
Mr. Steckle	4219
Mr. Anderson	4219
Mr. Epp	4219
Mr. Gouk	4219

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Order in Council Appointments	
Mr. Adams	4220
Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Adams	4220
Patent Act	
Bill C-361. Introduction and first reading	4220
Mr. Gouk	4220
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	4220
Firearms Act	
Bill C-362. Introduction and first reading	4220
Mr. Gouk	4220
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	4220
Petitions	
Nuclear Weapons	
Mr. Gouk	4220
CRTC	
Mr. Goldring	4220
Nuclear Weapons	
Mr. McWhinney	4221
Taxation	
Mr. McWhinney	4221
Cyprus	
Mr. McWhinney	4221
CRTC	
Mr. Ramsay	4221
Multilateral Agreement on Investment	
Mr. Riis	4221
Seniors Benefits	
Mr. Riis	4221
Criminal Code	
Mr. Provenzano	4221
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Adams	4221

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada Labour Code	
Bill C-19. Second reading	4223
Mr. Provenzano	4223
Mr. Mahoney	4223
Mrs. Ur	4223
Mr. Goldring	4224
Mrs. Ur	4225
Mrs. Lalonde	4225
Mr. Lowther	4227
Mrs. Lalonde	4227
Mr. Mahoney	4228
Mrs. Lalonde	4228
Mr. Pagtakhan	4228
Mr. Laliberte	4230
Mrs. Chamberlain	4231
Mr. Laliberte	4231
Mr. Bailey	4232
Mr. Laliberte	4232
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	4232

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Patent Act	
Bill C-248. Second reading	4233

Mr. Solomon	4233
Mr. Lastewka	4235
Mr. Bailey	4237
Ms. Alarie	4238

Mr. Speller	4239
Mr. Solomon	4240
Mr. Solomon	4241

Appendix

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

03159442

Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canadian Government Publishing,

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :

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

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

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 des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9