



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 080 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Wednesday, March 25, 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

Wednesday, March 25, 1998

The House met at 2 p.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

• (1400)

**The Speaker:** As is our practice on Wednesdays, we will now sing O Canada, and we will be led by the hon. member for Wentworth—Burlington.

*[Editor's Note: Members sang the national anthem]*

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

*[English]*

### GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

**Mr. John Cannis (Scarborough Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, for Canadians of Hellenic descent March 25 signifies one of the most important days of the Hellenic heritage. On March 25, 1821 the revolutionary trend for national independence burst out in a massive revolution that swept away the Ottoman empire which had occupied Greece for well over 400 years.

With the support of the allied forces of Europe, Great Britain, France and Russia, Greece was recognized as an independent state. For most people the struggle for independence represents a triumph of justice and liberal values against slavery and brutality. For others the massive Greek revolution exemplified the values of classical Greece and Christianity against the darkness of occupation.

Nevertheless, the contributions of people like Lord Byron of England, George Jarvis, Edward Everett and an array of scholars and ordinary people made the supreme sacrifice in the name of independence, liberalism, justice and, most of all, freedom.

Knowing very well how we Canadians value our rights and freedoms, let us join together in celebrating Greek Independence Day, March 25, 1821.

## NATIONAL UNITY

**Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Pierre Cote held hearings in Quebec City to limit referendum funding to discourage a repeat of the Montreal rally. He is so very wrong. Canada's unity spirit is not bought with cheap flights. He cannot stop the Canadian will by limiting mere dollars. He cannot abate our support for Canada by writing new laws.

Canadians together celebrate our solidarity with Quebeckers. Canadians are there for floods, ice storms and for unity. Canadians will travel again and again when called. No mere man, no sum of money, no written law will sever our Canadian bonds. We will come by plane, by bus, by train. We will be there in thought. We will not fail in our task to give support to our fellow citizens in Quebec, to give support to a Canada in need.

That is our promise to Mr. Cote. He must know where reality lies. He will never extinguish our will.

\* \* \*

## SENIORS

**Mr. Hec Clouthier (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to have the opportunity to talk today about our outstanding seniors.

These august men and women have built this great country at considerable cost to themselves. The United Nations has recognized the contribution of seniors and has declared 1999 the International Year of Older Persons.

I am proud to have a large number of very active seniors in the great riding of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke and I am honoured to say that the Arnprior 707 seniors group is among the very best. Seniors have adapted to our rapidly changing world in the same determined manner that they have demonstrated throughout their lives.

It was Socrates who said we should regard the aged as travellers who have gone on a journey on which we too may have to go and of whom we should inquire whether the road be smooth and easy or rugged and difficult. Our path through life has been made easier because of our sterling seniors.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]*

## ROAD TRANSPORT

**Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, for several weeks, since before Minister Brassard made his decision known,

*S. O. 31*

people from the regions of Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean, Haut-Saint-Maurice and Abitibi-Témiscamingue and myself have been calling for a public debate on the impact of increased tractor trailer loads on secondary roads in these regions.

• (1405)

Jacques Brassard refused to provide CRD stakeholders in these regions with a 1991 study on a basic rail network for Quebec.

The stakeholders in these regions are concerned after we learned last week that Raymond Bréard, a former vice-president of l'Association du camionnage du Québec and current executive assistant to Quebec finance minister Bernard Landry, had spoken to Minister Brassard himself and to political officials in his department in support of large trucking companies in Quebec and Ontario, at the expense of Quebec rail workers.

That is a major conflict of interest.

\* \* \*

**MATTHEW DA COSTA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**

**Hon. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 16, I had the pleasure of participating in a concrete action in support of the economic life of Montreal's Black community.

On that occasion, the hon. secretary of state responsible for economic development for Quebec announced a \$1.25 million investment in the Matthew Da Costa development corporation, providing it with the necessary tools to continue to ensure the economic development of the Black community and at the same time make a contribution to the entire Montreal region.

Job creation is a concern shared by all Canadians, and this program shows how our government is committed to helping small and medium size businesses through innovative solutions.

[English]

I am delighted that the Matthew Da Costa fund has received \$125 million from the Government of Canada, along with money from Quebec as well as the FTQ foundation.

\* \* \*

**HEALTH CARE**

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, if it is the slow bleed that kills, then our health care system, which has been hemorrhaging for some time, is in critical shape.

Sick Canadians lined up in emergency rooms wait for a vacant hospital bed while whole wards remain closed due to a lack of funds. Injured people wait one and a half years just to see a specialist and another year to get treatment. Some even die waiting

to get medical care, the medical care they were led to believe would be there during their time of greatest need.

Yet the government allows, on the one hand, violations to the Canada Health Act, but on the other pretends to uphold the act in order to look like a white knight.

The government uses health care as a political football to make itself look good while patients are sacrificed on the altar of political expediency.

Is this what the government means by putting health care first? Is this what it calls its number one priority? The government must put patients first and give politics a back seat.

Patients are dying.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**DOMUS TROPHY AWARDED TO CITY OF LACHENAIE**

**Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to announce that the city of Lachenaie has been awarded the Domus trophy for municipality of the year, residential sector, by the Association provinciale des constructeurs d'habitations du Québec, known as the APCHQ.

The population of this municipality, in the riding of Repentigny, has expanded from 7,000 in 1976 to its present 19,000. The Domus trophy attests to the dynamism and quality of residential development in the municipality of Lachenaie.

I wish to congratulate Mayor Marcel Therrien, the municipal councillors and the urban planning office under the direction of Guy Daoust for ensuring that their municipality develops in full harmony and with respect for the quality of life of its residents.

\* \* \*

[English]

**REFORM PARTY OF CANADA**

**Mr. Paul Bonwick (Simcoe—Grey, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it never seems to amaze Canadians just how low the Reform leader and his band of merry jokers will go to grab a headline.

Take for example the Reform leader's shameful and inaccurate statements yesterday about government appointments which, by the way, are undeniably necessary.

Yesterday the Reform Party released a list of appointees, dubbing them "loyal Liberals" and also citing that "membership has its privileges".

The Reform must have forgotten about people like Judd Buchanan for his supposed plum appointment as chairman of the National Tourism Board. This position garners a whopping \$1 per year.

What about other so-called loyal Liberals such as Perrin Beatty, the Tory cabinet minister? Or better still, Jack Fraser was appointed to the Veterans Affairs and Appeals Board. By the way, he is a former Reform MP.

The Liberal government appoints people based on qualification, not party. The leader of the Reform Party and his band of jokers have it wrong again.

I think they owe their western supporters more than this. Shame on them.

\* \* \*

• (1410)

[Translation]

#### WORLD WATER DAY AND WORLD METEOROLOGICAL DAY

**Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we all know that water, air and climate are the keys to life on this planet Earth.

Since we have just celebrated World Water Day and World Meteorological Day, there is no better occasion for reminding all the people of Canada and of Quebec of the importance of protecting our water and our air in order to protect our climate and our lives.

Everything in the air ends up in the water eventually: acid rain, carbon dioxide, heat. Everything in the air affects climate as well. Our factories, our automobiles, our waste disposal sites all emit heat-retaining gases which are turning our planet into a giant greenhouse. This appears to result in such things as floods and ice storms.

It is therefore the responsibility of governments, as well as each and every one of us, to do their part to reduce atmospheric gases. Our lives are at stake.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### THE ECONOMY

**Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, people like Lou Sekora in Port Moody—Coquitlam understand the meaning of effective representation. Leadership means working for policies that help people in their everyday lives: eliminating the deficit, lowering the tax burden, reducing the debt.

It also means making direct connections with people, as with the millennium scholarship program and student loans where the federal government has provided an annual grant of up to \$400 to parents who are saving for their children's education through RESPs.

Our last budget provided tax relief to over 1.8 million British Columbians. That is 92.5% of all B.C. taxpayers. After getting the nation's fiscal house in order, we reinvested in quality health care

*S. O. 31*

by increasing the cash floor in transfers to the provinces by \$1.5 billion. We have direct contacts between the federal government and municipalities in infrastructure programs that develop new and more cohesive community relations.

That is the new federalism emerging under federal government leadership.

\* \* \*

#### LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

**Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this government endlessly talks with great arrogance about holding itself to a higher ethical standard, but its actions show a different story.

In Liberal opinion, part time farmers in western Canada who were affected by natural disaster do not deserve the same compensation as farmers in Ontario and Quebec.

They label us as anti-Canadian because we did not give a speech at the rally in Montreal just before the last referendum. Reformers were there, Mr. Speaker, but the reason you did not see our leader on the podium is because the Liberals did not allow him to be on the podium.

Then there was the Liberal rejection of the Canadian flag on our desks. I thought nothing could top this. But yesterday the Prime Minister took this honour. During question period yesterday the Prime Minister said that my colleague from Peace River was a beggar and was not worthy to sit in the Senate. Is that because my colleague does not golf or have a financial connection with the Prime Minister?

Actions speak louder than words. Liberal actions show their arrogance. Is this the politics of division that the Liberals speak of so often?

\* \* \*

#### NOVA SCOTIA ELECTION

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday Nova Scotians voted NDP in historic numbers, demonstrating that last June's wake-up call to Liberals was no one time occurrence.

Nova Scotians have again sent a message to this federal Liberal government: health care matters.

But are Liberals listening? Canadians urged the federal Liberals to reinvest in health care, yet the budget produced not one new dollar for health transfers.

Nova Scotia Liberals did not listen either. Today they are not quite so smug. Atlantic Canadians face the lowest level of health care spending in the country despite the fact health care makes up the largest proportion of provincial budgets.

The problem: federal Liberal cuts; federal Liberal indifference. Liberals have not listened. Perhaps they will now.

*Oral Questions*

**The Speaker:** I will now recognize the hon. member for Labrador, whom I want to welcome back to the House.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

\* \* \*

**MEMBER FOR LABRADOR**

**Mr. Lawrence D. O'Brien (Labrador, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the round of applause. It is great to be back.

I rise today to thank the many people, both in this place and beyond, who were with me in spirit and prayer during my medical absence from this honourable House.

• (1415)

I say thanks to my many friends in Labrador, in Ottawa, across the province and indeed the whole country, and throughout North America for their kind words of encouragement. My wife Alice, my son Michael, my daughter Amanda and I draw strength from knowing we were in their thoughts and prayers.

Their cards, letters and phone calls were a source of comfort and support and have helped me to get back on the mend. I want to let them all know that I feel better than ever and I look forward to continuing to work for my riding for a long time to come.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**ANNUAL MÉRITE DES GENS D'ICI GALA**

**Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Shefford, PC):** Mr. Speaker, next weekend, the annual Mérite des gens d'ici gala will be held in my riding. It is held to honour the accomplishments of various individuals in the community. I would like to pay tribute to them.

Generosity, commitment and devotion are the words that spring to mind when we think of those exceptional people who realize the hopes of our community.

They all contribute to improving the well-being of the community and provide us with the finest examples of achievement.

My thanks to the Mérite des gens d'ici committee for making known and more importantly recognizing the worth of the people in the community.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[English]

**FISHERIES**

**Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday when we asked the Prime Minister about the 5,000 latest job losses in the B.C. salmon industry he did not have

an answer. Instead he talked about east coast cod crisis and blamed it on the Tories.

The B.C. salmon crisis is a recent problem. It was not inherited from the Tories. The Prime Minister might try to point fingers at others for the east coast fishery crisis, but who will he blame for the B.C. salmon crisis: the department, the fisheries minister or himself?

**Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, a number of factors are involved in the west coast problem we are facing at the present time.

First is the cyclical nature of salmon in any event and it was predicted that this would be a low cycle year.

Second is El Nino which has played hob with predictions on the west coast and indeed with salmon returns. We have problems with prices which are now one-third of what they were nine years ago.

I appreciate the hon. member's question because this is an historic day. For two days in a row in his first two questions he has asked about British Columbia salmon for the first time in his entire time in the House. I am delighted to see we are at last getting attention, that the byelection is getting the attention of the Reform Party.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, if Ontario were in an economic nosedive and heading into a recession, the Liberals would declare a national emergency. If central Canada's unemployment rate had jumped one-half of 1% in a month, the Liberal cabinet would be in an emergency session.

Those nightmares are coming true in B.C. and the Prime Minister does not even have a briefing note on British Columbia. All he can say is "we gave you the APEC conference instead of giving it to Toronto". Thank you very little.

Why is it that the government never treats British Columbia issues as genuine national issues?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, one thing is very clear. The tactics of the Reform Party do not create one job in B.C.

I would like to indicate that there was a contract of \$225 million to MacDonald Dettwiler of Richmond, B.C., a few days ago; a \$30 million investment in Ballard a few months ago; and \$70 million to support the TRIUMF Particle Physics Research Laboratory at the University of British Columbia.

Do you want more?

**Some hon. members:** More, more.

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien:** I could go on but I will get up again.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, when the east coast fishery collapsed the government treated it as a national issue, and rightly so. When the west coast

salmon fishery is threatened the government dismisses it as a regional problem.

If the supreme court renders a decision prejudicial to Quebec it is treated as a national unity issue. When the supreme court renders a decision prejudicial to B.C. like the Delgamuukw case it is ignored.

• (1420)

British Columbia is on the way to becoming the second largest province in the country. How long will it be until British Columbia issues are treated as national issues?

**Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Reform Party, a party which has had more British Columbia members than any other in the history of the House, has finally discovered that British Columbia exists. I congratulate him. Finally we are getting questions from them. I thank them for their interest.

With respect to the fishery that he talked about, \$136 million was put into the revitalization of the west coast fleet. We had retirement of licences. We had programs for displaced fisheries. Last year in terms of fish we had a better than average year.

The hon. member forgets that the price is one-third of what it was nine years ago. In addition we have El Nino.

**Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, as far as the Liberal government is concerned British Columbia should be seen but not heard.

The most laughable idea brought forth by the Prime Minister was that he expects us to be grateful that Vancouver hosted the APEC conference. B.C. happens to be the only province that touches the Pacific Ocean, and APEC could not be given to Shawinigan, Quebec.

Other than tax B.C., ignore B.C. and insult B.C., I want to know what he has really done for British Columbia.

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful the hon. member has given me the opportunity to carry on with my list.

Since 1993, \$210 million has been invested in the universities in B.C. by the natural science and engineering program for research projects; \$36.6 million from Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council; \$37 million in loans to 1,900 small businesses through Community Futures, which created 5,800 jobs in B.C.; and another \$70 million in partnerships with businesses.

**Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, let me tell the government what it has really done.

The Prime Minister forgot to list the billions we put into the federal coffers. What he has really done is shut down our army base in Chilliwack, British Columbia. He is shutting down our light-houses. He took the Senate seat that belonged to the people of

British Columbia and gave it to his buddy. He slashed funding from fish hatcheries and let Americans—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**The Speaker:** I encourage my colleagues to listen to the questions and to the answers. I will go back to the hon. House leader of the opposition.

**Mr. Randy White:** Mr. Speaker, while he slashed the fish hatcheries he let American fishermen vacuum our oceans, cut the quota for our fishermen and told them to go on welfare.

What does the Prime Minister have to say to British Columbia fishermen: take this job and shove it?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the mud slinging by the Reform Party on the other side looks very desperate and does not create one job.

An example of what we have done which was very good for British Columbia was our Open Sky agreement. It increased the capacity at the Vancouver International Airport from 300,000 passengers a week to 500,000 passengers a week. As a result, there has been an investment of \$350 million in expansion, creating 1,500—

\* \* \*

• (1425)

[Translation]

#### MILLENNIUMSCHOLARSHIPS

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the millennium fund project is losing its lustre.

All of Quebec is criticizing this project and feels that the federal government has no business in this sector. Even Quebec Liberals are trying to help the federal government out of the mess.

Since even Quebec federalists are refusing to throw their support behind the millennium fund project, will the Prime Minister admit that, if he sticks to his guns on this one, he is going to start another fight with Quebec?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think that students in Quebec, as everywhere else, are very anxious to get their hands on these scholarships.

When the finance minister included in the last budget a system by which parents can set money aside to put their children through university, this is not interference in education.

What we are doing is giving young people in Quebec the opportunity to benefit from the education system. I think this is what we have been doing for a very long time and we have been doing it in many sectors, because this is not about disagreement, but about giving the youth of Quebec more opportunities.

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it seems that there is not even agreement within his Cabinet on this issue. Those working directly with the Minister of Human Resources Development say that nobody wants to meet with the minister.

Is the Prime Minister aware that his Minister of Human Resources Development is not even capable of meeting with Quebec's education sector, including students, because the latter are demanding that the Government of Quebec be present at these meetings, and that the federal government has no other choice now but to rethink its decision?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, any little snippet can be distorted when taken out of context. It is absolutely ridiculous.

I have already met with the Fédération des étudiants universitaires du Québec. I have spoken with a number of stakeholders in the education sector in recent weeks because we want this project to be a success for Quebec's students.

We are going to see that this project benefits the students, who will decide which institutions they wish to attend, but they will have this access. We are going to implement the project in a manner entirely consistent with the existing systems in Quebec, which we are already funding through the Canada student loans program.

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, part I of Bill C-36, which establishes the Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation, confirms what we all knew, namely that the foundation will have an administrative structure, whose members will get paid for their services.

The minister has always said that the foundation would never duplicate existing loans and scholarships programs.

How then can he explain how the structures required to manage this scholarship fund do not amount to duplication?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the foundation will operate at arm's length from the government and will work with the appropriate provincial authorities to avoid any duplication of existing services. It will complement what is already provided by provincial governments.

The foundation will be in charge of the first selection and awarding of the fellowships and it could even sign contracts with the appropriate provincial authorities.

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, should the minister not listen to reason and give the money that he intends to spend, if not

waste, on his scholarships and on its administrative structure to the Quebec government, which would use it to restore funding to post-secondary education?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this government has a vision. It wants to help young people gain the knowledge they will need in the economy of the future.

The reason we established a millennium scholarship fund instead of building new concrete structures or monuments is that we have a vision.

The foundation does have a structure, but it also has a responsibility to get money from the private sector. Indeed, we hope that the private sector will contribute to the millennium fund, so as to promote knowledge and prepare Canada for tomorrow's economy.

\* \* \*

[English]

**HEALTH CARE**

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the federal human rights commission delivered a strong wake-up call to the Prime Minister. So did Nova Scotians.

The commission says that poverty and social inequality are being fuelled by federal cuts to health care and other social support programs. The Liberal government has stubbornly ignored this growing crisis.

Will the Nova Scotia election results finally convince the Prime Minister to keep the Liberal promise to reinvest in health care?

● (1430)

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, with what we have done already, there is a bill in the House of Commons at this time to re-establish \$1.5 billion to the health care system. It is exactly the level of \$12.5 billion that was recommended to the government by the national forum on health. The budget has a series of initiatives for investment in medical research, AIDS research and other programs related to health to help people. We have done it. We want to do it in the years to come—

**The Speaker:** The hon. leader of the New Democratic Party.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, in the budget there is not one new cent in health care transfers. Yesterday the human rights commission stated: "Poverty is a serious breach of equality rights and has no place in a prosperous country like Canada". Unlike this government, the commission recognizes the dangers in the widening gap between the rich and everyone else.

My question to the Prime Minister is simple. Will he make the commitment today to include poverty and homelessness as



*Oral Questions*

prohibited grounds for discrimination in Canada's human rights legislation? Will he do that, yes or no?

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this government has indicated that it is going to undertake a major review of the Canadian Human Rights Act in the coming months. I suggest that it is quite apparent to everyone that as part of that review, we will be looking at the possibility of including a ground of social disadvantage or poverty. We look forward to hearing from Canadians on that issue before we prejudge the conclusion.

\* \* \*

**MILLENNIUMSCHOLARSHIP FUND**

**Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC):** Mr. Speaker, the auditor general is the Canadian taxpayer's watchdog in Ottawa. The millennium scholarship fund is to be funded with \$2.5 billion worth of Canadian taxpayer money, yet the budget implementation legislation does not give the auditor general any right of access to the books of the foundation. Could the Minister of Finance explain why the auditor general will not have access to the foundation's books?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the auditor general will have access to the millennium fund's books.

**Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC):** Mr. Speaker, the budget implementation legislation does not guarantee access for the auditor general and it is well known that there has been a public dispute between the Minister of Finance and the auditor general. Is the minister's fight with the auditor general the real reason the auditor general's access to the foundation's books has not been guaranteed?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there will be an independent board that will have the right to make its decisions and to make its nominations but, as with all things, if the auditor general would like to have access to those books, it will be arranged.

\* \* \*

**ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Connie Jacobs and her son Ty died tragically this week when the RCMP tribal police and a band social worker tried to seize six children from Mrs. Jacobs' home on the Tsuu T'ina reserve. This is not a time for political finger pointing. It is time to grieve for Connie and Ty and to pledge to solve the root problems that led to this tragic shooting.

Aboriginal people are calling for a judicial inquiry. Will the Indian affairs minister ensure that the root causes of this tragedy are thoroughly investigated and not just the shooting itself?

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I informed the House yesterday, we are investigating this. A criminal investigation has started. The province of Alberta has jurisdiction in this case. I understand that even as we speak, Phil Fontaine, representatives of the local first nation and the RCMP are meeting with the attorney general's office in Alberta. I suspect there may be an announcement as early as today.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the wrong minister answered the last question. This shooting on the Tsuu T'ina reserve raises many troubling questions that go way beyond legalities. Why is it that Connie Jacobs and the six children who were living with her were living in such squalor when this band is not poor? Why are so many reserves plagued with alcoholism, drug abuse and violence when Parliament gives this minister's department so much authority and so much money to deal with these problems?

● (1435)

What is the minister, what is the department, what is the government doing to get to the roots of these problems rather than just dealing with the—

**The Speaker:** The hon. solicitor general.

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Leader of the Opposition shares the grief of all the people here and I hope he will respect the expressed request on the part of the first nation to not politicize this issue. It is a tragic event. Many people are calling for calm and I ask the Leader of the Opposition to do the same.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**STUDENT DEBT**

**Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Bill C-36 indicates that the government intends to increase the period a student cannot include student loans in a bankruptcy from two to ten years.

By increasing to ten years, the usual repayment period, the time that must elapse before a student loan may be included in a bankruptcy, is the minister aware that he is abandoning students to the banks and ignoring even the most elementary responsibility for them?

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, a look at what the government has done reveals that it permits students facing enormous difficulties to reduce their loan principal by 50%.

Regarding interest rates, students earning minimum wage, that is, less than \$28,000, will be allowed to reduce their rate of interest. Those earning less than \$20,000 will be allowed to not pay interest. We—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Charlesbourg.

**Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the minister can give all the explanations he likes, his legislation puts students in the same category as defrauders, criminals and those who fail to pay child support in the Bankruptcy Act.

How can the minister claim to be helping students when he is discrediting them by treating them as defrauders under the Bankruptcy Act?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have just explained that there are a whole series of measures to enable students not to have to declare bankruptcy.

However, I find it both incredible and inconceivable that this same member opposes the millennium scholarships, which will provide \$3,000 to 100,000 students a year. It is ridiculous.

\* \* \*

[English]

**THE SENATE**

**Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, two days ago in the House the Deputy Prime Minister said: “The Senate is a partisan political body. It is organized along party lines. Why should the Prime Minister not appoint people who would support his party and the government program?” This is indeed quite an insight into the Liberal mindset.

Considering that the Deputy Prime Minister already considers the Senate to be a partisan body, will the Prime Minister explain to the House what the job description really is for a senator? Is it simply to be a Liberal?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the first thing a member of Parliament should do is read the Constitution.

In 1867 Canadians decided to have a Senate. It was a copy of the House of Lords in England. In the House of Lords members are named for life, and it goes from father to son.

Here there is a time limit. Some are partisan and some choose to sit as independents. It is their choice. The Senate studies and reflects on the bills of the House of Commons. It is not under the pressure of the next election. Perhaps we should not have—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Edmonton North.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, maybe white wigs would help in the Senate, who knows.

Senator Andrew Thompson’s attendance record has been dismal for years. The Prime Minister only admitted this and it became an issue several months back when it became a disaster for public relations for the Liberal Party. Now Senator Andrew Thompson has retired so that he can get his huge enormous pension.

The Prime Minister still has not told Canadians what he considers to be the acceptable attendance record for senators. Will he answer for us today just how much is acceptable, 30%, 50%, which is it?

• (1440)

**The Speaker:** The member is asking an opinion of the Prime Minister. If he wants to answer the question, he can.

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I know the question is not in order but it shows the desperation of the opposition.

The opposition does not know what to ask questions about, so it has to be completely out of order to get the attention of the House of Commons.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**FISHERIES**

**Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Yesterday, the Prime Minister confirmed the view of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans that federal mismanagement of the fisheries has resulted in a disaster. He also seemed receptive to the idea that there must be assistance for fishers and fishery workers and told us that the Minister of Human Resources Development was working on it.

Can the minister tell the 22,000 people still relying on the TAGS program when and how they can be reassured about their future?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have a Prime Minister who is concerned about the situation of fishers in eastern Canada as well as of those in British Columbia.

The Prime Minister asked me, in my capacity as Minister of Human Resources Development, to look at the situation of fishers and of fishery workers as well, which is of very great concern to us. This is why we are now looking at ways of making the transition to a post-TAGS environment in eastern Canada.

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would remind the minister that spring is now here. It is time he came out of hibernation and did something. Fishers are waiting.

Will the Minister of Human Resources Development follow up on the recommendations of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, not just by extending the TAGS program, but also by launching a broad program of economic diversification for all coastal regions of eastern Canada?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to see that our friends in the Bloc Québécois are taking an interest in the adjustment program. We have often talked about the transitional job creation fund. It is one of the effective tools used by this government and we certainly intend to continue providing assistance to the unemployed in this way.

We are going to respond to the committee in due course. The TAGS program will wind up in August, as we have already announced in the House, and we are looking at the post-TAGS environment in a completely responsible fashion.

\* \* \*

[English]

**TRANSPORT**

**Mr. Jake E. Hooppner (Portage—Lisgar, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians hope there has been a mistake made by this government in deciding to investigate helicopter pilot John Gibson who heroically rescued two people in a Manitoba air crash.

Would the Prime Minister please tell this House what action he is willing to take to call off the investigation of this Canadian hero?

**Mr. Stan Keyes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asks an important question and I think he deserves an answer.

The answer is the individual is not being investigated. The helicopter pilot is part of a much larger investigation, one that stretches back starting in January. The investigation is looking at the flights that landed prior to and right after that tragic accident.

**Mr. Jake E. Hooppner (Portage—Lisgar, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is confusing because the article reads differently.

I am wondering why there is no attention paid by this government to why there was not a helicopter in place to do the job instead of depending on a private helicopter pilot who was willing to risk his life to rescue these people and who is now getting the this type of publicity.

**Mr. Stan Keyes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member is not suggesting that we should ignore the rules that are laid down by Transport Canada.

We are trying to make sure that Transport Canada and all those who are flying have the safest system in the world. It has been demonstrated and it is very clear.

The individual in question is not being singled out. He is part of a larger investigation. If the hon. member read on in the newspaper articles he would have seen how Transport Canada has said on many occasions that the individual is part of a larger investigation, that the investigation—

• (1445)

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Rimouski—Mitis.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**OPTION CANADA**

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

The Minister of Canadian Heritage has said that all information on Option Canada had been made public, but we are still waiting to get a copy of the letter the minister is supposed to have sent to the president of Option Canada requesting explanations on how \$4.8 million was spent.

Will the Prime Minister intervene immediately to ensure the minister honours her commitments and the letter is made public right away, as she promised last Thursday?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have it here.

\* \* \*

[English]

**BRITISH COLUMBIA**

**Ms. Sophia Leung (Vancouver Kingsway, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for Asia-Pacific.

British Columbia has caught a case of the Asian flu which affected the economy of the Pacific rim in 1997. How is the Liberal government showing leadership in restoring the economy and helping B.C. in business and jobs?

**Hon. Raymond Chan (Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is indeed very concerned about the Asian financial crisis and its impact on British Columbia. That is why we are supporting international efforts to stabilize the troubled Asian countries. At the same time we continue to promote job growth and exports by organizing Team Canada and other trade missions to the region.

*Oral Questions*

We continue also to invest in technologies in British Columbia. Just a couple of weeks ago the Minister of Industry announced a \$300 million project with MDA in B.C. to build a new satellite.

\* \* \*

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans has a rule that any companies unloading oil off ships in Canada have to pay a fee. Fair enough. What is not fair is they are forced to pay a different amount depending on the province they are in. Same oil, different price.

In Quebec for example it costs 44 cents to unload a tonne of oil but in Ontario it is \$1.85. In the minister's own home province it is \$1.52, almost four times as much as in Quebec.

Why is the minister from B.C. in charge of this fee discriminating against B.C. businesses and consumers?

**Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, once again the foundation of the question is simply inaccurate.

We have a double system whereby the coast guard provides standard services across the country. We in addition have response organizations organized by private industry. They must have the capability of dealing with a spill of 10,000 tonnes.

Because of different volumes which are moved in different areas and the different requirements for the equipment to be kept in stock, there are different costs. In some areas, to get the same level of environmental protection one must pay more. Environmental—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Medicine Hat.

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we know the minister from B.C. really is not the minister for B.C. He is actually the minister from Ottawa to B.C. telling B.C. how things are supposed to work.

We would think at least he would listen to the legions of backbenchers from Ontario. They have been complaining for weeks about this double standard that forces Ontario consumers to pay at least a cent a litre more for gasoline.

Why is the minister treating Ontario and B.C. as if they were second class provinces?

**Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, typically the opposition chooses an Alberta member to comment upon a British Columbia or an Ontario issue. Despite the fact that British Columbia has the largest representation in their caucus, they constantly ignore the B.C. members in the official opposition.

As a British Columbian I am simply appalled at the treatment of the majority British Columbian members in their caucus by the Alberta—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Burnaby—Douglas.

\* \* \*

● (1450)

**FISHERIES**

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. And if he is the best that B.C. can be offered by the Liberals, then God help us.

British Columbia's coastal and upriver communities are profoundly affected by the upcoming Pacific salmon treaty negotiations with the United States. In order to ensure that all key voices are at the table, will the minister assure the House that the Government of British Columbia will be a fully equal partner at these upcoming Pacific salmon negotiations?

**Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the issue of the Pacific salmon treaty is a very important one, except apparently to the official opposition.

The issue is structured so there will be one chief negotiator on both the American and Canadian side. They will be supported by a team. British Columbia will have a representative on that high level team. The level of participation of the British Columbia government will depend entirely upon how active it wishes to be and how good and useful its suggestions are.

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, as the minister knows, coho salmon are in crisis especially the northern coho as a result of Alaskan overfishing.

Will the minister assure British Columbians that any interim fishing deal will address this issue and the equity issue in the upcoming season, and not simply allow the United States to maintain the status quo which is absolutely disastrous both for fish and coastal communities in British Columbia?

**Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I certainly can assure the member of that. The issue of coho protection in northern British Columbia is an extremely important one. It will mean we will have to have extensive negotiations with the Americans on this specific issue. I am quite willing to point out to the member that this is one of the reasons for our concern this year on the catch levels we will have to establish.

*Oral Questions***CANADA MILLENNIUM SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION**

• (1455)

**Mr. Charlie Power (St. John's West, PC):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has said on numerous occasions in this House that a good government is a transparent government. However the millennium scholarship foundation is not subject to the Access to Information Act.

Will the minister allow true transparency by subjecting the foundation to the Access to Information Act?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is an outside foundation. Its books will certainly be available. They will be audited. This government as in all other things will continue to be open and transparent and so will the foundation. Its board of directors will consist of educators, leading Canadians from coast to coast. Their integrity should not be questioned.

**Mr. Charlie Power (St. John's West, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I was not questioning the integrity of any of the directors on the board, or their abilities or competence. I am asking in a transparent society, when \$2.5 billion of our taxpayers' money is going to be spent on a millennium scholarship foundation, why is that foundation not subject to the Access to Information Act?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, because it is an outside foundation and will operate as an outside foundation.

\* \* \*

**HEALTH**

**Mr. Janko Perić (Cambridge, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, a recent advisory panel report on regulations governing natural health products suggested several changes to provide consumers with greater freedom of choice.

Will the Minister of Health assure the House that serious consideration will be given to this report calling for a fair and effective regulatory framework for natural health remedies?

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what is happening right now. The issue is before the Standing Committee on Health. It is holding hearings in Ottawa and has been doing so for the last three months. It will move on to other areas in particular in British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec to hear all the stakeholders and consumer groups, including the one that had a press conference yesterday to publicize its own concerns.

All of those issues are being brought forward to the committee. The committee will make its report both to the House and to the minister in short order.

**FISHERIES**

**Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, fisheries management in British Columbia is in a mess. However our minister thinks he has found a way to solve the Pacific salmon crisis. He wants to let the Americans fish all our salmon and then place B.C. fishermen on a west coast TAGS program. His answer to the problem is to fold to the Americans, kill thousands of jobs and place British Columbians on welfare. What an embarrassment.

Why is it that the only solution this minister has is to put B.C. fishermen on welfare?

**Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. member from British Columbia. Thanks to the goading of the Alberta director of that party he was allowed to ask a question. I am glad he was.

I would point out to him that type of question only suggests to the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition that perhaps he should be kept in his seat along with the other B.C. members.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**MULTIMEDIA INDUSTRY**

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry.

A recently released report on the multimedia industry concludes that it is absolutely vital to quickly find new sources of financing if there is to be Canadian and Quebec content in Canada and in Quebec, in health and education, for instance.

Is the minister prepared to finally do what is necessary to help the financing of this industry of the future?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Canadian Heritage and myself are working together to try to help this very important sector of the economy, not only in the Montreal region, but everywhere in Canada.

\* \* \*

[English]

**THE ATLANTIC GROUND FISH STRATEGY**

**Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the finance minister.

Last month the government received the post-TAGS review known as the Harrigan report which recommended a successor

*Oral Questions*

program for the Atlantic groundfish strategy. The fisheries and oceans committee recommended the government continue TAGS until May 1999 and endorsed a new federally funded multi-year infrastructure and job diversification program.

Can the finance minister tell the people of Atlantic Canada if he will make sufficient funds available to finance the recommendations contained in these two reports?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, TAGS will continue until the end of August 1998. As for the other recommendations of the report, my officials are looking into them right now and are taking them into consideration.

We will be addressing the post-TAGS environment in eastern Canada in a responsible way.

\* \* \*

**YOUTH EMPLOYMENT**

**Mr. Jean Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche, PC):** Mr. Speaker, a study done by the CIBC bank states that more than 200,000 youth out of school have dropped out of the labour market. When combined with those who are registered, the figure jumps to 450,000 unemployed youth in this country.

What is the Minister of Human Resources Development prepared to do to prevent our youth from being caught in the cycle of no experience, no job?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are very preoccupied by the situation of the young unemployed in Canada. Even though the situation has improved substantially in the last few months, it is still much too high at over 15%.

This is why we have brought forward our youth employment strategy which has the precise aim of eliminating the conundrum of no experience, no job, no job, no experience. It will provide thousands of young Canadians through Youth Service Canada and Youth Internship Canada with summer jobs and good advice in order for them to have something on their CVs to break the conundrum.

\* \* \*

**CALGARY DECLARATION**

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Winnipeg South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Calgary declaration was adopted on September 14, 1997 by the premiers and leaders of nine provinces and the territories. Since then a copy of the declaration has been provided to every single Manitoba home and an extensive consultation has been undertaken.

I wonder if the Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs could tell us the results of that consultation.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the premier and Manitoba's legislature for their contribution to the Calgary process.

On Thursday, March 20 the Manitoba legislature unanimously adopted a resolution which reflected a wide consensus among Manitobans with regard to the Calgary declaration.

● (1500)

[Translation]

The Calgary declaration reflects the support of Canadians for a federation that always seeks to ensure greater fairness and equality, as well as respect for our country's diversity, which includes the unique character of Quebec society.

\* \* \*

[English]

**FISHERIES**

**Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am from B.C. Let us look at how the fisheries minister handled the problem of fish in B.C. creeks.

There was a conservation initiative called the habitat mapping and inventory program. The government spent \$115,000 on the program. It was ready to go but last month some members of the United Fishermen and Allied Workers Union criticized the minister. To punish them he cancelled the program, throwing 45 workers out of work and endangering the fish habitat.

Why does the minister always put politics ahead of what is best for the fishery?

**Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I take a certain satisfaction in having Reform members in British Columbia, goaded of course by earlier questions, demonstrate why we do not need another Reform member from British Columbia.

With respect to the project in question, we have funded 48 projects of that organization, totalling \$14.7 million. On this particular one, yes \$115,000 came from my department but after consultation with my department and human resources, we did not think it was one of the very top ones we should fund at this time. The reason is that we have four times as many projects come to us as we are able to finance.

\* \* \*

**PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

**The Speaker:** I wish to draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of a number of distinguished visitors.

*Speaker's Ruling*

I present His Excellency Eduardo Ferrero Costa, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Peru.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**The Speaker:** Mr. Zlatko Dominikovic, Minister of Agriculture and Forestry of the Republic of Croatia.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**The Speaker:** Parliamentarians from the United Kingdom branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association led by Mr. Andrew Macinlay, MP.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

\* \* \*

• (1505)

### POINTS OF ORDER

#### STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS—SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Speaker:** I am now prepared to rule on the point of order raised on Tuesday, March 24, 1998 by the House leader of the official opposition. I would like to thank the opposition House leader and the member for Windsor—St. Clair, who chairs the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, for their contributions on this matter.

[*Translation*]

The House leader of the official opposition argued that the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights was not complying with the terms of an order of reference of the House contained in two motions adopted on October 30, 1997.

[*English*]

The first motion was presented as part of the business of supply. He called on the government to present a motion under Standing Order 68(4), instructing the committee to prepare and bring in a bill concerning penalties for impaired driving. The motion further stipulated that once the committee was so instructed, it should report by May 15, 1998. That motion was adopted by the House.

[*Translation*]

Following the adoption of that motion, a second motion, introduced by the Minister of Human Resources Development pursuant to Standing Order 68(4), instructed the committee to prepare and bring in such a bill.

[*English*]

The hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair, as chair of the justice committee, argued that there was no deadline contained in the motion supplied to the committee as its order of reference by Journals branch. She further maintained that while the committee

had every intention of complying with the order of reference, pressure of other business referred to the committee by this House would prevent it's dealing with it immediately.

Having looked into the matter, it appears that the basic confusion arises from an original misunderstanding about the order of reference given to the committee. I understand that the text of orders of reference to committees are duly noted within the Committees and Legislative Services Directorate and that each committee is advised accordingly of any new order of reference it receives.

Reference is simply an extract from the actual *Journals* published by the House which are the official minutes of our proceedings and the record of our decisions. Ordinarily an order of reference is contained within a single motion, and this may be where the confusion has arisen. I understand that only the minister's motion was originally communicated to the committee through the usual channels within the directorate.

I have reviewed the two motions carefully. It is clear to me that these motions must be read in conjunction one with the other. The first motion presented as part of the business of supply contains two parts. The first part calls on the government to move a motion of instruction to the committee pursuant to Standing Order 68(4). The second part sets out a deadline to apply once such a motion of instruction has been adopted by the House. The second of the two motions is of course the motion of instruction itself presented by the minister and unanimously adopted by the House.

Once the motion of instruction presented by the minister was adopted, the deadline contained in the earlier motion adopted by the House became applicable, as this had already been agreed to by the House in adopting the supply motion as amended.

It is therefore my decision that the instructions to the justice committee adopted by the House October 30, 1997 do include a reporting deadline of May 15, 1998.

[*Translation*]

That said, it appears that the committee has been operating in good faith on the understanding that its instructions did not contain a deadline for reporting back a draft bill on impaired driving.

[*English*]

I realize that in a matter as serious and complex as the preparation of legislation, the time which remains for the committee to carry out this work is short, particularly given its other responsibilities on other fronts.

• (1510)

If the committee deems that more time is necessary to deal with this matter, then it may by way of report request the House to grant an extension to the original time frame.

*Routine Proceedings***ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS***[Translation]***MAIN ESTIMATES, PART III**

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues, I table part III of the main estimates consisting of 80 departmental reports on plans and priorities.

These documents will be distributed to the members of the standing committees to facilitate their consideration of the spending authority requested in part II of the main estimates.

\* \* \*

*[English]***REPORT ON PLANS AND PRIORITIES, 1998-1999**

**The Speaker:** I have the honour to lay upon the table the report on plans and priorities in relation to the main estimates for the House of Commons.

\* \* \*

**ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS**

**Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. 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.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 18 petitions.

\* \* \*

*[English]***MARRIAGE (PROHIBITED DEGREES) ACT**

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-385, an act to amend the Marriage (Prohibited Degrees) Act (marriage between persons of the same sex).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this enactment is to confirm that a marriage is not invalid by reason solely of the fact that the

parties are of the same gender. While federal statute law is silent on the capacity of gay and lesbian people to enter into marriage with their partners, a Liberal MP has tabled a bill that would deny gay and lesbian couples who wish to marry the right to do so.

I believe our relationships should be celebrated and affirmed as just as loving, just as committed, just as strong as heterosexual relationships, and federal statutes should reflect that equality.

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

\* \* \*

**INCOME TAX ACT**

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-386, an act to amend the Income Tax Act and the Canada Pension Plan (definition of spouse).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this enactment is to amend the definition of the term spouse in the Income Tax Act and the Canada pension plan to ensure that the same financial and fiscal benefits relating to pensions are available to both heterosexual and homosexual couples. The current law which is being challenged in the courts denies equality to gay and lesbian people. We pay income tax and make contributions to the Canada pension plan and our partners should be entitled to equal benefits and other equal responsibilities as heterosexual couples.

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

\* \* \*

● (1515)

**NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RELIEF COORDINATION ACT**

**Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-387, an act to establish a national committee to develop policies and procedures to ensure co-ordination in the delivery of programs by governments in the case of agricultural losses or disasters created by weather or pests, the co-ordination of the delivery of information, assistance, relief and compensation and study the compliance of such programs with World Trade Organization requirements.

He said: Mr. Speaker, as indicated in the preamble, this particular piece of legislation is to deal with the consistency of programs that are available to agriculturists throughout Canada, particularly the inconsistency with respect to programs that deal with disasters, not unlike what happened with the ice storm of 1998 and the floods of 1997.

It suggests that a national committee be struck made up of 21 members and that it look at these national programs to deal with consistency as well as to deal with the requirements of the World Trade Organization.



*Routine Proceedings*

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

\* \* \*

**DEPOSITORY BILLS AND NOTES ACT**

**Hon. Jim Peterson (for the Minister of Finance, Lib.)** moved that Bill S-9, an act respecting depository bills and depository notes and to amend the Financial Administration Act, be read the first time.

(Motion agreed to and bill read the first time)

\* \* \*

**PETITIONS**

## CRIMINAL CODE

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.)**: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 36 I wish to present a petition signed by several Albertans.

They say that they want to draw the attention of the House to the following:

That as deeply concerned citizens they believe that the provocation defence, as it is currently used in femicide and wife slaughter cases, inappropriately and unjustly changes the focus of the criminal trial from the behaviour of the accused and his intention to murder to the behaviour of the victim who from then on is identified as the one responsible for the accused violence.

Therefore the undersigned request that Parliament review and change relevant provisions of the Criminal Code to ensure that men take responsibility for their violent behaviour toward women.

## MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT ON INVESTMENT

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP)**: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to present a petition containing hundreds of names of Canadians from all across Canada who are concerned about the multilateral agreement on investment.

They see it as the latest in a series of regional and global agreements which, in the name of liberalizing trade and investment, expand the powers of multinational corporations at the expense of the power of governments to intervene in the marketplace on behalf of our social, cultural, environmental and health care goals.

They see this agreement as being flawed in so far as it seeks to protect the rights of investors without seeking similar protection for workers through binding core labour standards. They see it as being anti-democratic.

They therefore call upon Parliament to reject the current framework of MAI negotiations and instruct the government to seek an entirely different agreement by which the world might achieve a rules based global trading regime that protects workers, the

environment and the ability of governments to act in the public interest.

## NATIONAL UNITY

**Mr. Roy Cullen (Etobicoke North, Lib.)**: Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to present to this House a petition on national unity.

Petitioners in my riding are saying that they want a Canada with Quebec. The Quebec issue is causing political and economic instability in Quebec and throughout Canada. Therefore they encourage our government to strenuously continue its efforts at national reconciliation.

[Translation]

## EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ)**: Mr. Speaker, as a result of the ice storm, thousands of workers temporarily lost their jobs in my riding. While the employment insurance fund shows a \$7 billion surplus, a two-week waiting period was imposed on them before they could receive benefits.

The petitioners, all 1,134 of them, call on Parliament to abolish this two-week waiting period.

[English]

## TOBACCO PRODUCTS

**Ms. Shaughnessy Cohen (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.)**: Mr. Speaker, I am tabling today two petitions, both on behalf of the member for Windsor West and myself.

The first petition calls upon Parliament to enact legislation making it illegal for persons under the age 19 to possess tobacco or tobacco products.

• (1520)

## PAY EQUITY

**Ms. Shaughnessy Cohen (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.)**: Mr. Speaker, my second petition calls upon the government to provide a settlement to existing human rights complaints based on pay equity and to cease treating workers differently based on gender.

## NUCLEAR WEAPONS

**Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.)**: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to table two petitions on behalf of constituents.

The first petition asks that Parliament support the immediate initiation and conclusion by the year 2000 of an international convention which will set out a binding timetable for the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

## CRIMINAL CODE

**Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.)**: Mr. Speaker, the second petition deals with parental rights. In particular, the petition asks Parliament to retain section 43 of Canada's Criminal Code which recognizes and affirms parental rights for Canadians.

*Routine Proceedings*

## MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT ON INVESTMENT

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by residents from across Canada who are deeply concerned about the fact that the Government of Canada is currently negotiating an international trade agreement at the OECD called the MAI or the multilateral agreement on investment.

The petitioners note that the MAI is fundamentally flawed in so far as it seeks to protect the rights of investors without similar protection for workers. They also note that it is anti-democratic.

Therefore, the petitioners call upon Parliament to reject the current framework of MAI negotiations and to instruct the government to seek an entirely different agreement by which the world might achieve a rules based, global trading regime that protects workers, the environment and the ability of government to act in the public interest.

## CRIMINAL CODE

**Mr. Walt Lastewka (St. Catharines, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to present a petition to the House from my constituents in St. Catharines and from people in the Niagara area.

The petition states that Canadians are alarmed and deeply disturbed by further victimization of the families of Kristen French and Leslie Mahaffy by reason of the use of the Bernardo video tapes.

The petitioners wish to draw to the attention of the House that section 486(1) of the Criminal Code of Canada mandates that all evidence presented at criminal trials be presented in open court and be fully available to the public and media.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to amend this law by creating a specific exemption to this open court rule to exclude evidence of child and coerced pornography.

## MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT ON INVESTMENT

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce a petition signed by petitioners who believe that the MAI is anti-democratic in so far as it would be binding for 20 years, thus tying the hands of several Parliaments and future governments.

The petitioners call on Parliament to reject the current framework of the MAI.

## CO-OPERATIVE HOUSING

**Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to present a petition from several hundreds of constituents of Scarborough—Agincourt.

The petitioners indicate that the Government of Ontario has already breached its own agreements with provincially funded

housing co-operatives and has threatened to introduce legislation to cancel the contracts and operating agreements of housing co-operatives participating in federal programs once the federal government devolves its responsibility to the province.

The petitioners also indicate that the interests of the co-operative housing owners and members can be protected in these negotiations only if the Government of Canada insists that there be specific safeguards preventing the province of Ontario from using its legislative authority to cancel existing contracts and operating agreements.

Therefore, the petitioners call upon Parliament to ask the minister responsible for the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation to immediately suspend negotiations on social housing with the province of Ontario and to resume negotiations only if the minister proceeds under publicly declared principles established with the input of co-operative housing stakeholders.

Being a neighbour of one of the petitioners, I totally agree with the petition.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I am sure the hon. member for Scarborough—Agincourt knows it is improper to suggest whether he agrees or not with a petition. I hope he will refrain from doing so in the future.

## ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Wanuskewin, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition to the House of Commons assembly today.

Several hundred citizens of Canada pray that Parliament will oppose the decriminalization of assisted suicide. They urge members of Parliament to oppose Motion No. 123 in the vote this evening.

## MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT ON INVESTMENT

**Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am proud to present five petitions against the MAI. I am especially proud to present a petition which comes from Calgary.

The petitioners say that the MAI is anti-democratic in so far as it would be binding for 20 years, thus tying the hands of several Parliaments and future governments.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to reject the current framework of the MAI negotiations and instruct the government to seek an entirely different agreement which would achieve a rules based global trading regime that protects workers, the environment and the ability of governments to act in the public interest.

• (1525)

**Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 36, I am pleased to table a petition. This petition is signed by residents of my riding, by residents of Winnipeg and by residents of Thunder Bay, Ontario.

The petitioners are very concerned about the multilateral agreement on investment. They are very worried that Canada is currently negotiating an agreement which will threaten the very notion of Canadian unity, sovereignty, our cultural identity and our health care system.

The petitioners are worried that this is not an investment deal but a global constitution for corporations and that it will create the same rights for foreign owned corporations as for Canadian citizens.

The petitioners call upon this government to reject the current framework for the MAI and to proceed on a much more sensitive and humane basis.

#### PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition on behalf of a number of Canadians, including Canadians from my own riding of Mississauga South.

The petitioners would like to draw to the attention of the House that police officers and firefighters are required to place their lives at risk on a daily basis as they discharge their duties and that when one of them loses their life in the line of duty, not only do we all mourn that loss, but the employment benefits provided often do not provide sufficient assistance to their surviving families.

The petitioners therefore call on Parliament to establish a public safety officers compensation fund for the benefit of police officers and firefighters who are killed in the line of duty.

#### MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT ON INVESTMENT

**Ms. Louise Hardy (Yukon, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a petition from citizens from across Canada who are opposed to the multilateral agreement on investment as it is fundamentally flawed in that it seeks to protect the rights of investors without seeking similar protection for citizens' rights and workers' rights through labour standards or for our environment.

Therefore, the petitioners want this Parliament to reject the MAI.

**Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure, on behalf of many Canadians in Saskatchewan and Edmonton, Alberta, to present a petition in opposition to the current negotiations on the multilateral agreement on investment. They believe that this agreement is flawed. They believe it will hurt Canadians and Canadian businesses and, in particular, our independence.

They are calling upon Parliament to reject the current framework of the MAI negotiations and are asking the government to seek an entirely different agreement by which the world might achieve a rules based, global trading regime that protects workers, the environment and the ability of governments to act in the public interest.

#### Government Orders

[Translation]

#### QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

#### MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

**Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

[English]

**Mr. Jim Pankiw (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it has been over five months since I placed an order for the production of papers designated as P-8 on the Order Paper. I raised this issue a month ago under another point of order and I am forced once again to ask the parliamentary secretary when I can expect a response from the government on this matter.

**Mr. Peter Adams:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member's concern. I will look into this as soon as possible and will produce a response as soon as possible.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is it agreed that all Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Under the circumstances, I do not know what else we can do. Members can ask to have them transferred for debate, otherwise they stand.

#### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1530)

[English]

#### BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 1998

BILL C-36—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.)** moved:

That in relation to Bill C-36, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 24, 1998, not more than two further sitting days shall be allotted to the consideration of the second reading stage of the said bill and, fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business on the second day allotted to the consideration of the second reading stage of the said bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this

*Government Orders*

Order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the stage of the bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

**Mr. John Nunziata:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The net effect of the motion put forward by the House leader is to invoke closure, something that the hon. member opposed when he was a member of the opposition. This is pure hypocrisy.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I do not hear any point of order coming from the hon. member on that point. I think he may wish to debate the merits of the motion but that is not for a point of order.

[*Translation*]

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Call in the members.

• (1615)

[*English*]

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

*(Division No. 112)***YEAS**

## Members

Adams  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Bélanger  
Bennett  
Bevilacqua  
Bonin  
Boudria  
Brown  
Caccia  
Caplan  
Catterall  
Chan  
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)  
Coderre  
Comuzzi  
Cullen  
Dion  
Dromisky  
Duhamel  
Eggleton  
Finlay  
Fontana

Alcock  
Assad  
Augustine  
Baker  
Barnes  
Bélair  
Bellemare  
Bertrand  
Blondin-Andrew  
Bonwick  
Bradshaw  
Bryden  
Calder  
Carroll  
Chamberlain  
Charbonneau  
Clouthier  
Cohen  
Coppes  
DeVillers  
Discepolo  
Drouin  
Easter  
Finestone  
Folco  
Fry

Gagliano  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Grose  
Harb  
Hubbard  
Iftody  
Jennings  
Karetak-Lindell  
Keyes  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Kraft Sloan  
Lavigne  
Leung  
Longfield  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Marchi  
Massé  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Mifflin  
Minna  
Murray  
Nault  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Peric  
Pettigrew  
Pickard (Kent—Essex)  
Pratt  
Provenzano  
Reed  
Robillard  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Shepherd  
St. Denis  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Szabo  
Thibeault  
Ur  
Vancielief  
Whelan

Galloway  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Guarnieri  
Harvard  
Ianno  
Jackson  
Jordan  
Karygiannis  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Lastewka  
Lee  
Lincoln  
MacAulay  
Malhi  
Manley  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Mitchell  
Myers  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Proud  
Redman  
Richardson  
Saada  
Serré  
Speller  
Steckle  
St-Julien  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Valeri  
Wappel  
Wilfert —138

**NAYS**

## Members

Abbott  
Anders  
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)  
Bailey  
Benoit  
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)  
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Borotsik  
Brison  
Canuel  
Casson  
Crête  
Dalphond-Guiral  
Desrochers  
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)  
Dumas  
Elley  
Forseth  
Gagnon  
Girard-Bujold  
Goldring  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Guimond  
Hart  
Herron  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Hoepfner  
Jones  
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)  
Konrad  
Laurin  
Loubier

Ablonczy  
Asselin  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Bellehumeur  
Bergeron  
Blaikie  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Cadman  
Casey  
Chatters  
Cummins  
Davies  
Dubé (Lévis)  
Duceppe  
Duncan  
Epp  
Fournier  
Gilmour  
Godin (Châteauguay)  
Grewal  
Guay  
Hardy  
Harvey  
Hill (MacLeod)  
Hilstrom  
Johnston  
Keddy (South Shore)  
Kerpan  
Lalonde  
Lebel

*Government Orders*

Lowther  
 Marceau  
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)  
 McDonough  
 Mills (Red Deer)  
 Nunziata  
 Pankiw  
 Perron  
 Plamondon  
 Price  
 Ritz  
 Sauvageau  
 Scott (Skeena)  
 Solomon  
 St-Jacques  
 Strahl  
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
 Vautour  
 Venne  
 Wayne  
 White (North Vancouver)—103

MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
 Marchand  
 Matthews  
 Meredith  
 Muise  
 Nystrom  
 Penson  
 Picard (Drummond)  
 Power  
 Ramsay  
 Rocheleau  
 Schmidt  
 Solberg  
 Stinson  
 Stoffer  
 Thompson (Charlotte)  
 Turp  
 Vellacott  
 Wasylcia-Leis  
 White (Langley—Abbotsford)

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Alarie  
 Cannis  
 de Savoye  
 Dhaliwal  
 Marleau  
 Ménard  
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)

Byrne  
 Collette  
 Debien  
 Lefebvre  
 McCormick  
 Mercier  
 St-Hilaire

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

• (1620)

**Ms. Paddy Torsney:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I know sometimes we all have other duties but I think you will notice that the member for Fundy—Royal actually left his chair and the member for St. John's West left the Chamber completely during that vote. I am not sure that either of their votes should count.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The Chair is not certain that their votes should count either, but in the circumstances given the outcome, I think we will leave the vote undisturbed. Hon. members may have noticed that I was indicating that members did have to remain in the House at the end of the vote for the yeas and that I was administering appropriate chastisement. I think that in these circumstances hon. members will seek to remain in the House, in compliance with the rules, during a vote and we will leave it at that.

SECOND READING

The House resumed from March 24 consideration of the motion that Bill C-36, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 24, 1998, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Resuming debate. When the debate was interrupted on this bill, the hon. member for Markham had the floor. He has three minutes remaining in his speech.

**Mr. Jim Jones (Markham, PC):** Mr. Speaker, one of the important issues that was not acknowledged in this budget by the federal government was the millennium bug, commonly known as the year 2000 problem.

The year 2000 is less than 20 months away and there was no mention of its repercussions by the Minister of Finance in his budget. No attention was given to the significant cost and consequences this problem will have on Canadian businesses. No mention was made as to the aspirations of this government in combating the huge implications of this issue.

In the report by the Task Force Year 2000 released in February this year, it was recommended that the federal government introduce revenue neutral tax incentives, measures that focus primarily on small and medium size enterprises. It recommended that there be no delay in implementing this. The Minister of Finance ignored this recommendation and did nothing for small business enterprises in his budget respecting the year 2000 problem.

The PC Party feels that we urgently need to immediately implement formal action using the tax incentive levers available. The minister has missed his chance to make this incentive available to businesses at the earliest possible time. Now businesses may struggle on their own to attack this inevitable deadline of the next millennium with no monetary or tax relief from the Liberal government.

In conclusion, the 1998 budget may go down in history for being the first balanced budget in 28 years. However it will not be a budget that is to be remembered by Canadians as the budget that helped Canadians get ahead in life. The 1998 budget should have included initiatives to put money back into the pockets of the taxpayers. The 1998 budget should have introduced policy decisions that would have provided relief to small businesses, tax relief to Canadians, lowered the federal debt level and restored dollars to the provinces for health care, education and social assistance.

As I have indicated, the 1998 federal budget does little in the way of providing for taxpaying Canadians. We are not content to see the government spend away their sacrifices. We want to see more money and more jobs for Canadians. We must keep young Canadians in Canada and give them the opportunity their parents have had. It is crucial that we solve the alarming trend that has come to be known as the Canadian brain drain.

Taxes are still too high in this country. They penalize initiative. Taxes slow investment, investment that creates jobs. The result is that investment is being driven outside Canada. We also know that taxes encourage highly skilled entrepreneurial Canadians to seek their futures in other countries.

*Government Orders*

• (1625)

**Mr. Tony Valeri (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was speaking about small business. I would like the hon. member to recognize that small business benefits from balanced budgets, low interest rates and low inflation. The tax relief which was provided in this last budget took 400,000 Canadians off the tax rolls. It provided relief to 90% of Canadian taxpayers.

The hon. member talked about the debt level. The hon. member only has to read the budget to understand that this budget contains measures that will actually decrease the value of the budget and keep the debt to GDP ratio on a continued downward track, which is really the measure that is used by countries around the world.

I want to draw the member's attention back to the 1989 Wilson budget. He only has to look at that budget to realize that his party added the surtax, raised corporate taxes and raised personal income taxes. It did everything that he now stands up in this House and accuses this government of doing.

I would only hope that the hon. member could stand in his place and recognize that this budget, for the first time in a long time, has started to give Canadians hope. As we have said, the tax cuts are modest. We will continue on that track. I hope the hon. member would stand up so that constituents in his riding could hear him say that this budget is on the right track for the first time in decades. It certainly is not as a result of what the Tories have done, and it certainly is not as a result of the Reform Party across the way which does nothing but heckle.

**Mr. Jim Jones:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the hon. member that the way the Liberals got to this balanced budget was by one of the initiatives which was brought in by the Conservatives when they were in power, the free trade agreement. The free trade agreement has yielded incremental tax revenues of approximately \$25 billion.

The hon. member said that the government helped small business by taking 400,000 Canadians off the tax rolls. How does that help small business? I did not see any tax relief in here, like reducing the employment insurance premium.

Yesterday we heard in the industry committee that as high as 30% of small and medium size businesses could be out of business by the year 2000. I did not see any tax relief to help those businesses move into the next millennium.

When I look at the debt level, now that we have balanced the budget and the Liberals put in a contingency reserve of \$3 billion, I would have brought in a balanced budget or debt reduction law. The way they are dealing with the \$3 billion, it will take 200 years

to pay it back. They could have done a lot more to assure Canadians of the long term stability of this country.

**Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member who just spoke would like to elaborate a little more on the possible implications and the possible results that could obtain for example with hospitals in their intensive care units not having some of the embedded chips in certain parts of their control switches for the monitoring systems. What kind of an impact could that have on the intensive care units in some of our hospitals?

Could he expand on that a little further as the hon. member is somewhat familiar with this area.

**Mr. Jim Jones:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Kelowna for the question. He and I sit on the same committee.

We are starting to realize the very seriousness of the year 2000 problem. It is probably the biggest disaster since the second world war that could affect the world. We are talking about \$6 billion just to fix the problem. Who knows what the legal ramifications will be.

Yesterday we had a presentation on the embedded chips. It is not that easy to fix something. They are embedded in instruments, equipment and technology, maybe 300 or 400 chips at a time. It is the cost of replacing them. If critical equipment shuts down in a hospital, the impact on health care could be severe, lives could be lost or the information obtained or the diagnostics given could be wrong. If the problem has not been addressed, it could also cause legal ramifications for hospitals or other agencies.

• (1630)

This is a very critical problem which the government has to get serious about. I notice that with the millennium scholarship fund it is planning for education in the future. It is also planning the millennium party. It is time that it planned for the most important problem, the millennium bug problem.

[Translation]

**The Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Mississauga South, Health Care; the hon. member for Vancouver East, Immigration; the hon. member for Sackville—Eastern Shore, Fisheries; the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, Pharmaceutical Industry; the hon. member for New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby, Supreme Court of Canada.

[English]

**Mr. Norman Doyle (St. John's East, PC):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me no great pleasure to stand today in the House to state the budget is not a very big winner back home in the province of Newfound-

land and Labrador. Yes, we are all very much aware the budget has been balanced, but we have to ask ourselves at what price to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

There has been a 35% cut in transfer payments to the various provinces to achieve that balance, a 35% cut in moneys dedicated to health and post-secondary education. As a result, health and education services provided by the provinces have been cut severely.

In a poorer province like Newfoundland, the provincial government does not have the financial wherewithal or ability to make up for the reductions. The effect of the cuts in Newfoundland has been more severe than it would be in most provinces in Canada.

I point out to the government that the minister of finance of Newfoundland was quite quick to condemn the budget a couple of weeks ago, and well he should have condemned it.

As a result of the budget, the health care system, which incidentally has made Canada the envy of the world, is now a mere shadow of its former self. In post-secondary education the federal cuts have driven up tuition rates and students, especially those in Atlantic Canada, can least afford these increases. Our students, not only those in Newfoundland and Labrador but students all over Canada, are graduating from various universities and post-secondary education institutions with a debt load that is equal to a small mortgage.

Therefore, while student debt relief measures might be welcome, they should be recognized as a federal bandage on a wound caused by federal cuts in the first place. I do not think the government deserves a great amount of credit for the modest increases it has given to students across the country.

The budget makes a great deal of the \$7 billion increase in federal transfers to the provinces. However, in the case of Newfoundland, that only slows down the rate of cuts announced in previous budgets, and there have been cuts in previous budgets. We still receive less and less money in each of the next several years. This budget will cost the provincial government, as the provincial minister of finance has already indicated, in excess of \$30 million.

● (1635)

In order to undo the damage that has already been done Newfoundland needs an increase, not a smaller decrease, in federal transfers for health and post-secondary education in particular.

The real tragedy in the budget for Newfoundland is that it contains no real job creation effort. The federal government seems to be quite happy with the fact that the national unemployment rate has gone down to 9%. We rejoice and congratulate the government and everyone who is responsible for bringing the unemployment rate down to 9%.

### *Government Orders*

However, that is cold comfort for Newfoundland and Labrador. We have an unemployment rate that is double the national average. We have an unemployment rate that is officially up around 19.5%. There are many communities within the riding of St. John's East which has an unemployment rate of 60% or 70%. For these people that is cold comfort.

We also had a net outmigration in Newfoundland last year of 9,200 people. If this number were added to the official unemployment of 19.5% in my province, our unemployment rate would be up around 22% or 23%.

In addition, there was news this week that possibly there would not be a follow up on the TAGS program. Thousands of people in the fishery are about to come off the TAGS program who are not yet included in the statistics. If the 20,000-odd people who will be coming off TAGS were added to the 19.5% unemployment rate for our province, the unemployment rate would probably be in excess of 22% or 23%.

In balancing the budget the federal government has laid off as well roughly 15% of the nation's federal employees. Newfoundland and Labrador, the poorest province in Canada, took the biggest hit in terms of federal employees being laid off with roughly 30% of them being laid off.

An economic development fund has been set out in the budget for northern Ontario. I do not begrudge the people of northern Ontario their economic development fund, but Newfoundland has the highest unemployment rate in the country and as yet we do not even have a commitment from the federal government that there will be a follow up program on TAGS.

I will talk about the tax rates in our province and in Canada generally. The tax rates are far too high. They act as a disincentive to job creation. Tax cuts announced in the budget are very modest indeed. They are not large enough to kickstart the nation's domestic economy. No matter how we look at it, this is not a jobs budget.

One more matter of importance to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador is the equalization program. It keeps the province from starving and from moving ahead as well. Revenues raised from major economic projects such as Voisey's Bay and Terra Nova are deducted dollar for dollar from our equalization payments. With equalization payments currently running at about \$900 million a year in Newfoundland, we need to raise a billion dollars in revenue to be \$100 million better off.

● (1640)

It makes it very difficult for a have not province, a poorer province, to catch up under our current equalization formula. We need a better formula.

In the case of Hibernia a special deal was negotiated that would see us losing only 70 cents on the equalization dollar. We need a

*Government Orders*

more generous arrangement for equalization entitlements. We need that arrangement extended to other resource developments if we are ever to catch up to the various provinces, especially those in central Canada.

In short, the government is celebrating that the federal books are balanced. It sees light at the end of the federal tunnel. However the health and education systems run by the various provinces are in a shambles. They are in tatters.

The bad news for the unemployed people of the country and the people of Atlantic Canada in particular is that they will remain unemployed. For many Canadian citizens, especially people in Atlantic Canada, there is no light at the end of their tunnel. As I said earlier, the books have been balanced, but at what price to some of the provinces and their people?

Having balanced the nation's books, it is now time to start balancing opportunities in the nation. In Newfoundland and Labrador we want to be part of that Canadian dream without having to chase that dream all over Canada.

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member covered a lot of ground. I wanted to make a comment about the health aspects of the budget implications and ask him a question about his final comments.

He will well know that transfers to the provinces are comprised of two components: the cash component and tax points that were seconded to the provinces, which are basically the taxing authority of the provincial governments.

The net reduction in transfers to the province of Ontario under the Canada health and social transfer were some \$850 million, whereas concurrently the Government of Ontario, the Mike Harris government, cut personal income taxes by \$4.3 billion.

Five provinces have balanced budgets and have not seen fit to invest more into health care. Many of them are following the recommendations and the observations of the national forum on health which says that it is not a matter of money but of how wisely the money in the system is spent. Each province will have to look at that carefully.

My question for the member results from his final comments. He said to the people of Newfoundland that they would remain unemployed. He also said that there was no light at the end of the tunnel for them.

I do not think the government has given up on the people of Newfoundland. I am sorry the member has. A number of opportunities are facing us. One of the reasons members of Parliament are here is to work on behalf of all Canadians, especially those in most need like those in the province of Newfoundland.

Would the member like to rise and maybe withdraw his comments with regard to the position of the people of Newfoundland?

**Mr. Norman Doyle:** Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. member that I do not have to withdraw because I did not make the comment specifically about the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. The comment I made applies to the people of Atlantic Canada generally.

This was a bad news budget for the people of Atlantic Canada. There are no job creation efforts in the budget. It is the same old song and dance routine with the Liberals. They talk about the band-aid but they ignore the gaping cut they have created in the budget.

The hon. member talked about transfers to the various provinces. I am sorry I did not have a little more time to go into them. The budget and the CHST cash transfers to the various provinces are unfair. Ontario, Alberta and B.C., the three richest provinces in Canada, are all getting an increase, albeit a modest increase, in their cash transfers. Yet provinces like Newfoundland, P.E.I., Quebec, New Brunswick, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia are feeling the pinch from this budget. These are the provinces that have been hit the hardest.

• (1645)

It is the same song and dance routine from this government. I did not make the statement that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador specifically have no future or that there is no light at the end of the tunnel.

Many good things are happening in Newfoundland. There is the Hibernia project. The Terra Nova project will soon kick in. Voisey's Bay hopefully in the not too distant future will start up. These are things which will happen in the future.

We need jobs now in Newfoundland and Labrador. Nine thousand two-hundred people a year are leaving our province. It may not be a significant number in Ontario but when there is a population of 500,000, 9,200 people a year is a very, very significant number.

Last year school enrolment in Newfoundland went down by 4,200 students, 4.3%. That is very dangerous in a province with a small population base. If that continues and if the federal government does not make some commitment to job creation, or at least give some indication of a post-TAGS program, then we are going to see the next outmigration from our province double what it is now. I really fear for that little province. Newfoundland should not have that kind of haemorrhaging.

There are young people coming out of university on a daily basis who cannot stop at the university door. They go to the airport immediately and head to other provinces, like B.C. and Ontario. We are educating people, spending hundreds of thousands of



dollars a year on education in Newfoundland, to have those people travel to B.C., Ontario and Alberta. We have a great deal of concern about that.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I should advise the House that the five hours allowed for speeches of 20 minutes with questions and comments have now expired. We will now begin 10 minute speeches without questions and comments.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yvon Charbonneau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in considering Bill C-36, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget, it is important to remember that the 1998 budget marks a milestone in Canadian history, thanks to the support of and indeed the sacrifices made by Canadians during the past five years.

This year, for the first time in 30 years, a balanced budget was tabled. The crushing \$42 billion deficit we inherited in 1993, the highest deficit in Canadian history, is now a thing of the past.

In addition, the budget affirms our commitment to balanced budgets over the next two years; this will be the first time in nearly 50 years that balanced budgets will have been tabled three years in a row including this year.

With only a few minutes to comment on this budget, one has to focus on one particular aspect and it is somewhat difficult to select one out of the many interesting facets of the budget. One would have much to say, for instance, on this successful effort to achieve what is commonly called a zero deficit while slightly reducing the debt, providing some tax relief and making targeted social investments. This in itself would deserve extensive comment.

One could also comment on the good news for Canadian families, particularly with respect to the assistance provided for children and education. This budget could also be addressed from the perspective of recovery, of high tech research, in response to pressing demands in that area.

It all boils down to this being a budget which reassures those who have to make investment decisions, the economic agents, as well as those who are looking for work or for a new job, even though the unemployment level is still too high.

• (1650)

I would like to address another angle in particular. My choice of subject is inspired by the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, who spoke yesterday on the budget. As we know, he is the Bloc Québécois finance critic.

I heard him announce his intention to do everything possible to block the millennium scholarship program. He said “This is a program we detest because it encroaches, and shamelessly to boot,

### *Government Orders*

into an area of Quebec jurisdiction. It is a program totally unacceptable to us”.

He also said that he hated this millennium scholarship program so much that it would galvanize his energies, that he was full to overflowing with the energy to fight this budget, and this proposal in particular.

It is very sad to see an MP, his party's official critic for Finance, and a man who has a certain influence in Quebec, or claims to, calling for people to join forces to do battle, calling for Quebec to fight this measure, which he detests, and stating that he will focus all of his energies on hating it.

This finance critic also accused the government of having accumulated surpluses in the employment insurance account that are too large, in his opinion, while at the same time accusing it of putting \$2.5 billion in this fiscal year, which are in a way part of that surplus, into the millennium fund.

On the one hand, he is unhappy because the government is accumulating surpluses in the employment insurance fund; on the other, he is unhappy because that money is being put into the millennium fund.

This critic needs to get real. He must admit that there are very direct links, very important ones, between access to higher education, access to post-secondary education, and the ability for young people to find jobs, and it is they who will be the primary beneficiaries of the millennium fund.

This hon. member needs to admit that there is a direct link between the EI fund surplus and the immediate investment—not in two or three years—in the millennium scholarships.

Instead of rejoicing over this investment in young people, the Bloc Québécois critic is pouring negative energy into blocking this measure. It seems to me that these people, he and others, who went on in school and obtained advanced post-secondary degrees, BAs, MAs, have forgotten that there are others in their footsteps, that there are young people today who also want to go on to higher education because they know that that is the key to landing an interesting job. It is also the key to mobility throughout their career.

They also know that these scholarships will enable them to obtain Canadian experience, to see what is going on in environments other than their own, and to be able to acquire international experience, to study abroad, to find out how other countries see things.

It would look like members of the Bloc Québécois have forgotten about others, or that they do not want others to have access to these forms of education, which are important for the careers of young people wanting to work.

The strategy at the heart of this budget is equality of opportunity. I think this is what bothers certain critics most, particularly the

*Government Orders*

Bloc Quebecois critics, because it is an approach that directly targets the needs of people, young people in particular.

• (1655)

In his speech, the Minister of Finance said “Canadians know that there is more to taking care of the nation than simply taking care of the books. Canada is not just a marketplace. It is a community. Our country is anchored in shared risk and shared benefits, in lending a hand knowing that, some day, we too may be in need”.

These comments hurt people like the Bloc Quebecois critic, because they are about Canada-wide solidarity and exchanges. They are about sharing, supporting each other, and investing together a large amount—that will serve us for years to come, that will serve young Canadians, including Quebecers—in a joint account in which there will then be money available to meet our needs.

The notion of a Canada-wide solidarity hurts Bloc Quebecois members, because they are always saying that everything must be repatriated to Quebec, that there is nothing good throughout Canada.

Equal opportunity is an important issue for us in the Liberal Party, in the government, because it is a matter of basic fairness and social justice. We strongly believe in it. We also know that learning must be the central part of any national jobs strategy.

There are a number of elements to this strategy. I have not got the time to list them all now, but there are seven important ones, the first of which is definitely the millennium fund. We were told that \$2.5 billion would be taken from this fiscal year and used starting in the year 2000 and for several years afterward.

Other measures worth a total of \$3 billion will be spread across seven programs over the next three years, for a grand total of \$5.5 billion.

I think these are significant sums. Canadians have the right to know the truth.

The nine young people in the delegation of 18 that accompanied me to our convention last weekend in Ottawa said they were very happy. They were not turning their noses up at the scholarship program and other measures. On the contrary, they were very happy, and I think they are representative of Quebec youth, which is happy to have the federal government providing them with a considerable amount of money for the next decade.

Once again, we are talking about opening the door to co-operation. The federal government planned for negotiations with the provinces to avoid duplication and to reach an agreement on implementing this measure.

Instead of taking offence, pouting and trying to block everything, the government in Quebec and one part of the opposition here should try to co-operate. I think it would benefit young people in Canada and Quebec.

[English]

**Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, before I talk about the budget implementation legislation, I must put on the record how upsetting it is to have the 38th time allocation motion moved by this government. It has done this 38 times. It used to be done once and literally a government would be gone at the next election because of it. Thirty-eight times. It is pretty hard to explain to our constituents that we were not given an opportunity to speak because this government used time allocation.

There is a lot of deception in this budget. Liberals are talking about the golden age, the financial problem being all taken care of and the great auditing that has been done. Yet the auditor general deplores the methods used by the finance minister.

We seem to have conveniently forgotten about the debt. In 1969 our debt was zero. In just three years it quickly went to \$18 billion. In 1993 our debt was \$489 billion. Today it is \$583 billion. That is the thing we should be talking about. That is what the people say we should take care of. That is what is threatening our social safety net. That is what is threatening our health, education and pensions. That is what is going to hurt our future generations more than anything else. This government chooses to ignore that and begin more spending.

• (1700)

The tax and spend concept does not take into consideration what is happening in the world around us. We do not hear from the other side any mention at all of the potential Asian meltdown or what effect that might have on this country and how we should be so cautious to take care of that potential rainy day that might be down the road.

Look at a country like Indonesia with 200 million people with a 60% drop in its economy. People are unemployed. People are literally on the streets because they have lost their sources of income. Rice prices have gone up time after time. Japan has an overextended bank situation. In Korea people are literally bringing their gold to the government to try to get themselves out of this crisis.

This is the kind of thing that this government should be taking into consideration in putting forward its budget. It has absolutely no consideration about the world in which we live.

In B.C. we see the beginning of what will be potential implications for all businesses. What businesses need most is a drop in taxation so they can plan to counter what those potential dark clouds might be. What happens when cheap competitive products come on the market? What happens when there is less purchasing

power in some of those Asian economies? That is going to effect the U.S. economy. When it gets a cold we get pneumonia. This government has totally abrogated its responsibilities in planning for that future.

Look at the figures regarding our debt. Our interest payment is \$45 billion. That interest payment is equivalent to other figures that should be considered, close to \$12 billion of federal money for health care, \$14 billion for education, \$22 billion for pensions. Our interest adds up to more than all those payments put together and yet this government totally ignores that debt and that interest payment.

In 1993 when a number of us came to this place the taxes brought in about \$125 billion. By the year 2000 that figure will be \$173 billion that this government is taking in. Some of that is due to growth but a great deal of that is due to increased taxation. We are falling behind other places in this world. All you have to do is go around to different places to realize that our economy is dropping. Our expendable income is dropping. We are not the same country we were 10 or 20 years ago. This government by its high taxes and spending and by the kind of budget that we just saw is doing nothing to deal with that problem.

Look at our dollar. Just try to travel using the Canadian dollar and see where we are now in the world's economy.

This government had choices. It could deal with the debt and the problems it brings. I could have dealt with the taxes and brought them down which would have meant jobs and a great increase in our well-being in this country. Or it could have dealt with spending. It chose the third option. It chose to increase spending and to forget about the debt and let it take care of itself by this mythical dream that so many of these governments have about growth taking care of the problems. It never has and it never will. By raising taxes as this government has done it has done nothing to help improve the job situation for our young people.

The Liberals had a choice and they chose to ignore the debt. They chose to keep taxes the highest in the G-7 countries and they chose to start spending.

● (1705 )

If we start to look at some of that spending it is shocking: Canadian opportunities strategies, \$4.6 billion in increased spending; the millennium fund, which we hear about over and over again, a couple of billion dollars; Canadian culture, \$440 million. That is pretty scary when we think of what has been spent on things like, dare I mention, the flag issue, \$24 million to hand out flags and we know what happened in this place. Are there savings we could make?

### *Government Orders*

The patronage appointments that constantly go on with this government, the waste that occurs here, the total desire to maintain the status quo and not change anything in this place are why we are in so much trouble.

What does this mean to us as Canadians? The saddest part is that all of this inactivity regarding the debt, regarding the taxes, is going to affect the next generation. It is going to affect the kids and grand kids of most of the people in here, and even further than that. Those are the people who are going to have to finally face up to \$583 billion, to 30 cents plus of every dollar going to interest payments. That is what a future government is going to have to face.

This government should be embarrassed by the budget that has been put forward and by all the bragging about the golden age, that we have our financial problems taken care of, that we have nothing more to worry about. People out there are not stupid. People out there know that is not true. Far and away the biggest number of people out there are saying take care of that debt. In surveys which have been done, and it does not matter whether they are done in Quebec or Alberta or B.C., people have said that.

This government chose not to listen. I believe that as Canadians digest what is in this budget there will be a reaction. That reaction will not be favourable to the finance minister or to this government.

**Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the bill we are debating today includes some very important elements of the Canadian opportunities strategy which was introduced in the 1998 budget.

In particular, the bill launches the Canada millennium scholarships foundation. With an initial endowment of \$2.5 billion this foundation will provide more than 100,000 students full time and part time at colleges, vocational and technical institutes as well as universities with scholarships averaging \$3,000 per student.

The bill also includes some very important measures to help manage student debt. It introduces a Canada education savings grant to help families save for their children's education. It gives employers an employment insurance premium holiday for hiring additional young Canadians, reducing payroll costs for those employers by about \$100 million over two years.

These measures are only part of the strategy that we set out in the 1998 budget, a strategy that will help Canadians by expanding their access to the knowledge and skills they will need for better jobs and higher standards of living in the 21st century.

I want to take a moment to outline the other elements of that strategy. It is important to view these measures in the context of one another since they work together to provide a comprehensive set of tools to increase Canadians' access to knowledge and skills.

*Government Orders*

As part of the Canadian opportunities strategy the government proposes to introduce new Canada study grants. These grants recognize that many student needs are not fully met by scholarships and students loans. Beginning in 1998-99, Canada study grants of up to \$3,000 a year will go to over 25,000 needy students who have children or other dependants. These grants will help both full time and part time students and will provide \$100 million annually.

Assistance to students is only part of the information age equation. We must also recognize that nothing is more critical to Canada's economic success in the 21st century than vigorous broad based research and development.

• (1710)

To support graduate students and researchers as they develop the leading edge skills needed in a knowledge based economy, the opportunities strategy will increase funding to the three federal granting councils, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, the Medical Research Council and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.

These very important councils provide research grants, scholarships and fellowships. Over the next three years their combined budget of \$766 million in 1997-98 will be increased by \$400 million, and by the end of the year 2000-2001 the councils' budgets will be at the highest level in history.

As the Minister of Finance said in his budget speech, Canadians do not need to be told that student debt is a problem. That is why the strategy includes a range of measures to help reduce the financial burden on students, measures included in Bill C-36.

In addition, our strategy proposes that for the first time students will be given tax relief on interest payments on their student loans. This will be provided through a tax credit and it will help one million Canadians who are repaying those student loans.

Many Canadians in the workforce want to take time away from work to upgrade their skills through part time or especially full time study. But they often lack the necessary resources, so the budget also proposes several new measures to improve their access to learning through their lives. Therefore beginning January 1, 1999 Canadians will be able to make tax free withdrawals from their RRSPs for lifelong learning.

The need to continually upgrade knowledge and skills can be particularly hard for the growing number of Canadians studying part time and trying to manage the difficult balance of work, family and study. We are proposing therefore two new measures to help them.

Beginning in 1998 the education credit will be extended to part time students. This measure will benefit up to 250,000 Canadians.

In addition, for the first time parents studying part time will also be able to deduct their child care expenses within certain limits. Currently only full time students are eligible. This new measure will benefit some 50,000 part time students with children.

Finally, our strategy takes action to improve Canadians' access to the information highway. Beginning in 1998-99 we will provide an additional \$205 million over three years to expand and extend SchoolNet and the community access programs. There will be an additional \$55 million to the Canadian network for the advancement of research, industry and education.

The Canadian opportunities strategy provides a diverse and comprehensive set of tools. These tools will help Canadians acquire the knowledge and skills they will need for better jobs and a better life in the 21st century. By expanding access to opportunity we are building a stronger economy and a more secure society.

[*Translation*]

The federal government has done its utmost to ensure that the Canadian economy continues to be built on solid foundations. The federal government will continue to offer programs which meet Canadians' needs and expectations.

[*English*]

That is why I urge all members to support Bill C-36 in moving us forward to implement key elements of our strategy. I know certainly that the people of Waterloo—Wellington support this bill and want it to proceed and I know that all Canadians indeed want this bill to proceed as well.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate on Bill C-36, the purpose of which is to implement certain provisions of the 1998 budget.

This bill contains a number of elements, but I shall address two of them in particular. First, the millennium scholarships. A foundation is being created to provide new scholarships to Canadian students starting in the year 2000, but it is being created immediately through this bill, taking \$2.5 billion from this budget to structure the foundation so that it will be able to start awarding the scholarships in the year 2000.

• (1715)

This has been a pet project of the Prime Minister for some time, it seems. This is a project which the Minister of Human Resources Development is trying to defend, without much enthusiasm it seems, since it was obviously not his idea.

I have examined the various clauses in this bill, as it is the duty of every member to do when a new bill is introduced. I have noted a few details as I went along.

*Government Orders*

Clause 4 states:

4. The Foundation is not an agent of Her Majesty.

It is, therefore, a foundation that is not a direct agent of the government. In principle, this would be a totally independent foundation. I raise a question here, because it is nevertheless a foundation created by an act. Both Canada and the provinces have legislation providing for the creation of not-for-profit agencies or organizations, so a special bill does not need to be introduced.

When one is, this means there is a specific mandate, or the government wants to retain some power. Specifically, it retains power over the 15 foundation directors. Six, that is the chairperson and five other members, will be appointed by cabinet. These six will then appoint the others.

This much control right from the start means the government can choose who will be a member. Obviously, these will be friends of the regime, very probably people whom the Liberal government can trust. These people together will fill the positions on the board of directors with other people, who will likely enjoy the same Liberal confidence.

Some things are a bit odd. If we look, for example, at clause 13(5), we see when a member of the board ceases to be a member. The reasons given are fairly obvious, and it is rather odd that they take the trouble to identify them. The first point is "when a member dies". This is rather self-evident. Some things in this bill are unnecessary.

But that is not the problem, as we know. The problem is that the foundation directly interferes in a provincial jurisdiction. The government is trying to say that the foundation interferes only indirectly. However, since it controls the members of the board of directors and appoints the first six, it is the federal government that will be distributing the scholarships to students. Why in the year 2000? Because it will look good and the government will have a high profile as it distributes cheques with maple leaves on them to thousands of students. It is after visibility.

On the subject, I would point out that this fits in well with the Liberal government's strategy of increasing its visibility through various means. There is of course the flag flap and the more than \$23 million in the program the Minister of Canadian Heritage set up after the 1995 referendum. There was also the promotion of Canadian unity in the primary schools. This program cost \$60 million including the flags.

Then there is the Canada Post Corporation, which changed its name. It cost \$8 million to put "Canada Post" on the trucks.

I am the Bloc Quebecois critic on regional development. On March 4, the minister responsible for regional development in Quebec announced that the Federal Office of Regional Develop-

ment—Quebec was changing its name. To what? To the Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions Agency.

• (1720)

This is all a visibility operation. The federal government is targeting Quebec in particular, because of the dreaded third referendum of course. It is seeking visibility any way it can, even if it means sending cheques directly to students.

I mentioned regional development, and since we are talking about the budget, I would like to draw attention to figures quoted in recent budgets, which seem rather odd to me. The budget allocated to the minister responsible for regional development in Quebec for administration increased by 16.9%, or \$33 million. This is for the federal office for regional development in Quebec, which employs more than 260 people and which now has a new name.

The federal government plans to spend \$380 million in Quebec without taking into account the strategy adopted by the Quebec government, which is to rely on decentralized organizations such as the RDCs, Quebec's regional development councils, and more locally, the local development councils, a new type of organization whose purpose is to ensure development at the local level within each RCM.

So, the budget was increased but, oddly enough, there is also a whole series of cuts. For example, there is \$3,448,322 less for Quebec under the agreement on municipal infrastructures, \$1,478,300 less for contributions for programs to improve manufacturing productivity, \$1,256,943 less for the business development program, \$959,890 less for the subsidiary agreement on tourism, \$633,254 less for the innovations program, \$845,362 less for the salmon economic development program, and \$910,690 less for assistance programs in depressed areas.

I will skip the small figures. There is also \$2,640,045 less for Montreal's industrial recovery, \$4,462,000 less for Montreal's development fund, \$635,000 less for industrial recovery in South-west Montreal, and \$40,000 less—a small cut, but still—for organizations promoting regional development.

So, the government came up with new names and approaches to increase its visibility. The federal office of regional development also has a new name, but again this is to increase visibility.

Finally, some cuts affect very specific programs. The overall increase is explained by the simple fact that Quebec had to deal with an ice storm. The amounts transferred by the President of the Treasury Board to the Federal Office of Regional Development have the effect of temporarily increasing the envelope for regional development, but if we look at each program individually, we realize that major cuts are being made.

*Private Members' Business*

All this leads me to say that the millennium scholarship fund, regional development and other issues which will be raised later on by some fellow Bloc members, are a smoke screen to hide the ever increasing interference by the federal government in areas of provincial jurisdiction.

[English]

**Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, two years ago British Columbia introduced a scheme whereby welfare recipients were required to have lived in the province for at least three months before they were entitled to benefits. This was directly aimed at the poorest sector of the economy, the people who were most in need.

I find it incredible that an NDP government should do something like that, something that would be more typical, shall we say, of California or the western United States.

• (1725)

Nevertheless it was done and it led to quite a confrontation among the NDP government in British Columbia, various poverty organizations and the federal government.

As a result of the NDP action the federal government cut \$47 million in transfer payments to B.C. on the grounds that the Canada health and social transfer going to B.C. was aimed at all Canadians, not Canadians based on residency. Indeed this principle is enshrined in the charter of rights, in the Canada Health Act and certainly in the Canada health and social transfer program.

There were some angry words on both sides, but in the end an arrangement was made whereby the British Columbia government backed down and permitted anyone to collect welfare in British Columbia regardless of their province of origin.

Where this has relevance to the debate today is that we have a situation now in Quebec where the Quebec government receives money under the Canada health and social transfer, uses it to provide operating costs and tuition support for students in Quebec and, as of a year and a bit ago, the Quebec government introduced a differential tuition requirement for students out of province.

In Quebec today a student from elsewhere in Canada pays 41% more in tuition to go to a university in Quebec than a Quebec student. Tuition for Quebec universities is quite a bit lower than the rest of the country and this does reflect, indeed, some very wise spending decisions on the part of the Quebec government. However, just like all other forms of cash transfers from the federal government for social assistance, the very essential principle is that it should go to all Canadians regardless of where they are from.

Section 6 of the charter of rights specifies that anything that is accorded Canadian citizens should not be accorded to them or withheld from them based on their province of origin.

We have a Quebec government that is today discriminating against students from outside the province. It keeps young people in Quebec who were born and raised there based on territory and makes attending university in Quebec very difficult for students outside Quebec.

It makes a lot of difference to students. There are 20,000 of them in Quebec who have to pay the extra tuition because they want to go to a Quebec university. It is a difference of \$1,200. That is a very high and tough price for a student coming out of province, who may be a francophone, to pay to go to university in Quebec.

What do we do about it? We have several choices. One thing we could do is create a national university in Quebec where it is fully funded by the federal government and where everyone has equal opportunity to go to that university. That is one possibility.

Another thing we could do is what was done in British Columbia and threaten to withhold the transfers that are due Quebec until it allows all students equal opportunity, including those from out of province.

Finally, we can make sure the money in the millennium fund is managed by an independent body outside Quebec and distributed equally to young people who want an education inside Quebec or outside Quebec. In other words, a student going from Ontario to Quebec who is a francophone should be given money from the fund equivalent to what a Quebec student saves. Any student in Quebec should have equal opportunity to travel anywhere in Canada to get an education. That way we get away from the fortress mentality of Quebec separatism and we build a better Canada for tomorrow.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** It being 5.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business, as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1730)

[Translation]

### EUTHANASIA AND ASSISTED SUICIDE

The House resumed from February 2, 1998, consideration of the motion and of the amendment.

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Motion M-123, moved by our colleague, the

hon. member for Burnaby—Douglas, whom I congratulate, by the way, on his courage.

The motion reads as follows:

That a special committee be appointed, pursuant to Standing Order 68(4)(b), to review the provisions of the Criminal Code dealing with euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide and that the Committee be instructed to prepare and bring in a bill, in accordance with Standing Order 68(5).

Beyond the differences of opinion that are normal and even desirable in a democracy such as ours, we have all, you, I and all members of the House, one thing in common: we were elected by our constituents to study, debate and make laws on all sorts of issues. We are lawmakers, and our actions therefore have a direct impact on the lives of all our fellow citizens.

But rarely, almost never, are we called upon to deal with issues as important and sensitive as the one now before us. Motion M-123 is not about amending marketing standards, about increasing or reducing the budget, or about implementing international accords, although all these issues have their importance. This motion touches on the very essence of who we are and what we believe, on the very essence of life and, since life would not be life without it, death.

Whatever the angle from which we approach the issue, we must keep in mind that our actions must be carefully weighed and considered, because there are some issues where a bad decision is not an option. The only other possibility excluded from the outset is indifference, or acting as though the problem did not exist.

But despite the apparent scope of this debate, we can take comfort in knowing that we are not starting from zero. Many discussions have taken place, many rulings have been handed down, and recommendations made at various levels, here in particular. After spending several months hearing witnesses and gathering briefs from everywhere in Canada, a special Senate committee on euthanasia and assisted suicide tabled a full report on this issue in June of 1995. Even though the committee did not reach a consensus on what ought to be done or not done, which was not part of its mandate, the outcome of its study will be very useful to us, as elected parliamentarians, during the forthcoming debates and discussions.

These last few years, besides this Senate committee, several cases were given wide coverage by the media. The most famous one is probably the story of Sue Rodriguez, a woman with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis who, under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, challenged the ban on assisted suicide in the Criminal Code.

In December 1992, the Supreme Court of British-Columbia turned down her request, stating that section 241 of the Criminal Code did not go against the charter. On March 8, 1993, the Court of

### *Private Members' Business*

Appeal of the same province rejected the appeal by Ms. Rodriguez. Lastly, on September 30, 1993, the Supreme Court of Canada put an end to her crusade, with a close five to four decision that did not quash the debate, far from it.

On this issue, the comments made by dissenting justice Peter Cory reflect the state of mind of several of his colleagues. He stated and I quote "The life of an individual must include dying. Dying is the final act in the drama of life. The right to die with dignity should be as well protected as is any other aspect of the right to life. State prohibitions that would force a dreadful, painful death on a rational but incapacitated terminally ill patient are an affront to human dignity".

● (1735)

Despite some dissension within the Supreme Court, there was unanimity on one issue, namely that the decision belongs to us, as elected representatives. Whether it be the British Columbia Supreme Court, the British Columbia Court of Appeal or even the Senate committee, all those who studied this issue have said that it is our responsibility.

On February 12, 1994, Sue Rodriguez, assisted by a physician, took her own life. I will let my colleague from Burnaby—Douglas speak of this case in further detail if he wishes to do so.

In Quebec, in 1992, the case of Nancy B. gave a lot of people food for thought. The 25-year-old woman was suffering from an incurable disease called Guillain-Barré syndrome. At a certain stage of the disease, she had to be hooked to a respirator. She asked for the right to stop supportive treatment. The Quebec Superior Court recognized that right, and Nancy B. left this world courageously, in silence, in sickness, but at the time of her choosing.

Two other cases are worth mentioning here. First, there is the case of Austin Bastable, a 52-year-old Ontarian suffering from chronic progressive multiple sclerosis. During the 35th Parliament, he wrote several times to members to ask, just as Sue Rodriguez had asked the courts, for the right to die at the time of his choosing, with the assistance of a physician.

Like Sue Rodriguez, he realized that it is not easy to get an answer from a government that may be ill prepared to deal with such a request. Austin Bastable had to go to the United States, away from his family and friends, to die assisted by a physician whom he had probably never seen before. That is not dying with dignity.

Finally, the case of Robert Latimer raises other questions. In this case, he was not the one who was sick. He and his wife decided to take the life of their daughter Tracy, who was suffering from cerebral palsy and from serious physical malformations causing incredible pain. She had no hope of getting any better.

*Private Members' Business*

Although we will have to deal with this issue, Mr. Latimer's case is outside the scope of this debate since it is murder for compassionate reasons, which means that someone decided to take someone else's life.

It must be understood that we are talking here about the right of a competent adult who is terminally ill or who is suffering from an incurable disease to make that decision for himself or herself. The decision is not meant to be made for that adult by another person, a doctor, a relative or a parent.

To conclude, these four examples of individuals who have fought to further the debate each in their own way clearly show how important it is that the matter be clarified once and for all.

So far, the courts have had to decide the many difficult issues brought before them. Without minimizing the importance of their work, it seems clear to me that we will not always be able to leave this in their hands. Sooner or later Parliament will have to make a decision.

Both the current Minister of Health—and former justice minister—and the Prime Minister promised a free vote in the House on this issue. Federal Liberal Party members have already passed a resolution along those lines at one of their conventions. The Bloc Québécois too repeatedly asked that the House address this issue. More than ever, it is important that this serious and current issue be debated and debated now.

Motion M-123 is a perfect opportunity to do just that, and I hope it will be supported by a majority of parliamentarians. Because there is no life without death, because death is part of life, as its hidden face, we have a duty to develop frameworks which are fair and which respect human dignity.

Could we really imagine choosing for ourselves and all our loved ones anything but a gentle and humane death with dignity? Anything but the freedom of choice?

• (1740)

[*English*]

**Mr. Paul Steckle (Huron—Bruce, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the motion proposed by my colleague the member of Parliament for Burnaby—Douglas.

If adopted by this House, the motion before us would put into place a process that would see the development of a special committee designed to review certain provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada. The provisions of which I speak are those governing or outlawing the practice of euthanasia and physician assisted suicide. In addition to that, the special committee would also be required pursuant to Standing Order 68(5) to report its findings back to this House in the form of a bill.

In short, this motion is calling upon the Parliament of Canada to devise a mechanism of study with the budget, mandate and

capacity to further explore this highly emotional and deeply personal issue. I would respectfully submit to all members of this House that we have concluded this debate. As such we should put it behind us once and for all.

This issue is not a new concept. The practice of euthanasia has been around for as long as mankind has experienced disease. It is however only in the last two centuries that this matter has entered the political arena.

The issue of euthanasia, better known to many of us as mercy killing, is one of the most highly contentious matters ever examined by modern politicians. It has commanded the political spotlight for years. However, despite the prominence of this divisive and emotional topic and regardless of the constant attention it has received, euthanasia defenders seem reluctant to allow the issue to fade.

The subject itself is one that predates most other topics brought before this House of Commons. The term euthanasia is in fact an ancient Greek word meaning good or easy death. This was the original meaning. However, today the Campaign Life Coalition defines euthanasia as a practice of acting or failing to act so as to cause the death of a human being for the purpose of relieving suffering.

As well as understanding the exact definition of the term, it is also important that for the purpose of debate we clearly differentiate between a sound medically based decision to end a life and the practice of euthanasia.

Permitting an individual with a terminal illness to conclude their life in a natural fashion is simply not euthanasia. Where the situation is medically hopeless, a decision not to provide or to halt the continuation of artificial or extraordinary measures is in my opinion ethical, legal and consistent with standard medical practice. This would also be consistent with thousands of years of established religious philosophy.

In essence the textbook definition of euthanasia is the deliberate act of one human being designed to promote the death of another human being. This could be accomplished through the use of several methods such as a lethal injection or the intentional and deliberate failure to provide the essentials of life to another.

The practice of euthanasia can be further subdivided into two groupings, passive and active. I believe however that the terms passive and active euthanasia are simply that, terms. In all cases of this nature the intent is to kill; the method is simply a question of strategy.

I would be remiss if I did not mention the matter of assisted suicide. Few would argue that assisted suicide has attracted the lion's share of public attention over the past several years. The argument of quality of life versus quantity of life is most commonly used which, if allowed to go unchallenged, could lead to countless abuses of basic human rights.



*Private Members' Business*

In instances involving assisted suicide, the mind is willing to commit the fatal act but the body due to the individual's physical impairment is not able to perform the required action. As such the individual is forced to seek the assistance of another to perpetrate the fatal act.

Although assistance of this type is usually provided reluctantly for compassionate reasons, this is not always the case. It should be noted that regardless of the method, classification or motive, Canadian law currently does not recognize compassion as an acceptable justification for killing another individual.

In fact the Canadian Medical Association has democratically determined that it is in the business of promoting health and recovery. It does not want its members to engage in the practice of assisted suicide. The British Medical Association also took this stance as it believes that to permit doctors to kill or to assist in killing would seriously jeopardize the continuation of their traditional role as healers.

I feel Dr. Christoph Hufeland summarized it best over 200 years ago when he stated "If a physician presumes to take into consideration in his work whether a life has value or not, the consequences are boundless and the physician becomes the most dangerous man in the state".

I have been a member of this House for only a few short years. However, I have been an avid participant in the political process for much longer than I would care to recall. I can remember several instances in the very recent past when this matter sparked heated debate in this place.

• (1745)

In 1991 there was Bill C-203 and Bill C-261, both introduced with the intention of dealing with the mercy killing issue. In 1993, Motion No. 397 made its way to the floor, followed in 1994 by Bill C-215 and Motions Nos. 218 and 277.

Despite constant attention the issue continues to be on our agenda. I believe that we should get on with the business of running the country and should stop dwelling on the resolved issues of the passed.

The national news headlines often glisten with names such as Jack Kevorkian, Sue Rodriguez, Nancy B and Robert Latimer. While these individual cases can serve as tangible reference points, they also can distract from and act as a compelling hindrance to our grasping of the deeper moral and spiritual argument surrounding this matter.

Due to the contentious nature of this issue, the public, the courts and many of our nation's legislators find themselves struggling with their own personal value system.

As representatives of the people we must also consider the thoughts and opinions of our constituents. In addition, we must be ever vigilant of the media and various special interest groups seeking to influence the outcome of this debate.

In short, it is our duty to examine this issue based upon the facts, examples and testimonials at hand. We must make our final decision with an unbiased frame of mind and not because of any political agenda or due to media based sensationalized propaganda. We have already done that.

My personal views with respect to euthanasia are quite simple. It would seem that we have now somehow confused the right to die with the subject of euthanasia, or the deliberate killing of those who are suffering. They are not the same.

The right to die is defined as an individual's right to determine whether unusual or heroic measures should be taken. These measures would typically involve expensive, artificial and/or mechanical means of life support intended to prolong life in cases where death is almost certainly inevitable.

Supporters of euthanasia would claim that it is an exercise of a fundamental human freedom. I would strongly disagree. Euthanasia is not an exercise of a basic human freedom but rather an abandonment of that freedom.

In the February 17, 1993 edition of *Hansard*, the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell summed up this entire debate when he said "what we are debating is whether we will give the right to any human being to kill another human being". I personally fear that society would devise an infinite number of uses for death once it has become a legal means for solving human problems.

During one of the world's darkest time periods, the Nazi party developed and promoted a set of proposals designed to weed out certain people who were considered to have no value to society. The idea was adopted by the general public and the medical community of the day. As a result, the war machine euthanized more than 300,000 mentally handicapped children and adults in addition to the thousands of elderly people who were deemed to be useless by the Third Reich.

I understand that this is an extreme example. However, if members would like a more recent testimonial, they need look no further than the 1991 article written by Jack Kevorkian which suggested that the concept of a planned ending of a human life by the direct action of another human is only the tip of the iceberg. In that same article he suggested that the moral reasoning could be extended to capital punishment, both voluntary and involuntary; obligatory suicide; or quasi-optional suicide for relief from illness, disability and old age. This is absolutely unacceptable.

In my maiden speech in this place, I stated that it is by personal belief that life is a sacred gift from the moment of conception to the moment of natural death. For that reason I believe that as

*Private Members' Business*

legislators we must never condone or legalize the deliberate unnatural taking of life.

At the same time, when life can be only sustained through the use of extreme medical measures, allowing the natural and inevitable process of death to run its course is not necessarily wrong.

Once again I reiterate my opposition to the motion before us. The Criminal Code of Canada currently regards euthanasia or mercy killing as culpable homicide or murder. In fact, section 229 provides for a 14 year jail term or penalty for assisting in the planned death of another person.

I have been and continue to support the law as it stands. I feel that striking another special committee represents an unnecessary revival of an already concluded matter. The 1997 year end edition of *Maclean's* magazine labelled Canada and Canadians as confident, united by bedrock values in a wide variety of ideas including spiritualism.

Canadians are calling for their government to provide direction and guidance with respect to this bedrock value. A special committee would be unnecessary, wasteful and counterproductive. The wishes of the majority of Canadians are already recognized and supported by the current law.

It is for these reasons that I will not be supporting Motion No. 123 this evening.

• (1750)

**Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Wanuskewin, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to split my time with the member for Calgary Southeast and would like unanimous consent of the House to do so.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent that the hon. member split the 10 minutes allotted to him with the hon. member for Calgary Southeast?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Maurice Vellacott:** Mr. Speaker, in a 1997 poll of British Columbians 54% said they supported euthanasia. I would like to probe that poll a bit more deeply to demonstrate that the slim majority would collapse if three simple steps were taken.

That slim majority would collapse if the public were better informed about what euthanasia is and is not and what the criminal code does and does not say about end of life issues.

In Canada it is perfectly legal to refuse life sustaining treatment and allow oneself to die. Such refusal is not considered euthanasia. The poll in B.C. revealed that over two-thirds of supposed euthanasia supporters mistakenly believe that euthanasia includes refusing treatment. Apparently a considerable number of people who appear

to support euthanasia do not realize that what they would like to see legalized is already legal in Canada.

Pollsters and their respondents have not been speaking the same language, which undermines the reliability of such polling results. That slim majority support for euthanasia would collapse if steps were taken to better inform the public about palliative care. I believe that would be the second reason that slim majority would collapse.

The B.C. poll revealed that most supposed supporters of euthanasia have formed their opinion based on a concern about pain and suffering. Only a minority, only 23% of all who were surveyed based their opinion on the belief that assisted suicide is a basic human right. That means that most supposed euthanasia supporters see changing the criminal code as a means to alleviate suffering. They incorrectly suppose that euthanasia is the only logical solution to pain, a false assumption which proponents of euthanasia work very hard to perpetuate.

The truth of the matter is palliative care is a third option and a much better one. It is a specialized field that has made great advances over the last several decades. It has now made it possible to die without unbearable suffering. Even in rare cases of extreme pain, controlled sedation can bring relief for those who request it and sedation is often required for only temporary periods completely in accordance with the patients' wishes.

The public needs to know that. Only when people are aware of the effectiveness of palliative care will there be any validity to polling. That slim majority support for euthanasia would collapse if governments were to step up their efforts to make palliative care widely available.

In 1995 a special Senate committee on euthanasia recommended that palliative care become a top priority in the restructuring of the health care system. Unfortunately palliative care services have not been promoted as vigorously as that special committee recommended. The availability of these services varies from region to region. It also varies depending on a patient's disease, with cancer patients usually having the best access.

Then there is the problem of inadequate funding for research and implementation. In addition there is limited training in palliative care in medical schools. These shortcomings are not something to be proud of, but they do suggest that a tremendous opportunity to meet the needs of Canadians lies before us.

At a time when Canadians are expressing their sincere concern about pain at the end of life, it is exciting to think that palliative care has advanced enough that it can genuinely address those concerns. All that remains to be done is to implement programs that will ensure the universal availability of palliative care services. It is entirely within our grasp, which is one of a number of reasons euthanasia is such an unattractive solution to the problem of pain.

*Private Members' Business*

If Canadians were to see governments moving strongly to fund and promote palliative care, we would see the supposed public support of euthanasia decline significantly.

If these three steps were taken the only true supporters of euthanasia who would be left would be those who argue that euthanasia is a basic human right, an argument that was rejected by the supreme court. It is crucial to realize that such people are in a decided minority and only 23% of those polled supported euthanasia on such a basis. As I pointed out, a good number of them did not really understand what euthanasia was. That is hardly representative of the democratic will.

• (1755)

This is only one of several reasons I am opposed to the legislation on euthanasia and will be voting against the motion this evening.

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, some of the pertinent and important technical aspects of the debate that have been addressed by some of my hon. colleagues, questions such as the Senate committee hearings on these matters and the availability of palliative care, are all important issues and ought to have a bearing on the judgment we make here today.

However, ultimately what is before us today is a question fundamental to the nature of liberal democracy, a question that drives to the heart of what it is to be a citizen, a question of how we exercise personal liberty, and a question of the fundamental rights vested in parliament to protect on behalf of its citizens.

The preamble to the Constitution of Canada states that “whereas Canada is founded upon principles that recognize the supremacy of God and the rule of law”. This was no accident. Its placement in the charter reflects a long and central tradition in the theory of liberal democracy, the notion that we do not grant rights unto ourselves. We do not create ourselves and we therefore do not create our own rights, but we are created and rights are bestowed upon us. Fundamental human rights such as the right to life are inalienable. Even individuals cannot through the exercise of some radical personal autonomy alienate rights which cleave to the human nature of individuals because they were granted to us by our Creator.

This is what the preamble of our constitution suggests. This is what the first section of our constitution suggests where it enumerates fundamental rights, the very first of which is the right to life.

This is an echo of the foundational document of liberal democracy, the American Declaration of Independence which states that we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that among these is the right to life.

Certain inalienable rights are rights that cannot be alienated by a legislature, rights that cannot be alienated by a doctor whose business is killing and rights that cannot be alienated even by ourselves.

In this motion we are ultimately discussing whether or not parliament will grant to people the right to destroy themselves and the right to destroy the inviolable dignity stamped on them by the Creator of which our constitution speaks.

I say that we must never, in this society animated by a profound understanding of the inviolable dignity of the human person, allow a radical notion of personal autonomy or a disordered understanding of human liberty to overcome our most profound obligation as people, as creatures and as legislators to protect human life.

If parliament were to consider the motion and were consequently to pass legislation legalizing euthanasia and what is euphemistically referred to as physician assisted suicide, parliament would be entering the final taboo which would permit the wilful killing of the human person.

This century, the 20th century, what Pope John Paul II referred to as the century of tears, is tragically filled with a history of political movements based on the disordered notion of the authority of the state or of the authority of the individual which has resulted in the deaths of thousands and millions of human persons and sometimes the death of those persons based on physician assisted suicide and on euthanasia.

• (1800)

We must as legislators look seriously at the history of this century and understand that when the inviolable value of human life becomes compromised we all stand at risk.

I call on my hon. colleagues this evening to vote against what I think is a very dangerous motion.

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to rise in the House to support the motion of my colleague, the member for Burnaby—Douglas, that a special committee be appointed pursuant to Standing Order 68(4)(b) to review the provisions of the Criminal Code dealing with euthanasia and physician assisted suicide and that the committee be instructed to prepare and bring in a bill in accordance with Standing Order 68(5).

As a new member of this House I have come to learn that the House of Commons deals with many important issues, but rarely do we get an opportunity to discuss with reason and clarity the issue that is before us today.

First, I would like to thank my colleague from Burnaby—Douglas for bringing this motion forward again. He has done it with

*Private Members' Business*

courage. He has raised this issue in the House before. He has been an advocate for the dying with dignity movement and has become personally involved with this issue in a number of cases. It is not an easy matter to deal with. The fact that he has brought this forward and called on the House to enter into an intelligent discussion is something that shows courage and strength which all members of this House should support.

I would like to deal with several points. The first point I would like to make is that the status quo as it exists today is simply impossible and increasingly untenable. That is why this issue will not go away. It is increasingly untenable not just for Canadians as individuals in our society, but also for us as parliamentarians and under the law.

We only have to look at the tragedy of what happened to Sue Rodriguez. We only have to look at what has happened to Canadians who have been forced to leave Canada in order to exercise personal choice about their health and circumstances in their lives. We only have to look at the cases that have been spoken about in this House of people who are in desperate situations having to take desperate action because the law has been inadequate, the law has been archaic, the law has not been able to deal with the needs of people today.

The impossibility of the status quo exists in part because of our inaction. I will be the first one to rise and acknowledge—and this is the first time I have debated this issue, but I have heard it debated by other members—that this is a complex and difficult issue to take on.

I do believe that Canadians expect and want to see debate and guidance from Parliament, from their member of Parliament and from the House as a whole, on this issue. The reason I say that is that all of us know that Canadians today take more and more responsibility for the choices they make about their lives and particularly about their health care.

We only have to look at the debate that is going on in the standing committee on health around herbal remedies to know what an incredible industry has developed around alternative medicines. More and more people are choosing to become educated and informed about their health. In that context there has been a public debate.

There are polls which indicate that Canadians want the issue of physician assisted suicide to be clarified and to be resolved, not just to be debated, but for the status quo to be examined.

I was interested to see a poll that was done in December 1997 by Pollara. Astonishingly maybe to some members of this House, it found that 70% of Canadians would find it acceptable in some circumstances for a doctor to help a patient die.

The history of this issue in the House and in our local communities makes it very clear that Canadians believe the status quo is unacceptable.

The second point I would like to make is that the right to die with dignity is a most personal issue. It has been very interesting to hear the debate of some Reform members and government members in this third hour who have talked about the intervention of the state. I have heard Reform members on other issues talk about how the state should stay out of the lives of Canadians.

• (1805 )

Here we have a most fundamental issue, and a personal issue, which is someone's right to die with dignity. I believe very strongly that the purpose of the law should be to facilitate individual choice, not to facilitate the denial of choices. But unfortunately today's status quo situation leaves individuals suffering a terminal illness or an incurable disease without legal choices.

We are debating in the House the basic right of a competent adult to make a decision about their own life when they are in circumstances of a terminal illness or an incurable disease. I think it is fundamental in this motion, and in all the debate that has taken place, that what is key is that the decision can only come from the person involved, not from anyone else. It cannot come from a doctor, not from a family member, a stranger or a health care provider. The decision about what we do with our life is our decision alone.

I have some personal appreciation of how difficult and how intensely personal these matters can be. I do know what it means to be with someone you love who is dying. I do know what it means to care for someone in that situation. What I have learned is that the needs and wishes of that person are the most important things on the mind of a care provider. Nothing else matters.

In those circumstances I believe that for family members involved and for the person facing these kinds of choices there is actually a heightened sense of clarity about what choices there are and what it is that is personally ethical.

There is no question there are difficult decisions, even around issues of palliative care. A number of members have spoken about palliative care and have suggested that it somehow is the answer to this issue, that if we could somehow make that work better we would not be dealing with physician assisted suicide.

I am a very strong supporter of palliative care. From personal experience I know what is involved and what it means. Even in that situation there are very difficult decisions to be made by a patient or by family members. But at least in that situation we do have a health care system that provides some support and guidance.

*Private Members' Business*

But when it comes to other circumstances, when a person has made a fundamental decision that the time has come, that they need to have assistance to end their life because of their circumstances and what they are facing, then there is no question that families are often left alone with no help, no support to make those very painful decisions that they know to be right. That is something we cannot take away from people.

I believe we have an obligation to resolve this issue. We have an obligation to review the law. We have an obligation to guide the law and we have an obligation to make the law fit our society today and the right to die with dignity.

The motion before us, which we will vote on today, simply asks that a special committee be appointed to review the provisions of the Criminal Code. That is something that should be supported by all members of this House in the acknowledgement and understanding that if we do not do this today we will likely be debating this matter in another few months or in another year because the issue will still be here.

Surely it is the proper course of action that we pass this motion. This is what we are here to do. We are here to debate, to review and to decide on issues that affect our lives, the lives of Canadians, not just in terms of budgets and resources, but in terms of the quality of life itself and the right of a competent adult to make her or his own decision concerning their life.

I urge all members of the House to support this motion.

**Ms. Aileen Carroll (Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the matter of euthanasia and assisted suicide has enormous ethical and legal ramifications. At the outset it is critical to note that the non-initiation and cessation of medical treatment is distinctly different from a deliberate action taken to bring about the death of a patient. A huge difference exists between allowing to die and killing.

• (1810)

We are engaged in a discussion on whether we as legislators should change the Criminal Code of Canada to permit the killing of persons with permanent or terminal illness. Let us be clear about that.

The right of a competent individual to refuse or cease medical treatment has long been accepted in law and in care giving, but for this country to permit euthanasia and assisted suicide, removing the penalties of criminal law, as has been done in Holland, will in effect redefine the values of the state. Further, it will gravely impinge on the traditional relationship between the patient and the physician and the role of palliative care within our health system.

Let us consider the doctor-patient relationship. The trust inherent here must be preserved. The belief that the patient's self-interest is always the physician's priority is the most vital component of that

relationship. By creating a society in which the physician may participate in the active taking of life we cross a threshold and threaten the trust of beneficence that is the root of the physician-patient relationship. Where there is already vulnerability we risk the creation of fear and mistrust.

It is imperative to consider what motives might be behind a person's request for euthanasia or assisted suicide. Frequently the patient has begun to see himself as a burden on loved ones and feels obligated to cease being so. Sometimes the seriously ill patient is fearful of unrelieved pain that might not be managed and looks to assisted suicide as a way out.

While it is diminished, our health care system is capable of correction and of providing the resources and priorities necessary to address these fears. With appropriate support from hospitals, hospice and community care the concerns of the patient can be remedied. When the efforts of the care givers shift from curative to creating a comfortable environment wherein the person receives pain control, psychological and spiritual support, the opportunity exists for great integrity in the final weeks or months of the ill person's life.

As a former hospice worker I have witnessed great intimacy and honesty between the terminally ill person and his or her family that would never have occurred should the road chosen have been euthanasia instead of palliative care. Not only does resorting to euthanasia risk hijacking palliative care in this country and endangering the patient-physician relationship, it also leads our society on a trajectory we do not want.

The example of Holland, the only western country to officially sanction euthanasia and assisted suicide, cannot be omitted from any debate. Although the Dutch guidelines require that the patient be experiencing unbearable pain, that requirement is now read to include psychic suffering or the potential disfigurement of personality. I ask my colleagues how far down the slippery slope this shows the Dutch have gone. A further example is the landmark decision of 1993 in which a Dutch psychiatrist was ruled to be justified in helping his depressed but physically healthy patient to commit suicide.

The trajectory becomes a downward spiral, one on which this country must not embark.

In 1982 the Law Reform Commission of Canada raised the concern that there is a real danger that the procedure developed to allow the death of those who are a burden to themselves may be gradually diverted from its original purpose and eventually used to eliminate those who are a burden to others or to society.

In a world that does not try to give positive meaning to old age and suffering, it could become normal to ask to put an end to life and abnormal to want to live despite subtle pressures from all sides. We will have to justify our own survival. The day that an individual

*Private Members' Business*

must justify his or her own survival must never be allowed to dawn in this country.

• (1815)

The legal framework must enhance the common good. Removing the Criminal Code restrictions against euthanasia and assisted suicide will in the long run deny that common good and the principles that have so enriched this country's jurisprudence. As legislators it is our obligation to reaffirm, not deny, the common good we have been elected to safeguard.

Our denial of euthanasia and assisted suicide must be accompanied by a greater commitment to far greater resources being assigned to palliative care in this country. Death and dying receive the least amount of support from medical research funding agencies. Palliative care is not fairly accessed nor in sufficient quality for all Canadians in all provinces and territories. Likewise greater priorities and resources must be assigned to palliative care in our medical schools than is currently provided.

The distinction drawn in the United States Supreme Court decision in *Quill* must be seen as critical: When a patient refuses life-sustaining medical treatment, he dies from the underlying fatal disease or pathology; but if a patient ingests lethal medication prescribed by a physician, he is killed by that medication.

In the first instance, the patient is allowed to die. In the second instance, the patient is killed. The distinction is integral. We would be debating the latter, the killing of patients by deliberate action taken to bring about their death. We have rightly accepted the concept of allowing to die. We must not accept the concept of killing.

This House will decide the timing of such a debate. The essence of that debate is as I have described. We must look to all the issues that are before us. We do not have the option to engage in emotionalism.

For us as legislators, there is a great onus to dissect and care for all the ingredients before us before we change a law like this that will have such enormous implications and ramifications for our society, for the continual downward spiral I have been describing.

We are not able to take an easy course. We are not able to participate further in a society that would allow for instant gratification on so many other fronts to be brought to bear on any issue as critical as this.

There must be no fear among people entering hospitals in this country. There must be no concern among seniors who already in many cases are coping as they are with other issues that do not remedy the worst things that come to them. They must feel that their care and their health is their physician's first concern. It is their legislator's first concern.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time for the consideration of the amendment has now expired.

[*Translation*]

The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Call in the members.

• (1840)

[*English*]

*Before the taking of the vote:*

**The Speaker:** Colleagues, as it is the practice, the division will be taken row by row starting with the mover and then proceeding with those in favour of the amendment sitting on the same side of the House as the mover, and then those in favour of the amendment sitting on the other side of the House will be called.

Those opposed to the amendment will be called in the same order.

• (1850)

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 113*)

**YEAS**

Members

Asselin	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Beaumier
Bélanger	Bellehumeur
Bennett	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bonwick
Blaikie	Brisson
Borotsik	Cadman
Caccia	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Canuel	Davies
Dalphond-Guiral	Dromisky
Desrochers	Duceppe
Dubé (Lévis)	Finestone
Dumas	Fournier
Finlay	Gauthier
Gagnon	Girard-Bujold
Gilmour	Godin (Châteauguay)
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Guay
Graham	Harvey
Guimond	Ianno
Herron	Keddy (South Shore)
Jones	
Lalonde	

Laurin  
Loubier  
Marchand  
Matthews  
Meredith  
Perron  
Plamondon  
Rocheleau  
Solomon  
Stoffer  
Torsney  
Turp  
Venne  
White (North Vancouver) —71

Lebel  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)  
McDonough  
Nystrom  
Picard (Drummond)  
Robinson  
Sauvageau  
St-Jacques  
Telegdi  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Vautour  
Wasylycia-Leis

Redman  
Richardson  
Robillard  
Saada  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Serré  
Solberg  
St. Denis  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
St-Julien  
Szabo  
Thompson (Charlotte)  
Valeri  
Vellacott  
Wayne  
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Reed  
Ritz  
Rock  
Schmidt  
Scott (Skeena)  
Shepherd  
Speller  
Steckle  
Stinson  
Strahl  
Thibeault  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Wappel  
Whelan  
Wilfert—160

*Private Members' Business*

NAYS

Members

Abbott  
Adams  
Anders  
Assad  
Augustine  
Bakopanos  
Bélair  
Benoit  
Bertrand  
Blondin-Andrew  
Boudria  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Bryden  
Caplan  
Casey  
Catterall  
Chan  
Cloutier  
Cohen  
Copp  
DeVillers  
Discepola  
Drouin  
Duhamel  
Easter  
Elley  
Folco  
Forseth  
Galloway  
Goldring  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Guarnieri  
Hart  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hilstrom  
Hubbard  
Jennings  
Jordan  
Karygiannis  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Kraft Sloan  
Lee  
Lincoln  
Lowther  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Marchi  
Massé  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Mifflin  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Mitchell  
Murray  
Nault  
O'Reilly  
Pankiw  
Penson  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Price  
Provenzano

Ablonczy  
Alcock  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Bailey  
Barnes  
Bellemare  
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Bevilacqua  
Bonin  
Bradshaw  
Brown  
Calder  
Carroll  
Casson  
Chamberlain  
Chatters  
Coderre  
Comuzzi  
Cummins  
Dion  
Doyle  
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)  
Duncan  
Eggleton  
Epp  
Fontana  
Gagliano  
Godfrey  
Goodale  
Grose  
Harb  
Harvard  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Hoepfner  
Jackson  
Johnston  
Karetak-Lindell  
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Konrad  
Lastewka  
Leung  
Longfield  
MacAulay  
Malhi  
Manley  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Minna  
Muise  
Myers  
Nunziata  
Pagtakhan  
Patry  
Peric  
Pettigrew  
Pickard (Kent—Essex)  
Pratt  
Proud  
Ramsay

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Brien
Byrne	Cannis
Cauchon	Collette
de Savoye	Debien
Dhaliwal	Gray (Windsor West)
Lefebvre	Marleau
McCormick	Ménard
Mercier	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
St-Hilaire	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

**The Speaker:** I declare the amendment lost.

The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Speaker:** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

• (1900 )

*And the clerk having announced the result of the vote:*

**Mr. Grant Hill:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I inadvertently voted for the motion and I have also voted against it. I want to clarify my position. I am profoundly opposed to this motion.

**The Speaker:** So noted.

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

(Division No. 114)

YEAS

Members

Asselin  
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)  
Bélangier  
Bergeron  
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Bellehumeur  
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—  
Blaikie

*Government Orders*

Bonwick	Borotsik	McTeague	McWhinney
Brisson	Caccia	Mifflin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Cadman	Canuel	Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête	Mitchell	Muise
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies	Murray	Myers
Desrochers	Dromisky	Nault	Nunziata
Dubé (Lévis)	Duceppe	O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Reilly
Dumas	Finestone	Pagtakhan	Pankiw
Finlay	Fournier	Patry	Penson
Gagnon	Gauthier	Peric	Peterson
Gilmour	Girard-Bujold	Pettigrew	Phinney
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)	Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Grose	Guay	Pratt	Price
Guimond	Harvey	Proud	Provenzano
Herron	Keddy (South Shore)	Ramsay	Redman
Lalonde	Laurin	Reed	Richardson
Lebel	Loubier	Ritz	Robillard
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Marchand	Rock	Saada
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton)
Matthews	McDonough	Scott (Skeena)	Serré
Meredith	Nystrom	Shepherd	Solberg
Perron	Picard (Drummond)	Solomon	Speller
Plamondon	Robinson	St. Denis	Steckle
Rocheleau	Sauvageau	Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
St-Jacques	Stoffer	St-Julien	Strahl
Telegdi	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Szabo	Thibeault
Turp	Vautour	Thompson (Charlotte)	Torsney
Venne	Wasylycia-Leis—65	Ur	Valeri
		Vanclief	Vellacott
		Wappel	Wayne
		Whelan	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
		White (North Vancouver)	Wilfert
		Wood—169	

## NAYS

## Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Bailey
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Boudria	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brown
Bryden	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Casey	Casson
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Chatters
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Cummins	DeVillers
Dion	Discepola
Doyle	Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Duncan	Easter
Eggleton	Elley
Épp	Folco
Fontana	Forseth
Gagliano	Galloway
Godfrey	Goldring
Goodale	Graham
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guarnieri
Harb	Hart
Harvard	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoeppner	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Johnston
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Konrad	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	Lowther
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Massé	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Brien
Byrne	Cannis
Cauchon	Collette
de Savoye	Debien
Dhaliwal	Gray (Windsor West)
Lefebvre	Marleau
McCormick	Ménard
Mercier	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
St-Hilaire	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**INCOME TAX AMENDMENTS ACT, 1997**

The House resumed from March 23, 1998 consideration of Bill C-28, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Income Tax Application Rules, the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Children's Special Allowances Act, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, the Cultural Property Export and Import Act, the Customs Act, the Customs Tariff, the Employment Insurance Act, the Excise Tax Act, the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act, the Income Tax Conventions Interpretation Act, the Old Age Security Act, the Tax Court of Canada Act, the Tax Rebate Discounting Act, the Unemployment Insurance Act, the Western Grain Transition Payments Act and certain acts related to



*Government Orders*

the Income Tax Act, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

**The Speaker:** Pursuant to order made on Monday, March 23, 1998 the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions at the report stage of Bill C-28.

The question is on Motion No. 1.

• (1910 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negatived on the following division:)

*(Division No. 115)*

**YEAS**

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cadman	Caueil
Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dubé (Lévis)
Duceppe	Dumas
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Fournier	Gagnon
Gauthier	Gilmour
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goldring	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay	Guimond
Hart	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoeppner	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Konrad
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Loubier
Lowther	Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Nunziata
Pankiw	Penson
Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Ramsay
Ritz	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Stinson	Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Véllacott	Venne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)—74	

**NAYS**

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker	Bakopanos

Barnes	Beaumur
Bélaïr	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Borotsik
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brison	Brown
Bryden	Caccia
Calder	Caplan
Carroll	Casey
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Davies
DeVillers	Dion
Discepola	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goodale
Graham	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Jones
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Massé
Matthews	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proud
Provenzano	Kedman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Sada
Scott (Fredericton)	Serré
Shepherd	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (Charlotte)	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Wappel	Wasylcia-Leis
Wayne	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood —162

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Alarie	Brien
Byrne	Cannis
Cauchon	Collenette
de Savoye	Debien
Dhaliwal	Gray (Windsor West)
Lefebvre	Marleau
McCormick	Ménard
Mercier	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
St-Hilaire	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

*Government Orders*

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 1 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 2.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent that the members who are recorded as having voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay on this motion.

• (1915)

[*English*]

**The Speaker:** Is there agreement to proceed in this fashion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote yes to this motion. I would like to add the member for North Vancouver as well.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, Bloc members are in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, NDP members present in the House tonight vote yes.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote yes.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Nunziata:** Mr. Speaker, I will be voting yes to this motion.

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

*(Division No. 116)*

## YEAS

## Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Asselin
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaikie	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brisson
Cadman	Canuel
Casey	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	

Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
Davies	Desrochers
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Elley	Epp
Forseth	Fournier
Gagnon	Gauthier
Gilmour	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goldring	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay	Guimond
Hart	Harvey
Herron	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoepfner	Johnston
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Konrad
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Loubier
Lowther	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marchand	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Matthews
McDonough	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Muise
Nunziata	Nystrom
Pankiw	Penson
Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Price
Ramsay	Ritz
Robinson	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Solomon	Stinson
St-Jacques	Stoffer
Strahl	Thompson (Charlotte)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Vautour	Vellacott
Venne	Wasylcia-Leis
Wayne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)—104

## NAYS

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Caccia
Calder	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Chamberlain	Chan
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson

*Government Orders*

Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Massé	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Serré	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Wappel	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—132

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Alarie	Brien
Byrne	Cannis
Cauchon	Collenette
de Savoye	Debien
Dhaliwal	Gray (Windsor West)
Lefebvre	Marleau
McCormick	Ménard
Mercier	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
St-Hilaire	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 2 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 3.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the House would agree I would propose you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay, except for the member for Labrador who had to leave.

**The Speaker:** Is there agreement to proceed in this fashion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no to this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, the Bloc members are against this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP present vote yes to this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote yes.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Nunziata:** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the wonderful people of York South—Weston, I vote in favour of this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 117*)

**YEAS**

Members

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Blaikie
Borotsik	Brisson
Casey	Davies
Doyle	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Harvey
Herron	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Matthews
McDonough	Muise
Nunziata	Nystrom
Price	Robinson
Solomon	St-Jacques
Stoffer	Thompson (Charlotte)
Vautour	Wasylycia-Leis
Wayne—31	

**NAYS**

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélanger
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—)
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brown
Bryden	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Canuel	Caplan
Carroll	Casson
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Crête	Cullen
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	DeVillers
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Lévis)	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Duncan	

*Government Orders*

Easter	Eggleton
Elley	Epp
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Forsyth	Fournier
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon	Galloway
Gauthier	Gilmour
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goldring
Goodale	Graham
Grey (Edmonton North)	Grose
Guarnieri	Guay
Guimond	Harb
Hart	Harvard
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Konrad	Kraft Sloan
Lalonde	Lastewka
Laurin	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	Lowther
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchand
Marchi	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Pankiw
Paradis	Patry
Penson	Peric
Perron	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pratt	Proud
Provenzano	Ramsay
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Ritz
Robillard	Rocheleau
Rock	Saada
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton)	Scott (Skeena)
Serré	Shepherd
Solberg	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
St-Julien	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vellacott
Venne	Wappel
Whelan	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wilfert	Wood—204

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Brien
Byrne	Cannis
Cauchon	Collenette
de Savoye	Debien
Dhaliwal	Gray (Windsor West)
Lefebvre	Marleau
McCormick	Ménard
Mercier	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
St-Hilaire	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 3 lost.

**Hon. Marcel Massé (for the Minister of Finance, Lib.)** moved that the bill be concurred in.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree, I would propose you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

**The Speaker:** Is there agreement to proceed in this fashion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no to this concurrence motion.

[Translation]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, the Bloc members vote against this motion.

[English]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP in the House tonight vote no to this motion.

[Translation]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote against this motion.

[English]

**Mr. John Nunziata:** Mr. Speaker, I will vote with the Conservatives on this matter as a tribute to their leader.

• (1920 )

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

(Division No. 118)

## YEAS

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Caccia
Calder	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Chamberlain	Chan
Clouthier	Coderre

*Adjournment Debate*

Cohen  
Coppes  
DeVillers  
Discepola  
Drouin  
Easter  
Finestone  
Folco  
Fry  
Galloway  
Goodale  
Grose  
Harb  
Hubbard  
Jackson  
Jordan  
Karygiannis  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Kraft Sloan  
Lee  
Lincoln  
MacAulay  
Malhi  
Manley  
Massé  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Mifflin  
Minna  
Murray  
Nault  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Peric  
Pettigrew  
Pickard (Kent—Essex)  
Pratt  
Provenzano  
Reed  
Robillard  
Saada  
Serré  
Speller  
Steckle  
St-Julien  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Valeri  
Wappel  
Wilfert

Comuzzi  
Cullen  
Dion  
Dromisky  
Duhamel  
Eggleton  
Finlay  
Fontana  
Gagliano  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Guarnieri  
Harvard  
Ianno  
Jennings  
Karetak-Lindell  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Lastewka  
Leung  
Longfield  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Marchi  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Mitchell  
Myers  
Nunziata  
Pagtakhan  
Patry  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Proud  
Redman  
Richardson  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Shepherd  
St. Denis  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Szabo  
Thibeault  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Whelan  
Wood—132

Jones  
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)  
Lalonde  
Lebel  
Lowther  
Marchand  
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)  
McDonough  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Nystrom  
Penson  
Picard (Drummond)  
Price  
Ritz  
Rocheleau  
Schmidt  
Solberg  
Stinson  
Stoffer  
Thompson (Charlotte)  
Turp  
Vellacott  
Wasylcyia-Leis  
White (Langley—Abbotsford)—103

Keddy (South Shore)  
Konrad  
Laurin  
Loubier  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
Matthews  
Meredith  
Muisse  
Pankiw  
Perron  
Plamondon  
Ramsay  
Robinson  
Sauvageau  
Scott (Skeena)  
Solomon  
St-Jacques  
Strahl  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Vautour  
Venne  
Wayne

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie  
Byrne  
Cauchon  
de Savoye  
Dhaliwal  
Lefebvre  
McCormick  
Mercier  
St-Hilaire

Brien  
Cannis  
Collette  
Debien  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Marleau  
Ménard  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

**ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

**NAYS**

Members

Abbott  
Anders  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Bellehumeur  
Bergeron  
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)  
Blaikie  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Cadman  
Casey  
Chatters  
Crête  
Dalphond-Guiral  
Desrochers  
Dubé (Lévis)  
Duceppe  
Duncan  
Epp  
Fournier  
Gauthier  
Girard-Bujold  
Godin (Châteauguay)  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Guimond  
Harvey  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hilstrom  
Johnston

Ablonczy  
Asselin  
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)  
Bailey  
Benoit  
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—  
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Borotsik  
Brisson  
Canuel  
Casson  
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)  
Cummins  
Davies  
Doyle  
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)  
Dumas  
Elley  
Forseth  
Gagnon  
Gilmour  
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)  
Goldring  
Guay  
Hart  
Herron  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Hoepfner

[English]

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

HEALTH CARE

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, last week I had an opportunity to ask a question of the Secretary of State for Children and Youth about the issue of fetal alcohol syndrome.

Fetal alcohol syndrome and fetal alcohol effects are permanent mental and physical damage done to the fetus caused by alcohol consumption during pregnancy. This tragedy is 100% preventable and studies have concluded that most Canadians are not sufficiently informed of the risk of even modest consumption of alcohol.

In 1992 the Standing Committee on Health produced a report entitled "Fetal Alcohol Syndrome: A Preventable Tragedy". In the

*Adjournment Debate*

report it was found that there was no question maternal alcohol consumption could have devastating impacts on the fetus.

The basic fact is that when a pregnant woman drinks her unborn child also drinks, that is the alcohol in the mother's blood stream circulates through the placenta into the blood stream of the fetus. It is possible that the blood alcohol level of the fetus will remain at elevated levels for a longer period than that of the mother because the immature fetal liver metabolizes the alcohol much more slowly.

Research shows that 5% of all fetal defects are due to alcohol consumption during pregnancy. According to Health Canada, FAS occurs in 1 out of every 500 live births. This is more than for Down's syndrome which occurs in 1 in 600 live births.

FAS children can reflect the following: severe neurological disorders, social dysfunction, permanent behavioural problems, life span reduction, reduced brain development, learning disorders, hyperactivity, mental retardation, post and prenatal growth retardation, speech and vision impairment and other physical deformities. Needless to say, it is a very serious problem.

FAS is estimated to cost \$1.5 million during the lifetime of an FAS child. The annual cost to Canada is estimated at some \$2.7 billion in terms of increased health care, special education and other services.

FAE or fetal alcohol effects is very similar to FAS with the same range of problems in a less severe form and without the characteristic facial deformities. However, it should be noted that FAE occurs two to three times more frequently than fetal alcohol syndrome.

The medical profession concedes that the detection techniques are literally in their infancy in terms of their sophistication. As well, those with FAS or FAE generally have difficulties discerning the difference between right and wrong. There is a substantial concern that a large number of inmates in our prisons are victims of this terrible situation.

In October 1996 the Minister of Health and the Canadian Pediatric Society issued a joint statement in which they said that there was no safe level of alcohol consumption during pregnancy. They also said very clearly that the best decision for pregnant women is to abstain from alcohol during pregnancy.

• (1925)

I raise this matter in the House because I believe it is time that awareness of this issue come before the House again so all members of Parliament, and indeed all Canadians, know more about the problem. The fact is that even modest levels of alcohol consumption during pregnancy can have severe and devastating impacts on a fetus and for the remainder of their lives.

I raise the question with the secretary of state in the hopes that there can be some action taken with regard to improving public awareness of fetal alcohol syndrome and fetal alcohol effects.

**Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House to address the problem of fetal alcohol syndrome and fetal alcohol effects.

Fetal alcohol syndrome more commonly known as FAS is a medical diagnosis that refers to a set of alcohol disabilities associated with the use of alcohol during pregnancy. Fetal alcohol effects, FAE, is used to describe children with prenatal exposure to alcohol resulting in learning disabilities.

Although there are no statistics regarding the extent of FAS and FAE in Canada, it is estimated that one to three children in every 1,000 in the industrialized countries will be born with fetal alcohol syndrome.

I should qualify this statement by saying that work is being done in Canada. Specifically the work I am familiar with is being done in B.C. by a working group of professionals. Some of the notables in that professional group are Dr. Geoffrey Robinson, a former nurse by the name of Marilyn Van Bibber, originally from the Yukon Territories, and many others who are worthy of mention.

In the interest of time I have to say that no single group, organization, community, ministry or level of government can deal effectively with the problem on its own. Broad based efforts are required, given that everyone has a stake in addressing this complex issue.

I thank my colleagues, not just the member for Mississauga South but also the member for Moncton who shares a great deal of commitment and interest in this critical issue.

I would like to make a couple of suggestions. We need a national process. Perhaps a few suggestions are in order. There are many helpful recommendations in the standing committee report entitled "The Preventable National Tragedy". We might incorporate those into—

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** I am afraid the minister's time has expired.

## IMMIGRATION

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Madam Speaker, there is still very strong concern in my riding of Vancouver East regarding the immigration legislative review.

Vancouver East is one of the most multicultural ridings in Canada. It is made up of people whose mother tongue is English, Chinese, Italian, Spanish, French, Tagalog, Vietnamese, as well as other languages. Vancouver East has a strong historical multicultural root and has always welcomed immigrants from every continent.

It has the rich tradition of a working class immigrant settlement shaping such diverse neighbourhoods as Strathcona, Chinatown, Grandview-Woodlands, Little Italy, Oppenheimer Park and Japan Town.

Vancouver East is also home to many multicultural organizations and services. I provide this brief snapshot of my community to illustrate why the recommendations of the legislative immigration review concern me deeply. If implemented, the recommendations stand to fundamentally change Vancouver East as a living, vibrant example of multicultural diversity that enriches everyone in the community.

Prior to the hearings that began in Vancouver on February 27, I met with local organizations and organizations that served the immigrant communities and multicultural communities including organizations such as Success, the Chinese Benevolent Association, Mosaic, Immigrant Services Society, the Philippine Women's Centre and the Storefront Orientation Service.

My constituents and those organizations told me that they were deeply concerned about the recommendations contained in the report, particularly involving language, education and the fees imposed on prospective immigrants to Canada.

I also heard very strong concerns about the process of the review itself. Even before the report became public there was a very closed door process, by invitation only, in which many organizations not only in my riding but in other ridings were not allowed the opportunity to have input into the report before it became public.

• (1930)

The public hearings themselves that began in Vancouver were also something that caused a lot of concern in my riding. Many groups wanting to speak to the hearing were not heard and even though the minister provided some extra days of hearings there was inadequate time for local organizations to be heard on what really is the most serious situation involving potential change to Canada's immigration and refugee policies during the last 25 years.

There was also a lot of concern about the recommendation concerning language requirements. Reading through the report and from what I heard from my constituents is that in Vancouver East we believe very strongly that the recommendations show a very deep bias toward non-anglophone and non-francophone people. If those recommendations are implemented they would fundamentally change the kind of neighbourhood and the kind of riding that Vancouver East has been over the years.

I want to call on the government and the minister on behalf of my constituents to make it clear that this report will not be adopted. There is a lot of concern this report will be rushed through by the end of the year or that some recommendations will be dropped and that other recommendations, which maybe do not have popular support in terms of policies around refugees and lack of security around an independent process, will be pushed through by the government.

### *Adjournment Debate*

I would like to get an assurance that the government is not going to rush through legislative changes, that there will be a full and open debate around our immigration and multicultural policies and that the government will assure us that there will not be punitive and biased recommendations—

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** The Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

**Ms. Maria Minna (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think it should be clarified that the report submitted for public consultation is not a government report. It was written by an independent group of consultants. It is not the minister's or department's report. The minister is not bound by any of the 172 recommendations.

The minister has made it clear a number of times that the recommendation with respect to the language issue is not on. I think the hon. member is creating unnecessary anxiety where there is none because there is full consultation. In preparing the report, for example, the legislative review advisory group consulted with hundreds of groups and individuals across Canada.

There were consultations that also took place in 1994, as the hon. member will remember. They have done very thorough work. The minister has no intention of duplicating the work at this point.

The minister, however, has travelled across Canada and has consulted with various interested parties about these recommendations. The public submissions to the minister that took place in seven different cities across Canada were only one part of the broader consultation effort. The minister has also invited all interested Canadians to read the report, look at its recommendations and submit their comments in writing. All opinions and comments will be taken into account in the development of new legislation.

Initially the minister intended to conduct five days of consultation. That number more than doubled to accommodate requests from a variety of groups, allowing for even more voices to be heard on more issues. The fact that the minister extended the consultation days is a clear indication that the minister is listening.

It is the government's desire to develop legislation that will reflect the needs of Canadian society and prepare Citizenship and Immigration Canada for the 21st century while keeping in place Canadian values.

### FISHERIES

**Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP):** Madam Speaker, my question for the parliamentary secretary of fisheries and oceans is quite clear. He was on our west coast tour with the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans when we toured the

*Adjournment Debate*

west communities to find out exactly what is going on out there and why there is so much distrust between the communities that are involved in fishing activities and that of the DFO and of the current minister.

That is why I asked a question on behalf of west coast fishers and I will repeat that question. I will give it a little preamble after that as well.

• (1935)

My question was quite straightforward. The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans has stated to our committee that there is no 12 mile protection zone around Langara Island on B.C.'s west coast from commercial trawlers. He definitely stated there was no protection zone around that island. However, DFO documents clearly state otherwise.

The minister also stated that one should never give allocation of quota from one sector of the fishing industry to another. You should never do that. This is exactly what has happened when DFO cut off the chinook salmon to B.C. trawlers and fishers and gave it to the Sport Fishing Institute. Ms. Velma McColl, who once worked for the Sport Fishing Institute and lobbied very hard, is now the minister's assistance in British Columbia.

My question was straightforward. Why does this government allow DFO to have a policy that helps the minister's friends in British Columbia and not that of west coast fishers?

We have a crisis in B.C. with our coho stocks and that many thousands of B.C. fishers are now going to be facing unemployment and tragedy in their coastal communities. These people who are watching now have a right to an answer and I would like that answer as clear, concise and transparent as possible.

**Mr. Wayne Easter (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I will try to be very concise.

I am disappointed that the member is trying to allege favouritism because of one individual who works for the minister. The minister is very fortunate to have individuals within his ranks who have experience in the fishery. That is what we need in the fishery.

On the issue of Langara Island at the north end of the Queen Charlotte Islands, disputes between the recreational sector and the commercial seiners and trawlers have been an issue since the mid 1980s. It began with the growth of the chinook recreational fishery in the area and more recently these gear conflicts intensified. There is competition for the fishing area by the various groups, particularly for the relatively sheltered spots. Seine fishers because of the use of beach tie-offs and the size of the net interfere with or displace the significantly smaller recreational vessels. Similarly,

fishing patterns of trawlers also may conflict with recreational fishers.

I stress that the primary focus of the Langara Island issue is not about conservation. It is about the desire of the different sectors to fish in the same area and the inherent incompatibility of these gears to co-exist in that same area. A small area around Langara Island is closed to commercial salmon trawlers early in the season to slow the catch rate of the chinook salmon. This is intended to ensure trawlers have a longer season and to minimize gear conflicts. This area around Langara Island referred to as a chinook red line boundary is less than seven and a half miles—

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** I am afraid the time has expired.

## PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY

**Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP):** Madam Speaker, on March 16, I asked the Minister of Industry about the links between his department and the pharmaceutical industry. This question came on the heels of a decision by the Minister of Industry to push through drug patent regulation changes. This decision was made despite the fact that it added another two years to an already lengthy period of 20 year patent protection for brand name drug companies.

This decision was made despite the fact that it will continue to push up drug prices. This decision was made contrary to the wishes of Canadians, health care consumers, health care activists and the generic drug industry. This decision was made despite the fact that it will make it actually harder for the generic industry to compete in this important health care sector. This decision was made despite the fact that the Minister of Health acknowledged that the notice of compliance regulations were problematic and that cabinet would be dealing with them seriously.

It should be noted that the draft regulations were released January 24. The public was given until only February 23 to respond. The government then proceeded to revise those regulations and without any further chance for consultation pushed through the regulations and made the law on March 12. It should also be noted that when the cabinet decision was announced Merck Frosst had all the paper work ready to block a new generic heart drug from entering the market.

• (1940)

Is it any wonder that Canadians believe the drug industry is running this government? Is it any wonder that Canadians believe this government is always putting the needs of industry ahead of the common good, ahead of the public interest? The hope they had for positive change from this government has been dashed. They have been left with nothing but broken promises, disappointment



and a feeling of helplessness in the face of this huge hold by the multinational drug industry over this government.

All of us are asking the question: Who is in charge? Is it the industry or is it the Minister of Health? Is the Minister of Health involved? Where is the Minister of Health? Is it the position of this government that the wishes of the big brand name drug industry should rule the day?

All that we are asking for is that the government reconsider this important issue to put some competition back into this industry and stop this monopoly hold by big brand name drug companies which is forcing up prices. It is time for a national vision for pharmaceuticals, a vision that puts patients before profits, science before salesmanship and leadership before lobbying.

**Mr. Walt Lastewka (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, as previously stated by the Minister of Industry, it is impossible to conclude that the changes to the patent drug regulations were rushed through. The review of these regulations goes back to February 1997, in keeping with the legislative requirement to review Bill C-91.

Over a six week period the industry committee examined all aspects of the Canada drug patent. I should mention that her party seldom attended these meetings. During this time the committee heard some 130 witnesses and received an additional 40 submissions, many of which raised issues surrounding the regulations.

Counsel from both the generic and brand name industries appeared before the committee to assess various proposals on how to deal with the regulations. The committee recommended revisiting the regulatory regime.

Discussions with stakeholders have continued since that time. As a result changes, were proposed to the regulations. These changes were pre-published on January 24, 1998 with a full 30 day consultation period, as is the normal practice.

The final regulations that were approved by this special committee of counsel, on March 11 and registered on March 12, should have come as no surprise to anyone. It was business as usual.

After five years of experience with the old regulations we knew there were problems with this scheme that needed to be addressed, such as unnecessary litigation that wasted court resources, an unworkable damages provision, evergreening of patents and difficulty in administering the patent lists.

The new regulations address these problems. The regime we have put in place is a balanced one, recognizing the importance of all sectors of this industry, the generic, the brand name and newly emerging biopharmaceutical companies. It is fully in keeping with the government's objectives of a fair, more efficient system with reduced litigation that provides effective patent protection while enabling generic drugs to enter the market immediately on patent expiry.

### *Adjournment Debate*

Canada has the most pro-generic pharmaceutical policy in the developed world. We are the only country that has both a regulatory—

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** I am afraid that the hon. member's time has expired.

### SUPREME COURT OF CANADA

**Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to raise my concerns regarding the answer I received to my question of December 3, 1997.

At that time I asked the justice minister how the next supreme court justice could be put through a more appropriate public examination for the appointment process. The minister simply replied that she was willing to consult with Canadians who were interested. But this statement clearly indicates that the minister was not willing to bring forward a defined process of choosing a supreme court judge.

The minister stating that she is willing to consult simply means that the minister is not bound by any public input. The minister's reply to my question was out of touch with Canadians.

I ask, in appointing the supreme court justice, what specific consultations did the minister do? Did the minister travel from coast to coast asking Canadians what kind of judge they wanted? Exactly what kind of sociological advice did the minister receive in making the appointment? If the minister consulted with the provincial attorneys general, the chief justice, law societies and the Canadian Bar Association, does the minister believe this was adequate?

If the system has supposedly worked fine for 130 years, then why would former supreme court Justice Gerard La Forest comment that the Canadian process needs reform and that his replacement should be appointed only after a public review process has taken place? Did the minister not consult with former Justice La Forest?

• (1945)

In the United States the president nominates candidates to their supreme court. However before any person is able to take a seat on the bench they must appear before a Senate committee where their experience is tested, anything from their personal life to political views. In the United States they understand that these things are relevant for future quality decisions. To date, 12 nominations have been rejected and 17 have been withdrawn.

The public process has merit. Should we not want the absolute best judges to make rulings in our highest court? Do we not want to raise the public esteem of the court?

*Adjournment Debate*

It is evident that who does the deciding is just as important as what is being decided at the court. The time is now for this government to open up the process to allow the public to have a say in who is to be chosen.

The appropriate public examination needed includes a forum for all Canadians to participate. I am suggesting that the process look similar to that of the United States. For example, our Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights has the capability to review appointments of chairmen to the National Parole Board, the RCMP and CSIS just to name a few. Why would it be so difficult to set up a process for supreme court judges? On the other hand the Senate could hold ratification hearings.

In conclusion, I want to make it clear that Reformers are not implying that newly appointed supreme court judges are incapable or incompetent in any way. What we are saying is that the process to find replacements must change and must be modernized.

Canadians want change. Provincial justice ministers want change. Former supreme court justices want change. Why is the minister ignoring these pleas? The government even says that it wants change and then nothing happens. It is like the Young Offenders Act issue since 1993.

It is widely expected that before the end of this year two more justices will step down. A responsible minister would work on changing the process right now. Will the next appointments be made the same old way, or will the minister give way to the public's wishes and do the right thing?

Among the varied screening processes there needs to be a vigorous public accountability threshold to maintain the integrity and public regard for our highest court.

**Ms. Maria Minna (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, as you know, appointments to the Supreme Court of Canada are made by the governor in council. Puisne judges as well as the chief justice are appointed on the recommendation of the Prime Minister in consultation with the Minister of Justice. In the process leading to an appointment, senior members of the bench and the bar are consulted. While there is no formal involvement of provinces in the selection of the judges, the province from which the appointment is made is consulted as well.

[*Translation*]

This selection process has produced excellent results in the last 122 years, by allowing for the appointment of highly qualified jurists. However, since the adoption of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the bench, and particularly the supreme court justices, have become the interpreters and protectors of the values enshrined in the charter.

Canadians now show an increasing interest for the judicial function and for those who fulfil that function. Consequently, it is important to make sure that those appointed to the bench are receptive to the values reflected in the charter.

As she said on the appointment of Mr. Justice Bastarache, the Minister of Justice is open to expanding the consultation process leading to the identification of qualified candidates for a position with the court.

Unfortunately, because of the untimely death of the late Mr. Justice Sopinka, just a few weeks after the appointment of Mr. Justice Bastarache, the Department of Justice has not yet had the opportunity to closely examine all the possibilities.

[*English*]

In any case it is very clear to the Minister of Justice that Canada should avoid the adoption of a U.S. style confirmation hearings process which has too often become a sideshow in which reputations are routinely destroyed by opposing politicians' intent on scoring political points.

Let me assure this House that this government—

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** I am afraid the time has expired.

[*Translation*]

The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7.50 p.m.)







<b>Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation</b>	
Mr. Power .....	5335
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	5335
Mr. Power .....	5335
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	5335
<b>Health</b>	
Mr. Perić .....	5335
Mr. Volpe .....	5335
<b>Fisheries</b>	
Mr. Duncan .....	5335
Mr. Anderson .....	5335
<b>Multimedia Industry</b>	
Mrs. Lalonde .....	5335
Mr. Manley .....	5335
<b>The Atlantic Groundfish Strategy</b>	
Mr. Stoffer .....	5335
Mr. Pettigrew .....	5336
<b>Youth Employment</b>	
Mr. Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche) .....	5336
Mr. Pettigrew .....	5336
<b>Calgary Declaration</b>	
Mr. Alcock .....	5336
Mr. Dion .....	5336
<b>Fisheries</b>	
Mr. Grewal .....	5336
Mr. Anderson .....	5336
<b>Presence in Gallery</b>	
The Speaker .....	5336
<b>Points of Order</b>	
<b>Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights—     Speaker's Ruling</b>	
The Speaker .....	5337
<b>ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS</b>	
<b>Main Estimates, Part III</b>	
Mr. Massé .....	5338
<b>Report on Plans and Priorities 1998–1999</b>	
The Speaker .....	5338
<b>Order in Council Appointments</b>	
Mr. Adams .....	5338
<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>	
Mr. Adams .....	5338
<b>Marriage (Prohibited Degrees) Act</b>	
Bill C–385. Introduction and first reading .....	5338
Mr. Robinson .....	5338
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	5338
<b>Income Tax Act</b>	
Bill C–386. Introduction and first reading .....	5338
Mr. Robinson .....	5338
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	5338
<b>National Agricultural Relief Coordination Act</b>	
Bill C–387. Introduction and first reading .....	5338
Mr. Borotsik .....	5338

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	5339
<b>Depository Bills and Notes Act</b>	
Bill S–9. First reading .....	5339
Mr. Peterson .....	5339
(Motion agreed to and bill read the first time) .....	5339
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>Criminal Code</b>	
Miss Grey .....	5339
<b>Multilateral Agreement on Investment</b>	
Mr. Blaikie .....	5339
<b>National Unity</b>	
Mr. Cullen .....	5339
<b>Employment Insurance</b>	
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) .....	5339
<b>Tobacco Products</b>	
Ms. Cohen .....	5339
<b>Pay Equity</b>	
Ms. Cohen .....	5339
<b>Nuclear Weapons</b>	
Mr. Scott (Skeena) .....	5339
<b>Criminal Code</b>	
Mr. Scott (Skeena) .....	5339
<b>Multilateral Agreement on Investment</b>	
Mr. Robinson .....	5340
<b>Criminal Code</b>	
Mr. Lastewka .....	5340
<b>Multilateral Agreement on Investment</b>	
Ms. Davies .....	5340
<b>Co-operative Housing</b>	
Mr. Karygiannis .....	5340
<b>Assisted Suicide</b>	
Mr. Vellacott .....	5340
<b>Multilateral Agreement on Investment</b>	
Mr. Stoffer .....	5340
Ms. Wasylcia–Leis .....	5340
<b>Public Safety Officers</b>	
Mr. Szabo .....	5341
<b>Multilateral Agreement on Investment</b>	
Ms. Hardy .....	5341
Mr. Solomon .....	5341
<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
Mr. Adams .....	5341
<b>Motions for Papers</b>	
Mr. Adams .....	5341
<b>GOVERNMENT ORDERS</b>	
<b>Budget Implementation Act, 1998</b>	
<b>Bill C–36—Time Allocation Motion</b>	
Mr. Boudria .....	5341
Mr. Nunziata .....	5342
Motion agreed to .....	5343
Ms. Torsney .....	5343
<b>Second Reading</b>	
Bill C–36. Second reading .....	5343
Mr. Jones .....	5343
Mr. Valeri .....	5344
Mr. Jones .....	5344
Mr. Schmidt .....	5344
Mr. Jones .....	5344
Mr. Doyle .....	5344
Mr. Szabo .....	5346

Mr. Doyle .....	5346
Mr. Charbonneau .....	5347
Mr. Mills (Red Deer) .....	5348
Mr. Myers .....	5349
Mr. Dubé (Lévis) .....	5350
Mr. Bryden .....	5352

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

**Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide**

Mrs. Picard .....	5352
Motion .....	5353
Mr. Steckle .....	5354
Mr. Vellacott .....	5356
Mr. Kenney .....	5357
Ms. Davies .....	5357
Ms. Carroll .....	5359
Amendment negatived .....	5361
Mr. Hill (Macleod) .....	5361
Motion negatived .....	5362

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Income Tax Amendments Act, 1997**

Bill C-28. Report stage .....	5362
Motion No. 1 negatived .....	5364
Mr. Kilger .....	5364
Mr. Strahl .....	5364
Mr. Bergeron .....	5364
Mr. Solomon .....	5364
Mr. Harvey .....	5364
Mr. Nunziata .....	5364
Motion No. 2 negatived .....	5365

Mr. Kilger .....	5365
Mr. Strahl .....	5365
Mr. Bergeron .....	5365
Mr. Solomon .....	5365
Mr. Harvey .....	5365
Mr. Nunziata .....	5365
Motion No. 3 negatived .....	5366
Motion for concurrence .....	5366
Mr. Massé .....	5366
Mr. Kilger .....	5366
Mr. Strahl .....	5366
Mr. Bergeron .....	5366
Mr. Solomon .....	5366
Mr. Harvey .....	5366
Mr. Nunziata .....	5366
Motion agreed to .....	5367

**ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

**Health Care**

Mr. Szabo .....	5367
Ms. Blondin-Andrew .....	5368

**Immigration**

Ms. Davies .....	5368
Ms. Minna .....	5369

**Fisheries**

Mr. Stoffer .....	5369
Mr. Easter .....	5370

**Pharmaceutical Industry**

Ms. Wasylcyia-Leis .....	5370
Mr. Lastewka .....	5371

**Supreme Court of Canada**

Mr. Forseth .....	5371
Ms. Minna .....	5372

**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**

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada – Édition, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9.**