



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 136 • NUMBER 003 • 2nd SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Thursday, October 14, 1999**

**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

Thursday, October 14, 1999

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

• (1000)

[*English*]

## INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

**The Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 34, I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the parliamentary delegation that visited the Russian Federation from May 16 to May 22 inclusive, 1999.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

**Mr. Derek Lee (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 14 petitions.

\* \* \*

### INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

**Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the first report of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association which represented Canada at the spring session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly held in Warsaw, Poland, May 27-31, 1999.

\* \* \*

### CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-2, an act respecting the election of members to the House of Commons,

repealing other acts relating to elections and making consequential amendments to other acts.

• (1005)

He said: Mr. Speaker, I wish to confirm to the House that it is my intention to propose, pursuant to Standing Order 73(1), that the bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs before it is read the second time.

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

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### YOUTH CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT

**Hon. Don Boudria (for the Minister of Justice)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-3, an act in respect of criminal justice for young persons and to amend and repeal other acts.

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

\* \* \*

[*English*]

### COMPETITION ACT

**Mr. Dan McTeague (Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-201, an act to amend the Competition Act (protection of those who purchase products from vertically integrated suppliers who compete with them at retail).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure, along with my colleagues, to reintroduce the bill formerly known as Bill C-235, an act to amend the Competition Act to provide protection for individuals who purchase products from vertically integrated suppliers who compete with them at retail.

Contrary to the belief of some, I would like to reiterate that rumours of the bill's death have been greatly exaggerated by the industry committee and others.

The bill, along with the amendments to be put forward by my colleague, the hon. member for Cambridge, seeks to accomplish just one thing: to prohibit vertically integrated suppliers from charging their wholesale customers more for a product than what they or their affiliates are charging for the same product at the retail level.

*Routine Proceedings*

In terms of unjustifiable and high sustained prices, the bill tries to prevent market domination in the grocery and gas industries as well as others.

I look forward to the continuing debate on this renewed bill.

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is the hon. member suggesting the bill was in the same form as in the previous Parliament?

**Mr. Dan McTeague:** Mr. Speaker, the bill itself is a votable bill under the procedures that have been changed as a result of last year. The bill is in virtually the same form. It is in the same form as it was in the previous Parliament.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The Chair is satisfied that the bill is in the same form as Bill C-235 was at the time of the prorogation of the first session of the 36th Parliament.

[Translation]

Therefore, pursuant to Standing Order 86(1), the bill is deemed read the second time, referred to a committee, considered in committee, and reported with amendments.

(Bill deemed read the second time, referred to a committee, reported with amendments)

\* \* \*

[English]

**CRIMINAL CODE**

**Mr. Dan McTeague (Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-202, an act to amend the Criminal Code (flight).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to reintroduce the bill. I am sorry about monopolizing the time in the context of my former bill C-235. I thank the House leader for the Reform Party.

The bill was presented in the last session. It deals with a specific provision in the Criminal Code dealing with those who evade police in pursuit. The bill provides severe penalties for anyone using a motor vehicle to escape from the police and in the process kills, injures or maims another person.

Over the summer Canadians once again saw the tragic outcome caused by those who use motor vehicles to evade the police. In Toronto another family no longer has a loved one. In Sudbury another police officer was added to the list of those killed in the line of duty.

• (1010)

The bill has the support of the Minister of Justice, the Government of Ontario and the Canadian Police Association. I am confident that given its previous reception by the justice commit-

tee the bill will also obtain the support of the House in the very near future.

The bill is in the same form as the previous bill in the last parliament.

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** The Chair is satisfied that the bill is in the same form as Bill C-440 was at the time of prorogation of the 1st session of the 36th parliament.

Accordingly, pursuant to Standing Order 86(1) the bill is deemed read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**AUDITOR GENERAL ACT**

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-203, an act to amend the Auditor General Act (Poverty Commissioner).

She said: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of tools to evaluate the effectiveness of the federal government's anti-poverty programs and policies, I move that there be created a position of poverty commissioner, whose mandate would be to analyse the causes and effects of poverty in Canada, to evaluate the effectiveness of measures taken by the federal government to reduce or eliminate poverty, and to advise the federal government on measures that it could take to reduce or eliminate poverty.

The bill is the same in form as Bill C-490, which I introduced in the House of Commons during the preceding session.

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** The Chair is of the opinion that this bill is in the same form as Bill C-490 was when the first session of the 36th Parliament was prorogued.

Therefore, pursuant to Standing Order 86(1), the order for second reading of this bill will be placed at the bottom of the order of precedence in the Order Paper.

\* \* \*

[English]

**EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT**

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-204, an act to amend the Employment Insurance Act (parental benefits).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to reintroduce Bill C-449 which was first introduced into the House on October 27, 1998.

The 1996 national longitudinal survey on children and youth found that 25% of Canadian children enter adult life with significant emotional, behavioural, academic or social problems. Therefore investing in early childhood development, particularly in the first year, is an imperative not an option.

The bill responds in part to the need to provide more flexibility, options and choices to parents by amending the Employment Insurance Act to provide up to one full year of maternity and parental leave benefits under that act.

I am pleased to reintroduce the bill and I hope we will have the support of the entire House.

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

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### INCOME TAX ACT

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-205, an act to amend the Income Tax Act (deduction of expenses incurred by a mechanic for tools required in employment).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the aim of this bill is to allow persons employed as mechanics to deduct the cost of the tools required for their work which they provide, if it is a condition of their employment.

This bill is at the same stage and in the same form as was Bill C-502 at the time of prorogation of the first session of the 36th Parliament, and I am requesting that it be reinstated in the order of precedence.

• (1015)

I would remind hon. members that this bill was a votable item. I would remind the government House leader that, in the rather chaotic end of session last June 10, I had to cut 20 minutes off my speech. He had then given me his consent to have another 20 minutes to speak.

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** The chair is of the opinion that this bill is at the same stage as was Bill C-502 at the time the first session of the 36th Parliament was prorogued. Consequently, pursuant to Standing Order 86(1), the order for second reading of this bill will be placed at the bottom of the order of precedence in the Order Paper and it will be designated as a votable item.

#### Routine Proceedings

[English]

#### ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT

**Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-206, an act to amend the Access to Information Act and to make amendments to other acts.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is in the same form as it was before prorogation. What it does is substantially reforms the Access to Information Act.

Although it is only at first reading, I draw the attention of members to the fact that it is in the same form because I believe it is one of the first bills to obtain more than 100 seconders under the changes to the standing orders.

I have 112 seconders to this bill, mainly from the Liberals, the Reform and the Bloc Québécois.

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

\* \* \*

#### CRIMINAL CODE

**Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Wanuskewin, Ref.)**, seconded by the hon. member for Huron—Bruce, moved for leave to introduce Bill C-207, an act to amend the Criminal Code to prohibit coercion in medical procedures that offend a person's religion or belief that human life is inviolable.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce the former Bill C-461, an act to amend the Criminal Code to prohibit coercion in medical procedures that offend a person's religion or belief that human life is inviolable. The seconder for the bill is the hon. member for Huron—Bruce.

The purpose of the bill is to ensure that health providers working in medical facilities of various kinds will never be forced to participate against their wills in procedures such as abortions or acts of euthanasia. The bill itself does not ban abortion or euthanasia, but it makes it illegal to force another person to participate in an abortion procedure or an act of euthanasia.

Incredibly there are medical personnel in Canada who have been fired because the law is not explicit enough in spelling out their conscience rights. The bill will make those rights explicit.

This bill is in the identical wording as before prorogation and received some 100 signatures and significant support from all parties. It is a labour issue and it is also a conscience rights issue.

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

*Routine Proceedings***CROWN LIABILITY AND PROCEEDINGS ACT**

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-208, an act to amend the Crown Liability and Proceedings Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to reintroduce this bill.

Its purpose is to ensure that a person serving time in prison will not be able to sue the federal government or its employees under any federal legislation in respect of a claim arising while the person is under sentence.

If enacted, the bill would put an end to the practice of prisoners engaging in frivolous lawsuits against the federal government and their abuse of the legal system.

I urge all members in the House to give serious consideration to the bill.

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

\* \* \*

• (1020)

**CRIMINAL CODE**

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill 209, an act to amend the Criminal Code (prohibited sexual acts).

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to reintroduce my private member's bill. This bill seeks to raise the legal age of sexual consent from age 14 to age 16. It would thus make it a criminal offence for an adult to engage in sex with children under the age of 16.

The bill was first introduced in 1996 and reintroduced in 1997. However, the growing concern over child pornography and child prostitution in the country makes it even more urgent for the enactment of this legislation to protect the young and vulnerable in our society from predators among us.

For the sake of our children I appeal to members of the House to give serious consideration to the bill and lend their support accordingly.

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

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**BANK OF CANADA ACT**

**Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-210, an act to amend the Bank of Canada Act (withdrawal of the thousand dollar note).

He said: Mr. Speaker, on the day following the victory of the Bloc Québécois hockey team against the Parliament Hill media people's team, I am very pleased to introduce a bill that seeks to have the \$1,000 note withdrawn. This bill is supported by police forces in Canada.

Withdrawing the \$1,000 note will allow us to lead a more effective fight against money launderers, something most Quebecers and Canadians support.

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

\* \* \*

**INCOME TAX ACT**

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-211, an act to amend the Income Tax Act (travel expenses for a motor vehicle used by a forestry worker).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce this bill for the first time. This legislation seeks to amend the Income Tax Act to allow a reasonable tax deduction for forestry workers who work far from their place of residence, so that the Income Tax Act is an incentive to work and not the reverse.

This bill is in response to a request made by several forestry workers in my riding and in my region. These people deserve to be encouraged. When a person agrees to travel 300, 400, 500 or 600 kilometres to make a living, it is normal that the government should grant a corresponding deduction.

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

\* \* \*

**CANADA LABOUR CODE**

**Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-212, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code, the Parliamentary Employment and Staff Relations Act, and the Public Service Staff Relations Act (prohibited provision in a collective agreement).

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a bill that will prohibit the application of orphan clauses in the collective agreements mentioned in the following three statutes: the Canada Labour Code, the Parliamentary Employment and Staff Relations Act, and the Public Service Staff Relations Act.

The bill's purpose is to prohibit clauses in collective agreements that discriminate against new arrivals in the labour market and to ensure that these workers enjoy the same pay and benefits as previously hired workers.

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

• (1025)

### SHIPBUILDING ACT, 1999

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-213, an act to promote shipbuilding, 1999.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce a bill to promote shipbuilding in Canada.

Basically, it consists of three measures: a loan guarantee program specific to shipbuilding; a leasing write-off provision; a shipbuilding tax credit similar to the one that already exists in Quebec. These three measures were proposed two years ago by the Canadian shipbuilders' association and had the support of the interunion coalition of 4,000 shipbuilding workers in Canada.

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

\* \* \*

### TREATIES ACT

**Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-214, an act to provide for the participation of the House of Commons when treaties are concluded.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of introducing this act, which is aimed at involving the House of Commons in the negotiation and consultation relating to treaties. Its ultimate aim is to democratize the process whereby Canada concludes such treaties.

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

\* \* \*

### TABLING OF TREATIES ACT

**Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-215, an act for the tabling of treaties in the House of Commons.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of introducing this act, which is aimed at creating solid legal foundations for the procedure whereby the government tables treaties before the House of Commons, so as to inform the hon. members of this House of the existence of the treaties concluded by Canada. Canada had given up this practice but reinstated it several months ago. It does, however, require solid legal bases.

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

### *Business of the House*

#### TREATY APPROVAL ACT

**Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-216, an act to provide for the approval of treaties by the House of Commons.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the bill relating to the approval of treaties is aimed at allowing this House to approve treaties before they are ratified by the government, thus reinstating the past practice of having House of Commons support and approval for major treaties.

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

\* \* \*

#### TREATY PUBLICATION ACT

**Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-217, an act to provide for the publication of treaties.

• (1030)

He said: Mr. Speaker, this fourth bill, which also deals with treaties, seeks to require the government to publish treaties not only in the *Canada Treaty Series*, but also in the *Canada Gazette* and on the Web site of the Department of Foreign Affairs, so as to ensure wide circulation of treaties, which are becoming increasingly important documents for Canada and the international community.

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

\* \* \*

#### CONCLUSION OF TREATIES ACT

**Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-218, an act to provide for consultation with provincial governments when treaties are negotiated and concluded.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the fifth and last bill that I am tabling today seeks to put into a single piece of legislation all the issues that I would like to see included in a bill on the conclusion, publication, ratification and circulation of treaties.

I am pleased to introduce this bill and I hope that it will be passed so the signing of treaties can be made a truly democratic process by involving parliamentarians.

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

\* \* \*

[*English*]

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

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

*Routine Proceedings*

That, during the first thirty sitting days of the present Session of Parliament, whenever a Minister of the Crown, when proposing a motion for first reading of a public bill, states that the said bill is in the same form as a bill introduced by a Minister of the Crown in the previous session, if the Speaker is satisfied that the said bill is in the same form as at prorogation, notwithstanding Standing Order 71, the said bill shall be deemed in the current session to have been considered and approved at all stages completed at the time of prorogation of the previous session.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent that Motion No. 1 which you have just read under Routine Proceedings be put without debate, a division thereon deemed to have been requested and deferred until the ordinary time of adjournment this afternoon.

I would then later ask for two other motions to be put as well.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Does the House give its unanimous consent to proceed in the manner outlined by the government House leader?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Accordingly the question is deemed to have been put, a division deemed demanded and deferred until the conclusion of Government Orders later this day. The matter is therefore disposed of at this time.

I will proceed to put Motion No. 2 to the House.

[*Translation*]

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

That, during the first thirty sitting days of the present Session of Parliament, whenever a private Member submits a notice of motion that he or she submitted in the previous Session and that stood in the order of precedence pursuant to Standing Order 87 at the time of prorogation, if the Speaker is satisfied that the said motion is in the same form as at prorogation, it shall stand on the Order Paper pursuant to Standing Order 87 after those of the same class, with the same designation accorded to it pursuant to Standing Order 92(1) in the previous Session.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

• (1035)

[*English*]

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

That, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 81(10)(b), there shall be seven days allotted to the business of supply pursuant to Standing Order 81 in the period ending December 10, 1999.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

**Mr. Sarkis Assadourian:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was a few minutes late and I would ask for the unanimous consent of the House to present a private members' bill.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to revert?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

\* \* \*

**PETITIONS**

## GASOLINE ADDITIVES

**Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to present a petition which has been certified correct as to form and content. The petitioners are from the Grand Bend and London areas.

The petition states that the use of the additive MMT in Canadian gasoline presents an environmental problem affecting every man, woman and child in Canada. The petitioners call upon parliament to set by the end of this calendar year national clean fuel standards for gasoline with zero MMT and low sulphur content.

## THE CONSTITUTION

**Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a petition incited by the hon. member of the New Democratic Party as being a problem in this country.

The petitioners ask the House that parliament oppose any amendments to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms or any other federal legislation which will provide for the exclusion of reference to the supremacy of God in our Constitution and laws.

The petitioners also mention that the majority of Canadians believe in the God who created heaven and earth and are not offended by the mention of his name in the preamble of the charter of rights and freedoms.

This is tabled for the attention of the House and for the attention of the hon. member of the NDP who created this mess in the first place.

## AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to table that are of the same nature with respect to agriculture. There are 122 pages of signatures.

The petitions state that the federal minister of agriculture has introduced the agricultural income disaster assistance program fully knowing the shortfall as it relates to agriculture in western



Canada and that he has failed to set forth a support program that fully reflects the true needs of agriculture.

We will debate agriculture a little later this morning in the reply to the throne speech. The petitioners are asking that the minister of agriculture be replaced by a member of the House who would be better able to recognize and understand the issues of agriculture.

\* \* \*

#### QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

#### REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY DEBATE

##### IMMIGRATION

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 52 I request leave to make a motion for adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration.

Over the summer months it became evident that a crisis exists in our immigration and refugee determination system. Canada has become a primary target for illegal migration. This is causing a problem with queue jumping. People who are using the normal process are extremely concerned that their process is being held up as a result of poor handling of the refugee determination process by the government.

• (1040)

There are three recent events I would like to quickly refer to which demonstrate the need for an emergency debate.

First is the detaining of illegal migrants for months already and it will probably stretch into years in new camps or prisons that have been set up specifically for this reason. I do not think it is acceptable in a country like Canada to have a system that is working so poorly that people are being detained for months and years while they await the outcome of the determination process.

Second, Mayor Lastman, the mayor of Toronto, Canada's largest city, has publicly expressed concern about our immigration system, in particular our refugee determination system which is working so poorly that it is putting an extra cost burden on his city. He wants the government rather than the city to bear that burden if the government is not going to fix the system.

#### *The Address*

Third, yesterday, according to media reports the premier of Ontario has written a letter to the government and to the immigration minister saying he is fed up with the system working so poorly. He wants the government to fix the system because his province cannot bear the costs.

It is important that we debate this issue immediately to send a signal to people smugglers and those who would use their services that Canada will no longer be an easy mark. We must put in place legislation that will make this process happen within days and weeks rather than months and years as is currently the situation and which will quickly end the virtual slave trade that is building in our country. People smugglers are bringing people in illegally and putting them into slave-like conditions. That is something Canadians cannot accept.

For those reasons, it is important that we have an emergency debate today to change the law to fix these problems.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The Chair appreciates the intervention of the hon. member for Lakeland. It is the view of the Chair that his application for an emergency debate does not meet the exigencies of the standing order at this time.

---

#### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

#### SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

##### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed from October 13 consideration of the motion for an address to Her Excellency the Governor General in reply to her speech at the opening of the session, of the amendment and of the amendment to the amendment.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During the remainder of the debate on the Speech from the Throne the Reform Party members will be dividing their speaking time.

**Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Parkdale—High Park.

[Translation]

As in the last six years, Canada continues to be the UN's choice as the number one country in which to live.

[English]

This week's throne speech set out a strategy that will ensure we maintain our number one ranking. It signalled the government's plan to build on the quality of life for all Canadians.

*The Address*

In the years to come we will address the challenges of globalization and the demands placed on a knowledge based society. We have committed to bring down the personal income tax levels of Canadians and to invest in families and in children. The government has set out a plan that addresses our diversity and responds to our responsibilities as a global leader.

Today I will take some time to explore this throne speech and how it relates to my riding and the constituents of Kitchener Centre.

First I would like to review the government's record. Let me begin with unemployment rates. They are at their lowest level since 1990. I am pleased to report to this House that the Waterloo region has the lowest unemployment rate among municipal centres across the nation, a rate of 4.9%.

This Liberal government in partnership with the private sector has created the proper climate for job creation. As a result, we have seen the creation of 1.7 million jobs since we took office. We have consistently increased our investments in research and technology and we have supported small and medium size enterprises.

In my community Industry Canada has worked in partnership on the creation of the business enterprise centre which houses the Canada-Ontario Business Service Centre. This centre provides one stop shopping for entrepreneurs. Users of the centre have access to extensive and current information and tools which enable them to both succeed and grow.

• (1045)

The region of Waterloo is a microcosm of the changes that are happening across the nation. A generation ago no one could have envisaged a vibrant local economy that lacked the kind of family businesses such as Seagram's and Labatt's, nor could they have imagined the changes that we have seen at Schneider's meats, yet these changes have occurred.

Today in Kitchener we see an ever increasing number of small businesses starting up. Across the country over 80% of the new jobs created are by this sector and many are in the high tech area.

Waterloo region has seen incredible growth in the high tech sector. Our community has not only thrived but remained on the cutting edge of a competitive global economy.

This week's throne speech clearly indicates a strong commitment to building our economy through developing a skilled labour force and providing the necessary research dollars and tools for small emerging companies.

The Liberal government will ensure that skilled development keeps pace with the evolving industries and markets. This will be accomplished through the sectoral councils in close consultation with industry leaders. The government has once again acknowledged the importance of foreign investors in Canada.

For Canada's technology triangle this is good news. The CTT has been funded by the federal government to attract foreign investors to areas such as Kitchener. They are working and spreading the news about Canada. It is this type of organization with which we must encourage and foster relationships.

We must also support companies that will help us meet our environmental obligations under agreements such as the Kyoto protocol.

Recently I accompanied the Minister of Industry on a tour of GFI Control Systems where they demonstrated to us how their automobile conversion kits will help Canada meet its clean air responsibilities.

Our environment is also affected by our infrastructure. As a former regional and municipal representative I have witnessed the benefits of working in partnership on programs such as our national physical infrastructure.

In the throne speech we have indicated our will to continue to work with all levels of government and the private sector to achieve a five year plan for improving the infrastructure in both urban and rural areas across Canada. This will be a commitment that will be reached by the end of the year 2000.

Children and youth are the country's key to success in the 21st century. It is the responsibility of government and community, family, friends and teachers to open doors and encourage young people to seize their dreams.

I first entered politics to assure that the decisions of government were working in the best interests of my four children. During my 10 years as a member of parliament I have taken special interest in the youth of Kitchener. Through visits to classrooms and graduations, I have had the pleasure to meet the young people who will be the leaders of tomorrow.

I have been pleased to support organizations such as the KOR Gallery and art studio. This studio was created by another mother who wanted to see the greatest opportunities possible for her very talented son and other young artists in the Waterloo region. KOR Gallery has been supported by the federal government and has received half a million dollars throughout its years.

In the spring of this year the Prime Minister's task force on youth entrepreneurship spent a day in my community meeting with young entrepreneurs and visiting their businesses. The task force heard that our youth need support to gain access to funding and resources. We are responding to those requests.

Our goal is to give today's young generation of Canadians, no matter where they live, the tools and the opportunities for personal success in the knowledge economy. We will provide them with career information and access to work experience and learning. We will hire them to work on Internet projects. We will offer them the

*The Address*

opportunity to apply their talents overseas through youth international internship programs.

The government is committed to enhancing the skills and opportunities of young Canadians. We will do this through partnerships with local organizations and the provincial and territorial governments.

For example, this past summer Kitchener was the proud host of the skills Canada competition. The event, in connection with two other competitions, received \$800,000 from the youth employment strategy fund.

Skills Canada is an important project because it gives our youth the opportunity to compete with young people from around the world. The competition tested participants in over 40 trade, technological and other skill areas. I can think of no better way to encourage tomorrow's leaders. Our children and our families deserve a high standard of living. This will require, as never before, an adaptable, resilient population that is ready to learn throughout life.

• (1050)

It is clear that the foundation for such capacities is laid in the very early years of life. I firmly believe that the strength of our society will depend on the investments we make today as a nation in families and in children.

The government has committed to making a third significant investment in the national child benefit by the year 2002. We will put more dollars in the hands of families with children through further tax relief. We will lengthen and make more flexible employment insurance benefits for parental leave.

Now that the deficit is gone and the debt is in a permanent downward direction, we as a government have the opportunity to invest in the quality of life of Canadians. Canadians have said that health care, children, education and tax cuts are their priorities. We have been responding to these areas in the past years and we will continue to be committed to these issues.

This nation has a high quality of life. It is a nation of which we should be proud. It is a nation that others envy. Our Prime Minister has provided us with a strong direction and an unwavering commitment for unity.

[*Translation*]

The new millennium will be wonderful for all Canadians.

[*English*]

The new millennium will be a bright one for all Canadians.

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, with all the fluff that flies around here it is a wonder we do not break out

with allergies. I wonder if the member has ever visited the reserves across our country, as I have for the last two years, to see the quality of life. The government continually talks about how wonderful we are in this land.

I wonder if the member of parliament has ever walked the streets of Toronto, Vancouver or other major cities and visited with the people who are on the streets, who are homeless, who are experiencing this wonderful quality of life we keep hearing about from this minister.

I wonder if the member and the government recognize the extreme value of Mike Harris, Ralph Klein and other premiers, and how much they have contributed and sacrificed in order to make things happen in their provinces, with no thanks to this government. In spite of the government, they have managed to achieve many things.

I wonder if the member is aware that only this morning it was declared that there has been a 66% increase in poverty in one year. One out of every six children is going to school hungry. One year ago it was not that bad.

I wonder if the member is proud of a government that spends money to hang dead rabbits in a museum or to form a committee to study whether we should have a national insect.

The government is doing all this funny fuzzy spending while we get these kinds of reports. What kind of a record is that? What are the member and the government going to do about these things that are real and actual, that are happening on our reserves and on the streets of our country?

We talk about the quality of life while we hang dead rabbits in museums and search for a national insect. When is the government going to wake up, and what is the member going to do about it?

**Mrs. Karen Redman:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member opposite for the temporary promotion to minister.

I had the pleasure this past summer of going to the Arctic region and the Northwest Territories of this land and was very proud to see the process in place for self-government. As recently as last April we saw the creation of Nunavut. I will tell the member that the government is working very hard with our aboriginal people, who do not speak with one voice, to come up with self-government and empower them to use their voices to create what the next century will look like for them.

• (1055)

I also point out for the member opposite, if he would like to look at the Speech from the Throne, that there is reference made to the social union. One of the things that the social union does is allow all levels of government, with the leadership of the federal government, to stop pointing fingers at each other and to engage in

*The Address*

solutions of the kind the Minister of Labour has heard in communities as she crossed Canada looking at the homelessness issue and looking at a variety of ways that all governments can work together to solve this problem. It is a national concern of the government, but not one that merely demands having money thrown at it.

The social union structure allows Canadians to hold all levels of government accountable. The one thing the government will not do is risk financial gains by having a balanced financial picture and dressing down the deficit. We will not run deficits to give tax cuts, which is happening in Ontario.

**Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today in the House of Commons as a member of the government to address the Speech from the Throne, a speech which I can proudly say has been heralded as a return to traditional Liberalism.

I would like to thank our new governor general for her eloquent delivery of the Speech from the Throne and I congratulate her on her appointment.

In the Speech from the Throne the government has set out its vision for the next century by providing a comprehensive strategy to build a higher quality of life for all Canadians. The most striking thing about the speech is that the government has acknowledged that in order to successfully implement its strategy it requires consensus.

The Government of Canada cannot undertake this strategy alone. It can only do so in partnership and in collaboration, by working together with other governments, the provinces and the territories, the private sector, the volunteer sector and individuals. In fact, there is not a page in the Speech from the Throne which does not note the importance of working together or use the words “collaboration” or “partnership”. At the very beginning of the Speech from the Throne it is stated unequivocally as follows:

The best way to achieve the promise of Canada for every citizen is to work together to build the highest quality of life for all Canadians.

The issue that I would like to address today is the renewed commitment by the government to invest in Canada’s arts and cultural sectors, for in doing so we are also investing in our national identity which ensures our sovereignty and serves as a method of nation building and of promoting a multicultural society.

As a passionate advocate of Canada’s arts and culture and as the member of parliament for a constituency which is home to many of Canada’s artists, including writers, singers, actors, performers, filmmakers and producers, I had started to hear concerns that investments in Canada’s culture had become stagnant, that other interests and interest groups had overshadowed the importance of a continued investment in the arts.

I was actually confronted with concerns that the last two budgets had not addressed any new programs or incentives for our arts and cultural sectors, save and except those programs which had been envisaged in red book II, the Liberal election platform. While those programs and funding proposals had indeed been implemented, the fact still remained that these were not new commitments. Where was the vision for this sector that would lead Canada into the next century and ensure our cultural sovereignty and our national identity?

The concerns voiced by the arts community have been addressed and I applaud the government on its vision and leadership in continuing to promote our Canadian arts and cultural sectors.

The following are the themes that I trust will reassure and enhance our arts and cultural communities.

The government is now committed to ensuring that younger Canadians, from age 13, are given an opportunity to apply their creative abilities by providing them with a chance to produce their first works using traditional approaches and new technologies in the arts, cultural, digital and other industries.

• (1100 )

This commitment acknowledges the importance of arts in making children creative and preparing them for a knowledge based economy. There is substantial empirical evidence to show that children who are exposed to the arts, especially music, at a very early age score much higher on the math and science components of the SAT examinations than those who are not exposed.

In November 1997 an article appeared on the front page of the arts section of the *Globe and Mail* which confirmed this evidence and concluded that arts, not computers, make kids creative. The article stated:

Arts education is not only cheaper, it may be essential training for a more creative flexible world. Arts, not IBM, makes kids smarter.

The article also went on to say that arts education by focusing on the creative process prepares our youth for the highly skilled jobs that our country requires and will require in the future.

Under international trade investment the Speech from the Throne noted that the government would increase its trade promotion in strategic sectors. It specifically noted that one of these sectors was the cultural sector. This statement gives new meaning and life to the maxim that culture is a third pillar of our foreign policy.

The government also committed to use the upcoming WTO negotiations to build a more transparent rules based trading system which not only provides for better access in world markets for Canadian companies in all sectors but also respects the needs of Canadians, especially culture as is noted.

*The Address*

On the section of infrastructure the Government of Canada has committed to building a cultural infrastructure. It is committed to bringing Canadian culture into the digital age, linking 1,100 institutions across the country to form a virtual museum of Canada. It will put collections from the National Archives, the National Library and other key institutions on line.

Specifically the speech also notes and vows to increase support for the production of Canadian stories and images in print, theatre, film, music and video, and the government has committed to increase support for the use of new media.

In dealing with physical infrastructure the government has agreed that it will work with other levels of government and the private sector to reach agreement on a five year plan for improving physical infrastructure in urban and rural communities across the country.

One of the areas of focus specifically noted for physical infrastructure was culture. I was delighted to see the cultural sector as a specifically designated area in which to improve our physical infrastructure. I say so because as a member of parliament from the city of Toronto we are looking at wonderful infrastructure projects. In the city of Toronto plans are under way to build a new state of the art opera house.

In Winnipeg the Manitoba Theatre Centre, at 41 years of age and Canada's oldest English speaking regional theatre, is in desperate need of repair. This need has also launched a private sector campaign to refurbish its two buildings.

This theme brings new hope to a request by the cultural community to restore funding for the arts in general and infrastructure matters in particular. More important, this commitment to improve physical infrastructure for culture appears to be a direct response to recommendations 32 and 33 of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage report entitled "A Sense of Place, A Sense of Being: The Evolving Role of the Federal Government in Support of Culture in Canada", which was tabled in the House of Commons in June.

These recommendations call upon the Government of Canada to re-establish a capital fund and a long term financial strategy to deal with Canada's deteriorating cultural facilities. I applaud the government for its quick response to the committee's report.

In the section of the Speech from the Throne entitled "Canada's Place in the World", the government stated that it would act like like-minded countries to reform and strengthen international institutions such as the World Trade Organization. It also specifically noted that it would work to develop a new approach internationally to support the diversity of cultural expression in countries around the world.

• (1105)

This commitment is a direct endorsement of the report of the cultural industries sectoral advisory group dated February 1999 wherein it was recommended that the government champion a new cultural trade covenant, a new international instrument that would lay out the ground rules for cultural policy.

In addition, this commitment to a new approach internationally to support the diversity of cultural expression also is a direct response to recommendation 29 of the report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade entitled "Canada and the Future of the World Trade Organization: Advancing a Millennium Agenda in the Public Interest", tabled in the House of Commons in June.

Recommendation 29 specifically calls upon the government to pursue the policy alternative contained in the cultural SAGIT report for a new international instrument on cultural diversity. Again I applaud the government for its quick response to the report and for the commitment to implement this recommendation.

In conclusion, I am proud to be a member of a government that not only has a vision but has strategies for all Canadians as we enter into the 21st century. The Speech from the Throne provides us with a blueprint to build the 21st century but, as the speech unequivocally states, we will build the 21st century together. All Canadians, every citizen, every government, every business and every community organization, have a part to play.

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of time for the hon. member and I appreciate her commitment to the arts. It is very heart warming.

However I would like to know what the member thinks about what the federal government actually does with its so-called investments, that is to say wasteful spending in arts and culture. What does the hon. member think of the quarter of a million dollar investment of the minister of heritage in *Bubbles Galore*?

Does she think the federal government's cultural agenda should include producing pornographic films? What does she think about *Hanging the Dead Rabbits*? Does she think that is an important investment in the cultural future of Canada in the 21st century? Does she think that is necessary to defend our cultural sovereignty?

A few years ago, in part through a federal grant, the Vancouver Art Gallery exhibited something called *Piss Pope*, a picture of the Holy Father submerged in a jar of the artist's urine. That was another expenditure by the federal government of our tax dollars.

We could go on and on and on about the kind of absurd, disgusting, wasteful excuse for art which the government finances. How does the hon. member apologize for that?

*The Address*

**Ms. Sarmite Bulte:** Mr. Speaker, the opposition member has reported some instances of what he calls wasteful expenditure. I must say that I see any kind of expenditure in our art and cultural industries as an investment. It is an investment in our national identity. It is an investment in our cultural sovereignty. It is an investment in who we are and what we are.

Everyone does not have the same taste but culture and art is a wide-ranging sector. It gives us a sense of place and a sense of being, as the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage so eloquently put it. I recommend to my hon. colleague that he actually take a look at that report and at the recommendations made by that committee.

**Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, there must be many Canadians who voted for the Liberal Party that are feeling pretty embarrassed right now that the member would stand to defend the disgusting display of art or excuse for art that was just talked about by my colleague from Calgary.

The Liberal member stood to defend spending on that trash that she refers to as art and a good investment. She owes Canadians a huge apology for her confirmation that taxpayers dollars were spent on that kind of disgusting culture and art, as she referred to it. She probably owes an apology to some of her colleagues that were not very pleased with her response to the member from Calgary.

• (1110)

**Ms. Sarmite Bulte:** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to support the government and the Minister of Canadian Heritage on continuing investment in the arts and cultural industries in our country. They are not only a vital part of our economic growth but, as I have said time and time again, they are an investment in who we are, what we are, our identity and our cultural sovereignty.

Let us never forget that arts and culture sovereignty is inextricably involved with our economic sovereignty. I am proud to be a member of the government and to support its commitment to arts and culture.

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to the throne speech today and to be back with colleagues on this side of the House.

In response to the hon. member who just spoke, it is contrary to what most Canadians believe when she suggests that they should have their tax money forcibly taken from them and given to projects which are completely contrary to their values, the things they believe in.

Some people have very strong religious beliefs, for instance. It is completely wrong and I believe most Canadians think it is completely wrong when their tax dollars are forcibly taken to devote to

things those people would consider to be blasphemous. That is exactly what the Liberal government does, and I cannot believe it sits there and defends it.

At the beginning of a year most people sit down to make some new year resolutions. One point that is always universal about people is that they are always trying to improve their own situation. They are trying to improve the situation of their families. When they have the resources to do that, that is exactly what they do.

As the government moves into not only a new year but a new decade, a new century, and a new millennium, I would think it would want to do that too. It should want to make a special effort to set about reforming how it does things. I would argue, and I think most Canadians would agree with me when I say it, there are many areas where the government is simply not doing a good job.

It is not doing a good job in providing national defence. It is not doing a good job in our justice system. There is lots of room for improvement in the delivery of health care and social services. It is not doing a good job in ensuring that government is accountable. I would have thought the throne speech would be full of fundamental reforms to address those kinds of issues. However it was not. It was a lot of tinkering, and that certainly characterizes this administration.

I want to talk specifically about an area I am responsible for critiquing as the official opposition finance critic, the pathetic attempt the government made to convince people it really cared about the staggering tax burden. There was barely mention in the throne speech of why we need dramatic tax relief in Canada today.

When we wipe away all the rhetoric in the 24 page throne speech, what are we left with? We are left with an announcement that the government will make an announcement about tax relief at some point in the future. We are also left with a whole slew of tax increases which are coming our way very soon.

On January 1 we will see a payroll tax hike because Canada pension plan taxes are going up once again. We will see personal income taxes going up because of bracket creep. Some 85,000 people will be dragged on the tax rolls for the first time and hundreds of thousands of others will be pushed up into new tax brackets. We will see small business face a tax increase because their small business exemption will be eroded by inflation. They will pay more in taxes. It will be the same for the small business capital gains exemption and for farmers and their capital gains exemption. That will mean a tax increase for all those people. That is the reality.

All this talk that we hear on the other side about how much the government cares about taxes really does not amount to a whole lot when we look at what it will actually do. It will raise taxes.

The government talks about its plan to cut taxes. We will hear about that in the next few days. It is to reduce taxes by \$16.5

*The Address*

billion, but it does not say at the same time that it is raising taxes by over \$18 billion. The net result is that Canadians who now face the highest taxes in Canadian history will face even higher taxes thanks to the finance minister and the Liberal government. That is wrong. It is wrong for a couple of reasons.

• (1115)

First and probably most important, it is wrong because it hurts people. If the government really were compassionate and wanted to be fair and provide people with options and opportunities, it would have devoted the first 12 pages of the throne speech to explaining how it would deliver tax relief to help hard-pressed Canadians. It is unbelievable that we stagger under this tremendous tax burden today where families who earn less than \$20,000 a year are paying \$6 billion a year in taxes.

My friend from Crowfoot told me not long ago about a woman and in fact I saw her income tax return. She made \$11,000 and paid \$600 in federal income tax. That is shameful and that party claims to be compassionate. We have raised many examples in this place of people who make extraordinarily low incomes and pay extraordinarily high taxes.

I could go through some examples but I want to talk for a moment about an example presented to me yesterday by my friend from North Vancouver. He gave me a letter from a woman whose husband makes \$65,000 a year, which is a pretty good salary in most people's minds. However, they have the misfortune of living in socialist British Columbia and on top of the high tax burden the Liberal government imposes upon them, they have an effective tax rate of 52%. Even at that, they had to pay \$800 extra in taxes over and above the 52% of their paycheque they have to give to government every year.

The result is the family has to take one car off the road. They cannot live in Vancouver with the high cost of living and pay all the taxes this government and the British Columbia government demand. Believe it or not, because of the jeopardy the man's job is in, they are talking about resorting to welfare. They simply cannot put aside enough money to help them get through what will be a layoff period for this man. It is very disturbing when a person makes \$65,000 and he can barely make it because of the tax burden imposed by the government.

I happened to be looking through some documents which were confidential until we received them through access to information a little while ago. Even the minister's own briefing notes acknowledge that Canada has by far the highest tax burden in the entire G-7. Out of all of our trading partners, out of all of the most prosperous nations in the world, we have by far the highest personal income taxes.

I always find it amazing that in Canada today people pay more in taxes than they spend on food, shelter and clothing combined. When we add all of that up, it does not leave much left over. When

all those taxes are paid and money is spent on the bare necessities of life, there is very little left over. That is why we are in a position in Canada today where we have seen disposable incomes mired at 1980 levels. For 20 years we have had our disposable incomes mired at that 1980 level.

What did the government do about it in the throne speech? It devoted one line to the issue. There was much airy talk in the throne speech about Internet programs and acting as a big travel agency for young people and sending them around. That is really nice but it is not a luxury we can afford today, not when Canadians are staggering under that level of taxation. It is ridiculous. If the government were really fair, it would acknowledge that it was Canadians who balanced that budget for it.

Does the House realize that the average family today is paying taxes 30% higher than it was six years ago? That is \$4,300, a staggering number. It is not the finance minister nor the government that balanced the budget; it was balanced on the backs of taxpayers. Fairness decrees that they should now get some tax relief.

• (1120)

The Reform Party has been arguing since it came into being 12 years ago that we need to give Canadians a tax break. We want to see that happen.

I want to speak just a little bit about the situation on the farm today. I come from a farm riding. I want to talk about how taxes hurt farmers. Do hon. members realize that taxes are embedded in just about every input they can think of? Fuel taxes take up about 50% of the price of fuel. On fertilizer and chemicals and machinery, taxes take up 15%, 20% to 30% of the price of those things. If we could lower taxes we could help people in a direct way on the farm, but we do not see that coming from this government.

In conclusion, I simply want to say that the fairest way to treat Canadians as we go into the next millennium is to lower their tax burden. They will take those resources and use them to help their families and to help children, which is something that the government claims it is concerned about. Canadians will use those resources to help their friends and their neighbours and to strengthen their own situation. Ultimately, I think most Canadians would agree that a dollar left in the hands of the taxpayer will be a lot better utilized than a dollar left in the hands of a politician or a bureaucrat.

**Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, the Reform Party finance critic, for his excellent presentation in debate today.

I would like him to centre in on one thing which I think is of a huge concern to Canadian families. That is the shrinking disposable income in the household money they are able to spend and how it has decreased since this Liberal government came to power

*The Address*

in 1993. Also, perhaps the member could explain to us what that extra tax means in the lives of Canadian families.

**Mr. Monte Solberg:** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address that question from my colleague from Prince George—Bulkley Valley.

The fact is that Canadians have seen their disposable income stuck at 1980 levels. For the things the government claims it cares about most, for instance children, it means that children are put in a terrible position.

Not long ago I received a letter which had been passed on to me by the member for Cariboo—Chilcotin. In that letter a young woman explained that because of the EI rate of this government and the fact that people were not getting those employment insurance premiums back, she could not afford to put her young son into hockey. That is the sort of thing that happens on a day to day basis across the country.

It was not very long ago when the leader of the Reform Party brought a family from New Brunswick to Ottawa and explained what the Reform plan of reducing taxes would do for that family. About \$3,000 would go back to that family. We actually gave them that money. What did they use it on? They used it on things like dental care. They used it for things like glasses. They used it to go on a family vacation, something they had not been able to do for several years. They also used it to pay back an RRSP that they had to cash in to pay their tax bill.

That is the situation many families in Canada are in today. I was ashamed of the government for not recognizing that towering fact which everybody else in Canada seems to know about but which this government always ignores.

**Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it has become quite clear that the Liberal Party, the Government of Canada, is using a new code word for its favourite thing to do which is spending, and that word is investment. I do not know how many times we have heard it throughout the throne speech. The intervention of the member for Parkdale—High Park, who is so proud of returning to liberalism, defends the outrageous spending habits of the government.

I would like my hon. colleague's comments on this word investment. Could he tell us what that really means in terms of government spending?

• (1125)

**Mr. Monte Solberg:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. At a time when we are trying to devote resources to the highest priorities, we are in a situation where the government is taking not a few million dollars but literally billions of dollars in all

kinds of departments to devote it to what is stupid spending. It tries to cover it up by calling it investment.

Frankly, it is obscene what it does with some of the money but a lot of it is just serious waste. That money could be used for things that the government claims it cares about. What is a higher priority, spending money on pornographic films or providing hospital beds? Or should it be used to provide tax relief for Canadian families who are struggling? Should we be giving grants to big business or should we be using that money to ensure that children in Canada have a proper education?

Those are the sorts of things that are priorities, not grants to special interest groups, big business and ridiculous campaigns to impose certain cultural values on other Canadians using their tax money.

It is time the government came clean and simply explained to people that really its intention is not to use that money wisely but to spend it frivolously in too many cases.

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise on debate on Her Excellency's Speech from the Throne.

As the member for Parkdale—High Park said in her articulate defence of anti-Catholic government funded pornographic art, this budget was filled with all kinds of marvellous Liberal-style investments. It was a return to old fashioned liberalism, namely the arrogance of a tax and spend philosophy which believes that politicians and bureaucrats in Ottawa know better how to spend a scarce dollar than do a homemaker, a small business person, an entrepreneur or a taxpayer. That is the philosophy of the Speech from the Throne which we heard earlier this week.

The government devoted a couple of words in the speech to some token talk about tax relief, but it also said that the government has already cut taxes. We know we cannot believe the completely specious commitment to tax relief from the government given the fact that it has not yet delivered any tax relief. In fact what it has delivered are tax increases. It is tax grief for Canada, not tax relief.

If the government has lowered taxes, then why is it bringing \$40 billion more into the federal treasury than it was six years ago? Why is it that federal taxes are up \$4,200 or 30% for an average family since 1993? Why is it that federal revenues as a percentage of our gross domestic product, the most objective measurement, are at their highest level ever at over 18%?

Why is it that we continue to see, according to the major economic firm Wood Gundy that "the net impact of the last five Liberal budgets has been to raise Canada's tax bill some \$6 billion in 1999-2000 above what would have been paid under the 1993 tax regime"? Wood Gundy also said "from a tax competitiveness



standpoint, Canada ranks dead last in the G-7. While virtually every other G-7 economy lowered its personal income tax burden over the last 15 years, Canada's rose sharply, both as a percentage of GDP and of household income".

But we do not have to quote the experts or look at the stats that the government ignores because we do not have to make this case to Canadians. They know when they get their paycheques. They know when they look at their pay stubs that they are going home with less than they did in 1993 when this government came into power with a pledge never to raise taxes.

I remember the Prime Minister saying when he was asked if he would raise taxes, "Well, I can't rule it out, there might be a war or something". Well there has been a war. It has been a war on Canadian taxpayers and they are paying more than they ever have before.

The huge and growing tax burden has had a tremendous impact on Canadians. Just in the last couple of days while we have been debating the throne speech our dollar has gone down again by another half cent. That is the ultimate measurement by the international markets of the value of our economy, of our currency and it ultimately reflects the fiscal policy of the government. It is a reflection of the impoverishment of Canadians, Canadians who are coming home today with about \$900 less after tax than they did in 1989, Canadians who are working harder but coming home with less while the average American taxpayer is coming home with an average after tax disposable raise of \$2,000 over the same period of time. Americans are getting richer while Canadians are getting poorer.

● (1130)

The Liberal government loves to bash the United States. The United States has its fair share of problems, but I do not think we should take pride in becoming poorer as they become richer. I do not think we should take pride in what the Minister of Industry said last February, that had Canadian productivity, competitiveness and growth kept pace with that of the United States over the past two decades the average family in Canada would be \$28,000 a year better off. That is apparently the moral high ground that the government takes in its posturing and its bashing of an economy which is growing much faster than our own.

We do not have to debate the statistics; we have to look at real people's lives to see the impact this is having. I spent all four weeks of September in nine of the ten provinces and in nearly 30 communities speaking to business people, entrepreneurs, chambers of commerce and small business folks. I was on university campuses and in high schools. Again and again in every region of the country I heard that we have a huge and growing drain of talent and entrepreneurialism out of this country, not just to the United States but to other more competitive, faster growing and lower tax jurisdictions.

### *The Address*

This summer the Conference Board of Canada released a major study wherein it indicated that the number of Canadians who are going to the United States increased from 17,000 in 1986 to over 98,000 in 1997. The government denies it. The Liberals put their heads in the sand and say the problem does not exist.

Why then is it that nearly 70% of our computer science graduates are now leaving this country? These people will be creating untold future wealth and economic opportunity, and contributing to a tax base to finance health care, education and pensions. We want these people here, contributing to our tax base so that we can afford to pay down the debt, to grow the economy, to pay for health care and to pay for a civil society. We are literally eating away at the productive capacity of our economy.

I was on a university campus this summer where 120 of the 130 kids who graduated from computer science last year took placements outside Canada because they could not find economic opportunities here. The capital was not here to invest and create new cutting edge, information technology businesses and economic opportunities for those kids.

But this is not just a question of stats and dollars and taxes; it is a question of lives. Every one of those kids who has left the country represents the hopes and dreams of Canadian families who believed that if they worked hard, played by the rules, paid their taxes and invested in their children's education they would see their children and grandchildren raised happily and in prosperity in Canada. What do we have instead? We have thousands and thousands of broken dreams because of the broken economy delivered by this government's high tax, high regulatory, high debt, high spending policies.

We in the official opposition have a proposal to cut the tax burden overall by 25% through a whole suite of broad based tax cuts that would lift over one million low income people off the tax rolls, people who ought not to be paying taxes in the first place, single moms with minimum wages, and low income, fixed income seniors who are paying taxes today but were not six years ago because of the government's heartless and insidious bracket creep tax on the poor which forces low income people onto the tax rolls. That is our top priority. We want to relieve those people entirely of their tax obligations, which finance government investments like *Bubbles Galore*.

Reformers also believe it is critically important that we generate new investment and capital formation to create opportunities for those young people who are leaving today, as well as to cut the insidious tax on wealth creation called the capital gains tax. Canada has an effective capital gains tax rate of nearly 40%, while in the United States the effective rate has been lowered to 18% and Congress has just passed a law that would take it to 11%, fully indexed.

*The Address*

• (1135)

The United States is not going to stop there. The chairman of the federal reserve, the leading economic authority in the world today, has called on Congress twice publicly to eliminate the American capital gains taxes, as has been done in Ireland, Hong Kong and so many other jurisdictions. How can we believe that we can retain capital in this country to create wealth, jobs and quality of living as long as we have this enormous and growing differential?

Yesterday the finance minister made a specious claim. He said that the Reform Party would have to cut spending, and he picked some absurd number out of the air like \$50 billion or some such fictitious nonsense, in order to finance our \$25 billion in total tax cuts. The finance minister knows perfectly well that if he did not increase spending, as he plans to do, we would see surpluses of about \$25 billion a year within five years.

That is not all. Every jurisdiction in the world that has cut tax rates has seen revenues grow. Ireland has cut its corporate tax rates from 40%, the highest in Europe, to 10%, the lowest, and it has seen an explosion in revenues and economic growth. It is the fastest growing economy in Europe.

The United States cut its taxes in 1962 and in 1982, its high marginal rates and capital gains rates. In both instances it saw an explosion in revenues from those sources.

Right here at home, of course, Mike Harris and his common sense revolution cut income taxes by 30% and saw a massive growth in revenues from the income tax.

The moral of the story is that tax cuts are necessary to grow the economy.

The government says we have to wait for growth before we can cut taxes. We will never get to that kind of real growth if we wait to cut taxes. It is time that we got our priorities right. It is time that we let those young people who are leaving stay here to build a brighter future so that their parents can see their dreams realized here at home in Canada.

**Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the hon. member and the hon. member who spoke before him on their fine presentations. What they were stating is intrinsically true. Those regimes which have low taxes have high growth and the chance to create growth and wealth.

From 1992 to 1997 taxes have increased 15% as a percentage of income for Canadian families, to the extent that they now spend more money on personal income taxes than they do on food, clothing or household operations. Given that fact, if the govern-

ment really wants to develop a children's agenda and it wants to invest in and enhance institutions that invest in the betterment of children, why does it not invest in the institution that has proven to be successful for children, that being the Canadian family? If the government really wants to enhance the welfare of children in the country, why does it not provide the tax relief to Canadian families that they so earnestly deserve?

**Mr. Jason Kenney:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's question. I can only assume that the answer is that the members of the Liberal government honestly believe, and I grant them that they believe this sincerely in their little red Liberal hearts, that they and their bureaucrats here in Ottawa know better how to spend an extra buck than a taxpayer in Fundy—Royal or Calgary Southeast. That is fundamentally what drives the philosophy of this throne speech and this government. It is a philosophy which has been abandoned by virtually every other government of the developed world.

Let us take again the case of Ireland. It had a subsidy drenched subsistence economy with the highest taxes in Europe, whose only major export was its young people. They could have kind of moped along and said "Oh, well, we politicians and bureaucrats are going to keep on subsidizing, raising taxes and intervening in the economy", but they had the courage to do something different. They took a risk. They went out and cut corporate taxes from 40% to 10%. They cut income taxes. They cut their capital gains taxes. What they saw was a massive explosion in that economy, so that now 20% of the direct investment in Europe is going to a country with only 1% of Europe's population. They became the second largest software exporter in the world. Ireland's population is now growing for the first time in 150 years.

• (1140)

I cannot hesitate to remind my colleague from Fundy—Royal that, unfortunately, it was his party's government which oversaw the largest decrease in after tax disposable income in modern Canadian economic history because of its 72 tax increases, but I will not mention that.

**Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the member opposite has raised the issue of the Tory tax increases that we all had to suffer through in the 1980s. However, there was a group of Canadians who enjoyed some tax reductions. Those are some of the wealthiest Canadians in this country.

As someone who lives in the province of Ontario, I hear all this talk about the united alternative, uniting options on the right and tax cutters for the rich. The only thing they are interested in doing is cutting taxes for the rich. They do not care about the health and

the well-being of families in this country. They do not care about the struggles of the lower income classes. It is a farce when they talk about cutting taxes. What they are really talking about is making more money available for their rich friends, whether their rich friends are in Calgary or in Fundy—Royal.

I ask the member opposite if indeed he was willing to join in the hands of friendship and ideology with members of the Conservative Party as it slashed the taxes of the rich and made the poor continue to pay?

**Mr. Jason Kenney:** Mr. Speaker, this coming from a member whose government takes \$6 billion a year from people earning under \$20,000 a year. It is a government that takes \$12 billion a year from people earning under \$30,000 a year. It is a government that has put 900,000 low income people on the tax rolls through its back door tax increase called bracket creep. It is a government that gives billions of dollars of subsidies away to its big business friends like Bombardier.

When I hear the millionaires who populate the front bench of the government talk about concern for the poor, whom they put on the tax rolls and from whom they extract billions of dollars, it is a little bit disingenuous. The reality is that the top 1% of income earners in Canada pay over 20% of federal taxes. They are paying their share. Maybe it is time the millionaires on the front bench of the government paid their share.

**Mr. Hec Clouthier (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely delighted to inform the House that I will be sharing my time with the Ciceronian orator from Mississauga West.

I am privileged and pleased to stand in my place to speak on behalf of all constituents of the great riding of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke to make a reply to that carefully crafted, compassionate, caring 1999 throne speech.

Last night I had the privilege of having the Minister of Finance appear at a function in my riding. I might add that he braved rather stormy weather to make it up to the Petawawa Civic Centre. When he spoke, and he spoke very eloquently, he thanked the many people of the great riding of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, in the upper Ottawa valley, for everything they have done in the last 150 years to make Canada the greatest country in the world in which to live.

I looked around the room to see some of the people who were participating in this rather auspicious event. There were 10 other members of parliament who attended. Some of them are here in the House as we speak. As a matter of fact, some of them were from the opposition. I must say, unequivocally, that I agreed with the Minister of Finance that he had definitely hit the nail on the head. What the throne speech effectively did was tell the Canadian

### *The Address*

people that the government has done a great job. We hope that it continues to do so as we continue to build the country to greatness.

● (1145)

I looked around the room and at a table was my 83 year old father, Hector Sr., who has a grade four education. I know the hon. member for Calgary Southeast wanted to talk about people with money. I will be the first to admit that my father has money. I have nothing. I do not even have hair. At the age of 83 he has more hair than I. My father worked very hard for everything he has accomplished in life. At one time he had two lumber camps on the go with 125 men in each camp. He paid his dues. He is a good French Canadian Catholic married to an Irish lassie. They had 10 children and, I might add, my mother said I was the best of the 10. I grew up to be the worst which I guess pointed clearly to a career in politics.

At that same table sat the two aunts of our current finance minister. I will not divulge their ages but my father apparently took one of the finance minister's aunts out on a date many years ago. What is interesting to note is that our finance minister's father, the late Paul Martin Sr., was born and raised in Pembroke. He went to school and launched his political career in Pembroke.

The hon. members opposite can talk about being American wannabes, but what do the Americans cherish most about Canada? They cherish our valued health care system, our medicare. Paul Martin Sr. was the genesis who promoted medicare back in the 1950s and 1960s. We would not have that valued program were it not for people like Paul Martin Sr. When they are talking about balancing the books and reducing taxes, in many instances the members of the loyal opposition are talking about a frontal attack on medicare. Let us keep things in perspective.

Sitting at that same table was a man by the name of Roy Geisebreck, whom the finance minister will remember playing hockey with back in the 1950s and 1960s in Pembroke and Petawawa. The Geisebreck family is not only famous for their hockey playing talents. The member opposite spoke rather eloquently about small and medium sized businesses. The Geisebreck family has been one of the business mainstays in my riding for well over 70 years. There were seven brothers involved in the business started by their late dad, Charlie. Now Roy Geisebreck, who is 82, is the patriarch of that remarkable family.

It is people like Roy Geisebreck and his family who have really built this county through hard work and determination. They did not skate around the issue like some of the hon. members from the Reform Party and some of the opposition. I might add that Roy Geisebreck's son, Don Geisebreck, and I are partners in a few racehorses. It saddens me to say that some of those famous Geisebreck brothers can actually skate faster than my horses can run.

John Yakabuski was there from Barry's Bay. His father was a member of the provincial government for over 23 years, the provincial government that Premier Mike Harris currently leads.

*The Address*

John has seen the light. He has seen that I am going to support the Liberal Party. He was there last night supporting a well known Liberal in my constituency. His father was a former member of the Conservative Party. I believe that if Paul Yakabuski was alive today he would turn over in his grave for the way the provincial Conservative government has treated the quality of life for the people in the province of Ontario.

The hon. member opposite talks about tax cuts. They made tax cuts, no question about it, but with borrowed money. One should not make tax cuts with borrowed money. As a result of making those tax cuts with borrowed money, they had to do some closures.

• (1150)

In my riding they closed the Civic Hospital in Pembroke, Ontario. They tried to close a senior citizen's complex in Cobden, Ontario but there was a real brouhaha. We fought back, as only we can do in the upper Ottawa valley, and it did not close.

John Yakabuski, as we speak, is on council in Barry's Bay. He has also taken over his dad's hardware business and is doing a remarkable job. Again, I say to the member opposite, he is one of these people with a small and medium-sized business who is certainly promoting not only the quality of life for Canadians but also the Canadian culture. He was absolutely delighted last night with the throne speech that was brought down by Her Excellency Adrienne Clarkson.

Mr. Speaker, you are well aware of Renfrew, Ontario. I believe that you have a cottage up in Renfrew where on occasion you go canoeing and swim. You would know Mac Wilson from Renfrew. Mac Wilson was at this very auspicious event last night. Mac Wilson suffered some health problems about six or seven months ago. He was hospitalized in Ottawa because we have great medicare and he took advantage of the medicare system. Mac was on his back. What did he do? Did he give up? No, he fought back. He picked himself up and went back to work in Renfrew. He is the industrial commissioner but not only that, as you well know, Mr. Speaker by knowing Mr. Wilson personally, he is one of the great entrepreneurial spirits in Renfrew, Ontario.

We had big Len Shean there last night. He is the mayor of Arnprior. Len got up and asked the finance minister what we were going to do about the four-laning of Highway 17. I completely agree with Mr. Shean, the big mayor. He said we should have more funding set aside for the four-laning of Highway 17. The finance minister clearly indicated to him that we were looking favourably at it but that basically it was at the disposal of the provincial Conservative government. However, we will arm-twist and I am sure that we will get the job done.

We had Tommy Donohue there from the farming community of Douglas. He is another person that you know, Mr. Speaker. Stay in

your own riding, Mr. Speaker, and do not run in mine because I would like to be here again and again and hear many more throne speeches to make sure that we take the lead in providing what the country needs.

One singular characteristic that is endemic to all of these people I have spoken about, and not only to those people but to many people throughout Canada, is simply that they have taken personal responsibility for their lives. They do not want us, nor do we want as a government, to infringe upon their entrepreneurial spirit or their *joie de vivre* by saying that we are going to tell them what to do. These people take personal responsibility for their lives. They have the vision. They have the values of this party and, I am sure, of every colleague in the House.

I am absolutely delighted to speak on this the last throne speech for the 20th century and hopefully, if the voters from the great riding of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke see fit, I will be here for the first of many throne speeches delivered from this side of the House I might add, so that we will continue to charge on to greatness for this wonderful country called Canada.

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today in reply to my colleague on the throne speech.

Before I do that, I would just like to congratulate Her Excellency Adrienne Clarkson on her appointment to the position of Governor General.

What my colleague from the other side said is quite interesting. I would just like to remind him that he is in a federal parliament not in a provincial legislature talking about provincial issues.

Let me ask the member this question. It was quoted today in the paper by the Minister of Industry that a stronger focus is needed on tax cuts. It states here that he is wise enough to put on the record that tax reform is an important issue. The government is not taking this issue as seriously as its own industry minister. I would like the hon. member to comment on that point.

**Mr. Hec Clouthier:** Mr. Speaker, here we go again. When the Reform Party first got elected their mantra for years and years was that we have to reduce the deficit. There was really no talk about tax cuts. Its plan, fresh start, or no start, or behind start, or whatever it was, false start, kick start, clearly said to the Canadian public that we had to eradicate the deficit that was left behind by the Conservative government. I might add that probably 98% of those members—and I just saw a former Liberal, who is in the Reform Party, leave—were probably Conservative supporters before they joined this other party. They were responsible for a \$43 billion annual deficit. We eradicated that deficit. We now have a surplus and are giving tax cuts. We have given \$16.5 billion in tax cuts.

*The Address*

• (1155)

I do not know of what the member speaks. We are moving in a comprehensive manner. We will give further tax cuts. That is clearly in our red book agenda. I do not know where he is coming from. I might tell the hon. member opposite something which I said to the Civitan Club last week in Cobden, Ontario. One person got up and asked me if I liked paying taxes. I told him to get on the band wagon. I said that I do not like paying taxes but that they are a reality of life. If the hon. member opposite does not want to pay taxes he should move to some third world country where there are no taxes. However, my friend, there is also nothing else, no schools, no infrastructure, no security, no nothing. We will reduce and we have reduced taxes.

It is egregious, it is polemic, it is downright stupid for the Reform Party to stand and say “cut taxes” when we have already done that. All their mantra was to get rid of the deficit and we have done that. As a matter of fact, in the Reform Party’s false start agenda it stated it would reach a no deficit in the exalted timeframe of the year 2000. Let me get this straight. I am not a mathematical genius, but we did it two years in advance and we will continue to do it. This is the first time there has been two balanced budgets since 1951-52. I hope that answers the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to the member speak about his family’s history. It was interesting. However, after four months of inactivity, I was expecting to hear something about the throne speech.

The purpose of a throne speech half way through a term of office is not the same as one at the beginning of a term of office. Right now, there are problems. The focus of the member’s speech could have been very specific.

I would like the member to take a few moments to talk to us about the constitutional crisis, the fisheries crisis, the health and education crisis, the transportation crisis, the poverty crisis, the EI crisis and the millennium scholarship crisis.

After four months of inactivity, I think it is time to deal with serious issues and leave family history aside.

**Mr. Hec Clouthier:** Mr. Speaker, I am very very proud of my family. My father was a logger and a farmer, and I am proud of that.

The hon. member says that the member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke is always talking about people. But Canada is its people. I would tell my friend: “Stay in Canada because you know that this is the greatest country of them all. Stay calm, my friend. You know very well that it is the country of all the people served by all the members of this House of Commons”. I am very surprised that he feels education is not—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Member but his time is up. The hon. member for Mississauga West.

[*English*]

**Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, congratulations to you on the exalted position you have been returned to.

How does one follow the oratorical splendour of the previous speaker? He neglected to tell the House that the event he was talking about last evening was his 50th birthday party. We should say happy birthday to our friend from Pembroke. I was also interested to hear him tell the House that his mother and dad had 10 children, as did mine, interestingly enough. We have a few other things in common. We are brothers. It appears we must be related.

• (1200)

He talked about his father. The interesting thing about my situation is that my dad was a national labour leader. I often say that having 10 children, my mother and dad were the only couple I knew who were constantly in labour together.

I find it interesting, though, returning to the issue at hand, to listen to what clearly amounts to nothing more than a feeding frenzy by the opposition.

I thought about this place over the break this summer. I thought that it would be interesting to try to bring some civility into parliament. I must admit that sometimes I have contributed to the rising temperature in some members opposite. I was shocked this morning, when I got back on my elevator to go upstairs in my apartment building, to see the member for Wild Rose coming down. My God, he is in my building and there goes the neighbourhood. Property values are apparently in serious trouble. I will have to look for alternative accommodation.

The Reform Party spent the summer, as we all know, busily bashing one another. Infighting occurred. Expulsions into the back row or oblivion or right out of caucus appeared on the front page of every journal in the country on a regular basis. Then when Reformers got tired of that they bashed poor Joe Clark. It seems that Mr. Clark has rejected their amorous attempts to bring them together in bed. All this internal combustion that has been taking place appears to be exploding. Someone has lit a match under them, I guess, and it appears to be now exploding back into this place in parliament.

As much as I really want to try to deal with the issues, it would be interesting if the opposition parties could try to do the same thing. What they are doing now is just simply, mindlessly, without any kind of proper research other than perhaps the *National Post*, casting aspersions.

*The Address*

I talked to Canadians all summer. When they watch this stuff they get confused. They ask who is right and who they should believe. Should they believe the Reform Party? We are saying we will cut taxes. The Reform Party cannot take yes for an answer. Canadians look at it and wonder if they should believe these guys in the opposition or believe the government.

I heard one thing this morning from the opposition that I agree with. The critic for finance said that Canadians deserve credit for the financial turnaround of the country, and he is absolutely right. Unfortunately he then went off into a tirade of nonsensical nonsense, if there is such a thing, a double standard, and he lost a very good point. It is the people in Canada who indeed have worked hard, who have re-elected the government because they believed in the platform that we put forward.

We put our cards on the table. We said that we would eliminate that \$42 billion deficit. We said that we would reduce taxes. We have done that, regardless of what the opposition continues to say, by some \$16 billion in the last budget. We will reduce taxes again in spite of what members opposite say. Over 600,000 low income Canadians have been taken off the tax rolls altogether.

Have we done enough? I do not think so. Could we ever do enough to satisfy the appetite of members opposite? I do not think so. Canadians can ask themselves one question, which is the measure of whom to believe: Are we better off as individuals Canadians than we were in 1993?

• (1205)

Members opposite say we are worse off. The United Nations says this is the greatest country in the world in which to live. We know that. I find it interesting that one can say it is the greatest country in the world in which to live unless one lives here. People want to complain.

I had an experience this summer when I went to Strasbourg, France, to the Council of Europe. I listened to the issues that were being debated. There were 41 countries from Europe that got together in Strasbourg at the Council of Europe, a 50 year old institution. I listened to issues they dealt with. They dealt with war, death, destruction of communities, ethnic cleansing and annihilation of entire races of people.

I am not denigrating or putting down the problems we have in the country. Some of them are extremely serious but let us take a look around the world. This country is a marvellous place. Perhaps opposition members could at least concede that this country is a marvellous place and that Canadians are not boastful people as our Prime Minister said. We are quiet, industrious and hard working as a nation. We are known for that throughout the world.

**An hon. member:** Are you quiet?

**Mr. Steve Mahoney:** Maybe not all of us are quiet, I would agree, but we are hard working and industrious. It cannot possibly be the doom and gloom we hear opposite.

I give some credit to the member for Wild Rose for raising the very valid issue of the problems on our reserves. It puzzles me, when I hear a member from the opposite side talking about supporting the natives on our reserves and improving their quality of life, that they do not support the Nisga'a treaty. That treaty has wide support in British Columbia yet they do not support it.

I also heard them talk about people on the street. If there is one problem that is absolutely visible to people who come to this country from other parts of the world, it is the fact that we have a serious homelessness problem. We must do something about it.

It is mentioned in the throne speech, but let me add that a throne speech is a visionary document. It is not a document, unlike what the opposition would like, that simply lays out specifics about the size of a tax cut. Even though it does say there will be a multi-year tax cut based hopefully on a five year plan it cannot give the specifics. The work is yet to be done. Members opposite know full well that those specifics will appear in a budget in February, a budget for which I am quite sure they already have their negative remarks prepared. It will lay it out in detail.

The issues of homelessness and affordable housing are mentioned in the throne speech. Once again one would not or could not possibly put the specifics in a throne speech which deals with a vision of the government.

Turning to the issue of children, my close friend and brother-in-law from England once said to me that when babies start killing babies we have a serious problem. I do not want to overdramatize the issue but we have seen an explosion in the youth in all of North America. It has even occurred in western Canada. There is a reason for it and we must address the reason. It cannot be fixed overnight. There have to be stronger families, stronger opportunities for parental care and supervision, and strong leadership within families.

It is my view that a throne speech simply sets out the vision for that to occur. We want to do all these things and it is difficult to balance everything.

• (1210)

We believe in tax cuts. We absolutely believe in reducing the debt which is a burden for future children of the country. It is a top priority. We believe in our children and in our youth and that the plan laid out in the throne speech has very strong merits to make us the country of the next millennium.

**Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it hurts me to say this but I would like to compliment my two Liberal colleagues on their speeches. I do so because they spoke from the heart. While I fundamentally disagree with much of what they say, they have the ability to speak from their hearts rather than

*The Address*

from a canned speech handed to them by somebody in the lobby. I disagree with much of what they say but I appreciate the fact that they are speaking from their hearts. Perhaps they could talk to their colleagues and give us a little more entertainment in this place.

My colleague made a comment about whom people should trust or believe. People should look at the actions of the government, not at the words but at the actions and what has happened.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** I am really sorry to interrupt the member for Dewdney—Alouette but he used his 30 seconds to compliment them and we will go now to the member for Mississauga West.

**Mr. Steve Mahoney:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the compliments. That is probably all I need to say. I know what his question was—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** We will go now to the member for Churchill River.

**Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the regional diversity of Canada is witnessed by everyone who travels the country, but the agricultural industry and the family farm are in crisis. Time and time again everyone points to the throne speech and says that the family farm was not discussed.

Perhaps the member could respond at some point in time to the fact that part of our family has fallen into hard times. Can he speak to this issue at all?

**Mr. Steve Mahoney:** Mr. Speaker, not representing a farming community obviously puts me at some disadvantage, but as national politicians we must address all these issues.

I thank the member for raising the issue. Our government must continue to support GRIP. We have to find a way to make the family farm stronger. That is part of the overall goal. One does not exclude one segment of society simply because there may not be a specific reference.

We are talking about tax cuts. I think they will help farmers. We are talking about new technology, investing in science, finding new ways to treat crops, new ways to cut costs for farmers and programs that are already in place.

I agree with the member's concern and I am confident the government will help farmers.

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of comments. Forty-eight per cent of the farming community in the areas we have been referring to are up for bankruptcy. Quality of life is in jeopardy for these people, which is something the member would not know anything about because he thinks milk comes from a carton or that pork is manufactured in some plant.

I wish the Liberal government could visit reserves to see the squalor that exists. The Nisga'a agreement does not solve that but accountability does.

When the government came to power in 1993 it announced that one million children were living in poverty and that something had to be done. This morning it was reported that figure increased by 66%. Would the member forget trying to be a comedian and tell me how this wonderful caring Liberal government could allow the number of children in poverty to go up by 66% since it has come into power?

**Mr. Steve Mahoney:** Mr. Speaker, I do not consider child poverty to be a very funny issue at all. Our government has announced that we have already increased the national child credit and that we are committed to doing more in that area.

The most important thing we can do for the country is to ensure that all families, all Canadians, have equal access to opportunity; that children go to school with full bellies in the morning; and that they have proper supervision and someone to come home to at the end of the day. I have raised three boys and I have some understanding of where milk comes from, regardless of the member's denigrating remarks.

• (1215)

We must and we will do something about child poverty. It will be action, not words, and not the negativity I hear coming from members opposite.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I would simply like to draw to your attention the fact that my colleague from Beauharnois—Salaberry will be sharing his time with my colleague for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, and that all colleagues in the Bloc Québécois will be sharing time for the rest of the debate.

**Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity of my first speech of the second session of the 36th legislature to greet the people of Beauharnois—Salaberry and to let them know that I intend to continue to represent them in this House with dignity and to behave in a manner that is fully respectful of Parliament and its members. I reiterate my commitment to continue to serve the public within this institution, a service which gives a deep and sincere meaning to my political commitment.

I would also like to greet my landlady here in the federal capital region, Mrs. Anne Allard, who has honoured me today with her presence in the Opposition gallery.

I was not much impressed by the Speech from the Throne, and even less impressed by the address in reply given yesterday by the

*The Address*

Prime Minister. What I find objectionable in these speeches is not so much their ceremonious nature but, rather, their pretentiousness.

There is something unhealthy about a speech in which the government keeps repeating that Canada is the best country, that it is the envy of the whole world and that others dream of a country like ours. The fact is that such pretentiousness cannot hide the insecurity that characterizes this country, that compels it to make an abusive use of its flag and symbols to create an identity that it is sorely lacking.

Such insecurity probably explains why the Prime Minister likes to refer to Canada as a multicultural, postnational society, while trying to present his government as a national government.

It is not the first such paradox from the Prime Minister. This speech is indeed a paradox, given that a supposedly national government is opting for a way which, for Canada, is increasingly less respectful of federalism, an allegedly national government that is delivering, at least as regards Quebec, an increasingly less coherent speech.

Incidentally, is it not strange that, following the Mont-Tremblant conference on federalism and globalization—in which my colleagues and myself were, as can be expected, very pleased to participate—the word “federalism” is nowhere to be found in the throne speech, nor is the term “federation”, and the adjective “federal” is used only four times?

By contrast, the speech refers to national will, national strategy, national program, national child benefit, national action plan on skills and learning, national health system, national accord with the voluntary sector, and so on.

So, after the great federalist statements made in Mont-Tremblant, here we have the national ambitions in Ottawa. In Mont-Tremblant, Bloc Quebecois members were sovereignists and they still are, here in Ottawa.

National ambitions may seem quite legitimate to Canadians who want the federal government to take on a greater role in the areas of family policy, education, health, or in the voluntary sector.

• (1220)

As far as Quebecers are concerned, the jurisdiction of the National Assembly and of the Government of Quebec should not be limited by such intrusions and by such ambitions, because these ambitions become intrusions. Each successive government in Quebec has challenged the federal government's right to invade Quebec's areas of jurisdiction, by using its exorbitant spending power.

In this regard, the Speech from the Throne, like the latest budget speech, puts the framework agreement on social union at the centre

of its national strategy, an agreement that incorporates the national will of the Liberal government.

It should no doubt be mentioned that Quebec did not sign the agreement, because the Speech from the Throne does not mention Quebec's opposition and treats Quebec's objection as empty. According to the throne speech, the agreement is, and I quote “a commitment by governments to work together for Canadians”. It calls for “governments to report publicly on the effectiveness of social programs”. It also commits “governments to eliminating barriers that unjustifiably impede the mobility of citizens within Canada”.

But what does it matter, the framework agreement on social union, like the Constitution Act, 1982, before it, which Quebecers objected to and continue to do so, is to structure Canada of tomorrow, to provide it with a national government, to focus on health care, post-secondary education and social services.

The Bloc Quebecois will defend the interests of Quebecers here in the House of Commons, and will keep on reminding people that the framework agreement on social union, just like the 1982 Constitution, was adopted without the consent of Quebec and cannot be imposed upon it.

It will continue to demonstrate that Canada is engaged in a process of centralization that adulterates the federal regime, which can scarcely be described as such, since it is obvious that what is wanted for Canada is a single national government, one that barely tolerates the existence of another national will, that of Quebec, which remains free to choose its destiny. That freedom is making the Government of Canada more and more troubled and less and less clear.

The modest place reserved for national unity, an expression moreover that does not figure in the text of the 1999 throne speech, only thinly disguises how much the Liberal government is troubled by this question. The cause of this seems to be the continuing high level of support for sovereignty and the fact that Quebecers are keeping all of their options open as far as their political and constitutional future is concerned.

Moreover, it is aggravated by the fact that the commitment to an in-depth reform of federalism cannot be respected and that no concrete proposal for renewal has been formulated, as is clearly evident in the throne speech and the Prime Minister's address in reply, both of which indicate the total absence of a plan A, which we now realize will never see the light of day.

It also explains the laconic nature of the throne speech, which contains two very general statements, one that suggests Quebecers do not want a third referendum, and another that invents a new principle of clarity. As far as this second point is concerned, the Government of Canada, which demands clarity from others, is



*The Address*

hiding behind a principle of clarity that the supreme court has not ruled constitutional so as to hide its own intentions.

It is leaving itself lots of leeway to interfere in Quebec's referendum process. Will it resort to legislation, a motion, or a ministerial statement? When it comes to clarity, we have seen better.

And here is a clear message to all ministers responsible for clarity, truth, interference and guardianship: they will have to answer to the Bloc Québécois, which will proclaim loud and clear that Quebec is a sovereign nation and that, when the time comes, it will oppose any plan designed to limit its freedom to choose its own destiny.

• (1225)

In conclusion, I would like to quote from Jean de La Fontaine, who wrote in one of his fables:

Discussion is what many like.  
Opinions in the court abound.  
But calls to action strike great fear.  
Supporters then cannot be found.

Today, the government keeps talking about Plan B in an attempt to give it new life. The court of the Prime Minister of Canada and his Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is overflowing with advisers pushing for confrontation with Quebec. If they do not make their intentions clear, they will no longer find any support in Quebec.

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague's speech was very clear and no one asked for any clarification on his excellent analysis of the situation.

Before dealing directly with the throne speech, I want to convey the following message to all farming families in my riding, in Quebec, and even in Canada: the Bloc Québécois will not let you down. The Bloc Québécois will continue to demand additional resources to fight organized crime efficiently and to eliminate the terror that these families are subjected to year after year by cannabis producers.

In the weeks or months to come, my colleagues from Berthier—Montcalm and Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert will propose legal measures to step up the fight against organized crime, particularly with regard to cannabis producers. We expect the government, which has a great responsibility in this regard, to take measures based on our proposals.

That being said, I will now deal with the throne speech from a public finance perspective. First, I want to correct two major blunders found in the Speech from the Throne, which I am sure are accidental, but which have left a lot of people wondering. I am convinced these are mistakes.

The two big blunders found in various parts of the throne speech are the references to tax reductions and to the government's determination to fight poverty. There appears to be two analytical and factual errors in the speech. I will take the next few minutes to set the record straight.

First of all, I practically fell off my seat when I saw in the throne speech that the government had reduced taxes by \$16 billion over three years. At this rate, if we are to believe the government, in about ten years' time, Canadians will not be paying a cent in taxes.

That is what the Minister of Finance is telling us. He talked about the cumulative tax cuts he has supposedly made over the years and added them up. If we took this to its logical conclusion, in ten years not a single Canadian would be paying any personal income taxes.

It is well known that the Minister of Finance eliminates surpluses. The truth is that he has continued to cook the books. A look at the most recent Department of Finance publication shows that Quebecers and Canadians were paying \$5.5 billion less in taxes in 1993-94, before the Minister of Finance and the Liberal government took office, than they are today.

In other words, by means of various hidden taxes, as well as tax tables and a fiscal structure in general that are completely undindexed, the government has increased the tax burden of Quebecers and Canadians by \$5.5 billion since 1993-94. These are real figures.

As I mentioned, these figures can be found in any financial publication put out by the minister's own department.

Undeniably, there have been tax cuts. The last four years have seen a number of such cuts. Let us look at some examples of just what sort of cuts the Minister of Finance is offering.

Let us take the last budget. A significant measure in the last budget was the abolition of the 3% individual surtax.

• (1230)

And who will benefit from the elimination of the 3% surtax? It focuses first and foremost on those with incomes of \$250,000 or higher. These are the people who have benefited from this tax reduction, from the abolition of the 3% surtax. On average, their tax savings this year will be \$3,700.

Yet when one looks at those who have really been the ones responsible for putting public finances on a sounder footing, that is the middle income earners, those with annual incomes of between \$30,000 and \$70,000, they have saved approximately \$160 in taxes this year. They are the ones who are being strangled by the lack of indexation and by other disguised taxes, and they are never the ones who get any recompense for their efforts.

*The Address*

Yes, there have been tax cuts. But cuts for the richest people in this country. Those who have been most responsible for putting public finances on a sounder footing have been totally forgotten.

We in the Bloc have done an analysis on people earning between \$30,000 and \$70,000, and we have consulted Quebeckers on the basis of that analysis. People who earn between \$30,000 and \$70,000 a year are the ones most responsible for putting public finances on a sounder footing, and yet they are the ones with the worst balance, in terms of tax payments.

I will offer two figures to illustrate this. Families earning between \$30,000 and \$70,000 in Canada constitute 27% of Canadian taxpayers. They are responsible for about 50% of personal income taxes that flow into the federal government's coffers.

Do you see the imbalance? These people make up a little over one quarter of all taxpayers, but they contribute half of all the taxes paid by individuals to Ottawa. It is for that group that the government must do something, not for those earning \$250,000 or more, which include millionaire friends of the Minister of Finance.

It is in that category that the government should have taken action, but did not. The fact is that, in net terms, Canadian individuals pay \$5.5 billion more in taxes than they did before the Liberal government came to office, in 1993.

The other major blunder to which I referred earlier is the fight against poverty. I read on page 7 of the throne speech that the government intends to make it easier for families to break the cycle of poverty.

I believe there is a mistake here. I think the analyses were not presented properly and the government will make corrections. How can you break the cycle of poverty when you are the one that created it?

When I see what this government did with employment insurance by excluding close to 60 per cent of those who should normally have benefited from the program, with the result that only 42 or 43% of unemployed people can now collect benefits, I can only conclude that this cycle of poverty was triggered by the government and the result is that there are now 500,000 more children living in poverty than there were when the Liberals came to office. I can only conclude that excluding the unemployed from the employment insurance program, excluding people who are experiencing hard times because they lost their jobs has resulted in an increase in the number of people living in poverty.

How can the cycle of poverty be broken when the government is the author of it and is not prepared to change the employment insurance plan.

In some instances, problems have been deliberately incorporated in the plan. Let us take, for example, the case of pregnant women,

who must stop working because their health and the health of their child are at stake. Because of the problems in the plan, weeks spent on the Quebec CCST are not included in the calculation of hours and weeks worked in order to be able to enjoy special employment insurance benefits subsequently. This is a serious problem. Women are therefore going to think twice before taking precautionary time off work, thus putting their own health and the health of their child at risk.

There are a lot of problems in the system. And why do all these problems exist? Why are most of the unemployed excluded? In order to bring in a surplus of between \$6 billion and \$7 billion. This is despicable. Especially when the government is saying that it wants to break the cycle of poverty and then behaves in this way. This is an acceptable.

The government also cut the Canada social transfer, much of which goes to funding social assistance.

• (1235)

Every year, there is \$4.6 billion less in the plan than there was in 1993. The government wants to break the cycle of poverty, but continues to create it and nurture it.

Finally, when we look at this government, we realize that it generates poverty. In conclusion, in examining this and having seen what the government proposed in the throne speech, we have no choice but to consider this government irresponsible. It is much better at making hollow formulae than at correcting inequality and fighting poverty with vigour.

For all these reasons, we reject this throne speech, which is worth nothing more than the paper it is written on.

[English]

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join the debate on the Speech from the Throne. It really is our first opportunity as commoners to discuss among ourselves and debate our views on how we will see Canada in the 21st century and the new millennium.

As a member of the government side of the House and as a Canadian, I must say how proud I was of our Prime Minister yesterday. He gave a tremendous speech and allowed us to contemplate Canada today in the context of our past.

The Prime Minister reminded us that we did not discover this land, that first nations and Inuit people were here first and welcomed newcomers so many years ago. He reminded us of our French heritage, of our British heritage. He allowed us to appreciate that here in Canada out of the need to respect diversity, we are now a country that values and celebrates diversity; that out of a need to welcome immigrants we are now a country that values and welcomes immigrants and provides a safe place for refugees.

*The Address*

The Prime Minister allowed us to contemplate the fact that out of a need to downplay nationalistic tendencies, we now are a country that values quiet confidence and modesty. Out of a need to share wealth, we in Canada now value the sharing of wealth and generosity not only between and among citizens and between and among regions of this great country, but between Canada and other countries around the world.

We know that Canada out of a need to respect individual citizens and respect the importance of each one of us as Canadians is now a country that absolutely respects and values human rights and freedoms.

Out of the need to govern with compassion over the turbulent but wonderful history we call ours, we are now a country that values governance with compassion, governance with tolerance, governance with generosity. We indeed know that our country is a wonderful and unique federation.

To many, Canada is an experiment, but to us, Canada is a logical, practical and principled society and we are always pushing at the edges of what we know to be civilization. I am convinced that as we move into the 21st century we will continue to do that.

Another thing the Prime Minister said is that in our federation there is room for improvement and that indeed is true. But if we look at the nineties, our options to continue to improve this great country in which we live were limited. The decade of the nineties was a time of turbulence, of difficulties for citizens and for our country.

We know that unemployment rates were extraordinarily high. We know that there was a lack of confidence in Canadian institutions, including government. We know that our country's unity was being challenged. We know that we were under very significant fiscal constraints. But with the leadership of our Prime Minister and with the extraordinary will of the Canadian people we are now back in a stable form.

Unemployment is at its lowest level in nine years at 7.5%. There is an increasing respect and confidence in Canadian institutions. We know that we live in a great federation and we are continuing to appreciate that and to build on that. We got our fiscal house in order. We are governing in a balanced way. We are attacking our debt.

• (1240 )

As Liberals we have always said that we were not interested in making cuts for the sake of making cuts. Getting our fiscal house in order was a challenge we set for ourselves so that we would allow ourselves the choices to continue to improve and build on our great federation.

On the Speech from the Throne, the Prime Minister identified in his speech yesterday a number of areas that we set out as our

priorities as we move into the 21st century. We want to continue to build our strong federation. I would like elaborate on a couple of those aspects in my speech today.

First, Canadians now know that the government has put a priority and a focus on our children. As we reflect on the work of our country in the past decades, we know that we have found ways to support Canadian seniors with programs like the old age security, guaranteed income supplement and our partnership with the provinces with the Canada pension plan. Those are programs that Canadians know and appreciate and which seniors access. Those programs have allowed us to significantly reduce poverty among Canadian seniors.

We have programs in place to support working age Canadians, such as employment insurance and the provinces have income support. Those programs are there. Canadians are familiar with them and use them if they have to.

Since 1993 we have understood that there is a role for us to play in working with Canada's youth. The youth employment strategy was introduced. We have encouraged and supported our young people in finding that very important first job. We have encouraged them to continue with post-secondary education. We are finding ways as a country to support our youth.

In the Speech from the Throne we identified continuing ways to support Canada's youth by ensuring that they have the opportunity to travel this great nation through exchanges to get to know each other. That is critically important in a country as large as ours. We know that at earlier ages young people are able to contribute and the notion of celebrating their first works is an important priority for our government.

We have not spent a lot of time considering how we build a strong relationship with our children. It is probably because we believe that it is parents who really are the critical element in ensuring that our children are supported and nurtured. There is no question that remains paramount. It is parents who have the responsibility and the ability to raise healthy children.

But times are changing. It is very expensive to raise children. Yes, it is appropriate that we make tax cuts in support of families. The Reform Party would see that as being the only support we can provide to our children, but we know there is much more that is needed.

Research is telling us that the very early years of a child's life, zero to six, are critical. That research is now becoming more and more available to us. In the Speech from the Throne we have been directed to work together as governments, the Government of Canada with the provinces and territories, to explore this research, to understand it and to build some common values and principles as to how we can support parents and children through those very early times.

*The Address*

That work has already begun. We have sat at the table with the provinces and territories. We have built a document, the national children's agenda, which is now being discussed in workshops around Canada. We will look for input from Canadians on that to assess the values and principles that should guide us as we build a stronger partnership with Canadian citizens, parents and children to support early childhood development. We intend to have that work completed and to present it to Canadians by December 2000.

There is more. We know there is a direct relationship between children at risk and the income of their families. Provinces have supported families through income support measures and services for children. We know that the most important thing we can do is to find ways and means for all Canadians to have a job. That is the biggest thing we can do.

When parents, men and women, move from welfare into a job, very often that job may be low paying. It is difficult for parents to contemplate leaving welfare, where services may also be part of their support for their children, to take a low paying job. We are changing that through the national child benefit. In this system the federal government provides money to families with children for income whether they are on income support or in low wage positions.

• (1245)

The savings that the provinces gleaned from that additional money coming from the federal government are being reinvested in services for Canadian children, services that are available to them whether they are supported by families on income support or in low income jobs.

We are making progress. In Quebec we see the \$5 a day day care approach. In Alberta we see the focus on providing health services, dental care and eye examinations for children. These are the kinds of approaches that show a flexible relationship between the Government of Canada and the provinces is working. We know it to be a good platform and we want to build on that.

In the Speech from the Throne we identified that we would make a significant additional investment in the national child benefit by July 2002. Of course everyone heard the Prime Minister yesterday. He identified this as being a priority and he has moved that date up to July 2001. That is a strong message to the people of Canada. We know that we have to support our children. We have to focus on child poverty and we have to focus on it in a way that will allow parents to get work and to contribute, in partnership with their governments.

There is another aspect to this that is tremendously important. We are starting to really understand the changing relationship between the workplace and the family. Seventy per cent of Canadian families are dual income families, mom and dad both working.

Of course that is changing the relationship between what they are able to do as parents in support of their children. That is where we step back and ask, recognizing that those early years are so important, is there not something more that we can do to help parents spend more time with their children and their infants in those very early years? We have identified that indeed there is. Yesterday the Prime Minister announced that by January 1, 2001 we would double the parental benefit for Canadian citizens. We have directly shown how important a contribution this is to building a strong Canada through our children.

The Prime Minister said that we would double the benefit, make it more flexible and more accessible. In terms of flexibility, we will focus on the parental benefit. We will not tell families which parent should stay at home. They will decide.

In terms of flexibility, we also appreciate that there are adoptive parents and that they too need to be home with their children in those early years.

In terms of accessibility, we will know that we have made changes to the employment insurance program. Wisely, we have put in place a monitoring and assessment system so that every year we receive information about how that system is working.

We are seeing in last year's monitoring and assessment report that indeed there may be an unintended effect on women. In the way that women relate to the workplace, they may not be accessing benefits in the way we expected them to do. I am looking forward to receiving this year's monitoring and assessment report to contemplate that trend, to see if indeed we have to do something to ensure there is accessibility.

I know that colleagues on this side of the House have begun to talk about it with me—the member for Essex, the member for Guelph—Wellington and others—and we will look at this.

As the Prime Minister indicated, we want to ensure that there is accessibility to this incredible and significant new plan that was announced yesterday.

With all this and a focus on children we are recognizing that it is wise for us to invest in the early years. Right now there is a cost to us in supporting prisons and youth justice systems because our children may not be getting a healthy start. For us it makes a lot more sense to put the investment in the early years. If we focus on our children the dividends will be huge.

Out of a need to invest in our children I am convinced that we will come to value children as our most valuable resource.

In the context of valuing people, let us turn to another aspect of the Speech from the Throne. We know that our economy has changed. We are in the knowledge based economy now. The challenge for us as a country is to ensure that our citizens have the

ability to participate in the knowledge based economy, to be able to continue to develop and benefit from a vastly and rapidly changing economy. We will do that.

• (1250)

First and foremost we have to ensure that we build a tradition of lifelong learning in Canada. In the Speech from the Throne we identified that that will be a priority for us, to work with our partners, with the private sector and with the provinces to do what we can to make sure that from our very early years right through to our senior years we value and engage in lifelong learning. That means improving literacy, without question. We have a dynamic partnership with the provinces right across this country in focusing on upgrading the literacy of our citizens.

We have also built strong partnerships with the provinces in the area of labour market development. The provinces now have active measures within the agreements that we have written with most provinces and they are using them to facilitate and stimulate the capacity development of their citizens so they can participate in the new Canadian economy.

We need to do more. We need to appreciate that our economy is not a single economy, but is sectoral. There are different aspects and sectors to the diverse Canadian economy. We need to partner more effectively with the private sector and with unions to understand that, to encourage them to look at their industries, to look at the timeframes, to help smooth out the peaks and valleys, to identify their workforce requirements. We can do a better job in this regard. In fact, by doing so, instead of following the trends in the economy, we can lead the trends in the economy.

Another thing that is tremendously important is making sure that Canadians have the information they need to make decisions about employment opportunities and business opportunities. There was a recent forum for labour market ministers, attended by all provinces and territories, including Quebec, to talk about this. We agreed that it is wise for us to work together to create a platform of information that can be used locally at the community level, at the provincial level, at the national level and at the international level so that Canadians have the information they need to make the appropriate decisions for their lives and the lives of their families.

There is a third aspect in all of this that I would like to reflect upon as my time draws to an end and that is how we should build public policies in the 21st century. Without question, we have to reach out and engage others at the very beginning of the development of policies. We have to work with the private sector and with the voluntary sector. We cannot abrogate our responsibility to lead and to make important decisions, but we can find a modern way, a 21st century way, of building sustainable policies and programs that speak to all Canadians.

### *The Address*

This is a fundamental issue. In the 21st century what we want to do is challenge ourselves to write policies that are inclusive, policies that do not inadvertently exclude people: Canadians with disabilities, aboriginal people, those from low income families. That is not the way to build appropriate responses to the needs of Canadians. Rather, from the very first instance we want to contemplate policies that speak to all Canadians, policies in which all Canadians can see themselves right from the start.

These are the challenges that we have set for ourselves. They are a reflection of our belief that we live in a wonderful country, that we have built a flexible federation, that we have something to work for, something to be proud of and something to build upon.

The Speech from the Throne, as it was presented, gives us all these opportunities. I, as a member of this side of the House and a great team, am committed to doing what I can to continue to build a great Canada, to build a Canada which is where people want to be in the 21st century, to build a Canada that we know will continue to be the greatest country in the world in which to live.

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, having known this minister now for quite some time I realize that there is a lot of care and a lot of compassion in her heart. I can understand that. We have talked a lot over the years about the squalid conditions on reserves, the poverty that exists. The conditions, by the way, are not getting any better; they are getting worse in many cases.

I have continued to visit these reserves on a regular basis, right up until the time we returned to the House this month. Apparently nothing the government has done over the last six years has improved the conditions. They continually get worse and there are more and more problems.

• (1255)

It has also been brought to my attention that in 1993 members of the House said that we had to do something about the one million children living in poverty. Today it was reported that poverty has increased by 66%. That means we no longer have one million in poverty, we now have 1,600,000.

It was also reported this morning that for every one million children who go to school, 166,000 of them go hungry.

These are the problems that exist. They are worse today than they were in 1993 when the government took office. What has the government in mind to deal with these problems? Programs designed for the year 2001 are not going to make a lot of people happy. What is it going to do tomorrow to alleviate these problems? What measures is it going to take to eliminate these serious problems? Instead of all the fluffy talk, where is the meat? Where is the action? I want to see it.

*The Address*

**Hon. Jane Stewart:** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the question. Indeed, the issue of child poverty is an issue that the government takes very seriously. That is why we have already invested \$1.7 billion extra per year in the national child benefit. It is that benefit that goes to children in low income families. It is that benefit that allows provinces to reinvest their savings in services for these children in the kinds of projects that the hon. member references, food, child support and all those sorts of things.

That is why, recognizing this as being a priority, in the Speech from the Throne it was announced that we are going to invest another significant amount in the child benefit.

Despite all this, I bet that side of the House will vote against these measures.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, the minister said that, in Canada, the rich were getting richer and the poor were getting poorer. This was what she told *La Presse* about two weeks ago. We were looking forward to some sort of corrective action in the throne speech.

Today, 40% of elderly women living on their own are living below the poverty level. Our old age pension system leaves 40% of elderly women living below the poverty level, and the throne speech offered no solution.

Then there is EI, for which 40% of unemployed workers qualify. We showed in great detail how this was unacceptable, but the throne speech is silent on the topic.

Today, all Canada's resource regions are facing terrible situations. We argued for a full year against the intensity rule for seasonal workers, among others. In resource regions, 80% of workers are affected by this rule. After 20 weeks, benefits drop to 50%, after 40 weeks, to 53%, and after 100 weeks, to 50%. All our seasonal workers have reached that point.

I would have expected the new Minister of Human Resources Development to have won out over her more hardhearted Cabinet colleagues, but it seems not.

She stated that having a job is the best way to improve one's lot. That is true, but one must have a decent income. A good example of this can be found in the United States. The unemployment level is 4%, but a lot of people are worse off now than before even if they are working.

Here in Canada we have the same situation developing, because we wanted to have an employment insurance system similar to the Americans'. More and more people have work, the unemployment rate is dropping, but the bottom line is that overall family incomes

have dropped. This is not an incentive to work, but a disincentive. It tells people "Even if you work, you will not qualify, or if you do qualify, we will not give you enough weeks of benefits". This is a direct incentive to drop out of the system and to get paid under the table, and I expected that issue to be raised in the speech.

I will conclude with the matter of parental leave. If I have understood the minister correctly, she is going to wait for the third year report evaluating the employment insurance program before deciding whether she is going to make eligibility conditions easier for women. If she does indeed wait for the third year, I have just realized why the program would come into effect only in 2001. This means we will have another year of the program we criticized back in March 1999, when we asked her predecessor a question which prompted the answer "because there are fewer people being born, a lower birth rate, so there are no problems with maternity benefits". We have proof that, despite a 4.6% drop in the birth rate, there were 7.4% fewer recipients. There was also a 7% drop in the amount paid out.

• (1300)

Cannot the minister commit today to stating that the rules for eligibility, which have nothing to do with extending the length of parental leave, could very easily take effect now?

[*English*]

**Hon. Jane Stewart:** Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member looks at the Speech from the Throne and the commitments of the Prime Minister to double parental benefits, he will see that significant changes to the employment insurance system have been announced. Everything that he speaks about suggests that he will indeed support us in terms of the Speech from the Throne and the measures we introduced.

As the economy has changed and increased, one thing that has become clear is that poverty has been stopped this time around. Usually as the economy increases poverty returns. It ebbs. However this time it has not and that is why at this juncture in our history we must stand back and take stock. We must remember that governments have a role to play in supporting their citizens and in developing programs and policies that do not create have and have not.

If he looks at the items itemized in the Speech from the Throne and listened to the speech of the Prime Minister yesterday and the speeches from this side of the House over the course of this debate, the hon. member will see that we understand the role we must play in ensuring that we do not create have and have nots in Canada. One of the best ways of doing it is to focus on our children, and we are committed to doing that.

*The Address*

[Translation]

**Mr. André Harvey (Chicoutimi, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I think all of us here want the federation to work, we want the sharing of powers between the provinces and the federal government to work properly.

The problem is that everyone wants to be excessively visible. The provinces, like the federal government, want to be excessively visible, with the result that there are new programs that lack clarity, both at the provincial and federal levels.

For instance, there is currently no issue more serious than health in our country. Who would have thought that, one day, Canadians would have to travel to the United States to get medical treatment? I am convinced that the Canadian government, whose role is to ensure compliance with the Canada Health Act, did not amend that act—at least I did not see anything to that effect—to provide that Canadians will have to get medical treatment in the United States.

I want to ask the minister if she thinks—after cutting \$17 billion in the social transfers to the provinces for health, education and help for the poor—that the government can do its utmost to ensure that people can get medical treatment in our country. Especially in Quebec, there are very serious problems in the hospitals' emergency services and some people have no choice but to get medical treatment outside Canada. In addition to the internal problems that we are faced with because of a lack of funding, the cuts made to transfer payments have been drastic. This is true for every sector, but I am asking the minister if there is any hope for the health sector.

[English]

**Hon. Jane Stewart:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is specifically asking the Government of Canada to focus on the issue of health care. I remind him that indeed we have. Some \$11.5 billion were announced in the last budget to continue to support delivery of health services by the provinces.

That is the kind of partnership we in Canada believe in. That is the kind of flexible federation we know works and that is the approach we are committed to continuing.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by announcing that I will be splitting my 20 minutes with the hon. member for Vancouver East.

In the limited time I have available I would like to make a few comments on the Speech from the Throne and the state we find the government in. It is hard to pick a metaphor. Many metaphors come to mind. One thinks of the metaphor of a deer caught in the headlights. One thinks of the metaphor of an absentee landlord. One thinks of the metaphor of Nero fiddling while Rome burns. There is a long list of things for which the government stands

condemned for a failure to act in a timely fashion, or in many cases a failure to act at all.

I will just go down the list, but I do not have the time to go into all of them in the detail that I would like. The first one that comes to mind is the crisis in agriculture in the country and the fact that producers in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and many other places are facing an income crisis the like of which they have never experienced before. Yet we see a government unwilling to act, pathetically trying to cram solutions to this unique crisis into programs that were developed for much less severe circumstances. The government stands condemned in terms of its inaction with respect to agriculture.

• (1305)

We have a crisis in the airline industry in the country, and what do we hear from the Prime Minister? We hear the Prime Minister say it is a private matter. I cannot imagine that even 10 years ago, and particularly 15 or 20 years ago, the Prime Minister of Canada would have said that the future of the Canadian airline industry—Air Canada, Canadian Airlines and the structure of the Canadian air transportation system—was a private matter. Yet that is the kind of thing the Prime Minister has said.

We have a government that has stood idly by without taking the kind of action which might ensure that not only jobs and consumers are protected but that Canadian control is protected and we do not end up in a situation in the country like we now have with the railways where basically we are owned and controlled by American shareholders.

On water exports, we have various provincial projects going ahead. The Gisborne Lake project in Newfoundland has received tentative forms of approval. Instead of acting on a motion passed by the House of Commons back in February which called for a national ban on the export of bulk water, we have nothing except the ball being thrown back and forth between various provincial capitals and this government. There has been no action yet to ban bulk water exports and no promise of such legislation in the throne speech, not a mention of it.

When it comes to the fishery on the east coast and the judgment of the supreme court with respect to the treaty rights of aboriginal people in that area, we have a government which appears to have been totally unable to have anticipated what that judgment might be or to have anticipated difference scenarios so that if the judgment came down in favour of treaty rights, as did happen, then it would have some plan in place. This is just elementary. Yet it is almost as if the Liberals were caught completely by surprise and almost as if they did not even know the supreme court was considering it.

This has been complicated. It arose in the first place because of an unwillingness on the part of the government to act on the

*The Address*

recommendations of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples which said that these things should be negotiated and not left to the courts. Were they negotiated? Was there action taken? Nothing. Now we have an horrendous crisis on the east coast as a result of that inaction.

On homelessness, winter is coming. Perhaps the Liberals do not know this. Perhaps so many of them go on winter holidays that they do not know that winter is coming and it gets cold in Canada. We have thousands, perhaps tens of thousands of people who are homeless. Yet did we see any commitment to real money and real action in the throne speech with respect to homelessness? We have a minister of housing but we do not have a minister who is willing to do anything about homelessness, or about housing for that matter.

We have the crisis in the west coast with respect to the abuse of our refugee system and all the questions that raises. Have we seen any action yet that would maintain the integrity of our refugee system while at the same time attack and address the fact that this system is being abused? No. I do not know what the government is waiting for, and no one else seems to know.

We have had for a long time now promises of legislation to deal with new reproductive technologies and all the tremendous choices, options and I would say potential evils and dangers that lurk in that array of technologies. Did we have any mention of this in the throne speech? Is there any intention on the part of the government to deal with this? Silence. Is that all we get from the throne speech? The feeling is that if we could just hook everyone up to the Internet and send a few kids on an exchange program here and there everything will be terrific. It will not be. We have to address these issues and more.

• (1310)

On child poverty, soon it will be the 10th anniversary of the motion introduced by the hon. member from Oshawa, my former leader Ed Broadbent, and passed in the House. Ten years will have passed. Will child poverty have been dealt with?

The list goes on and on. People know as a result of court decisions that our child pornography laws are inadequate. We can have a debate about how we should respond to that, whether we should use the notwithstanding clause, appeal the decision or whether we should bring the law back to parliament and write a better law if the law is inadequate. Let us write a law that deals with that situation. Do we have such a law before us? Do we have even the promise of such a law before us? Not a hint, not a sniff of action on any of these fronts.

It is worth asking why there is this powerlessness, this impotence and this complete silence with respect to so many issues. If we look we will see that the underlying reality of all this is the way in which over the past 10 or 15 years, sometimes for good and well

intentioned reasons and other times for less well intentioned reasons, this place, both parliament and government, has abdicated its responsibility in many ways to first the marketplace and in some other ways to the courts. The government reflects the powerlessness it has chosen by repeatedly signing agreements or adopting policies that make it incapable of dealing with a lot of the situations that we have before us.

Why in part do we have the crisis in agriculture? Because this government and governments before it have deliberately stripped the Canadian farmer of all the support systems that used to exist. Why? Because we wanted to be the international Boy Scouts of the marketplace, with all due respect to the Boy Scouts because they sometimes get maligned by being associated with the government.

The fact is the government has stripped Canadian farmers of the support systems they used to have. This started with the elimination of the Crow rate and went right on down. Then they say there is a crisis in agriculture. No wonder. Other countries have not left their producers abandoned to the marketplace in the way our country has. There it is, abandoned to the marketplace and to the judgments of the World Trade Organization and various other trade agreements.

On airlines, what we have before us is the result of deregulation and privatization. I can remember when deregulation and privatization first came in. Oh what a wonderful world it was to be with competition, healthy Canadian airlines competing with each other. It was to be a capitalist Nirvana.

At that time we said that what is happening today would happen. We are sorry to be right but the fact is that we were right. What we predicted at that time is now happening. Now we see a government so addicted to the bromides of the marketplace, to the idea that this is a private matter and who would want to interfere in the marketplace, that we stand on the brink of having our airline industry completely taken over by American interests.

The list goes on. We cannot deal with water exports because of NAFTA. We cannot deal with poverty or homelessness because that would involve interfering in the marketplace. What do we have to do for homeless people? Build them houses, for God's sake. That is what they need, but there is no market for the kind of houses poor people can afford.

We would have to do that with government money. We would have to do that outside the marketplace. What a heinous thing. What a blasphemous thing that would be because that is outside the political conversation now. That is outside the ideological universe, or rather prison, the government and parliament live in. It is about time they saw Canadians have had enough of this self-inflicted powerlessness. They want the government to do something. If that means getting out of agreements, intervening in the marketplace and acting like governments used to act, then it is high time it did that.



*The Address*

**Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of listening to the member for Winnipeg—Transcona for a number of years. Philosophically there are a number of issues we are compatible on, but he was not putting out factually correct information on four specific issues related to my community in downtown Toronto.

• (1315)

The first point is on the issue of homelessness. City councillor Jack Layton is having a heyday capitalizing on those 500 to 700 people who are living on the streets of Toronto which none of us like to see. The reality is that the issue is affordable shelter. Yesterday the Prime Minister spoke very specifically about an infrastructure program. I think the member and I know the people of my community will be quite satisfied in the very near future as the whole issue of affordable shelter will be central to the infrastructure plan which is unfolding.

The second issue is that of banning exports of water. The Minister of the Environment even before we had recessed for the summer break took very specific measures in the announcement banning exports of water. That is something the member obviously missed.

Another issue relates to the children's legacy. I do not think anyone in the House would deny the fact that the Prime Minister's remarks in the House last night went a long way toward moving the commitment to children forward. I think it is important that the member when he is criticizing also acknowledge some of the very specific initiatives that were taken.

Finally on the Onex deal where I have very strong views myself, we had assurances yesterday from the Minister of Transport, which I am sure the member read in the paper, that on the issue of air transportation in this country we will have a full and vigorous debate in the House. Every member will have an opportunity to put his or her views forward and will be accountable.

It is important when we are having this debate that we at least acknowledge those areas where the government has acted immediately.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie:** Mr. Speaker, the member says the Prime Minister talked about affordable shelter. Big deal. The government has been talking about affordable shelter for years now. We want to see affordable shelters, real objective things that people can live in and people can find shelter in. We do not want more fancy speeches from the member, the Prime Minister or anyone else when it comes to homelessness. We want real action. My complaint is that there has been no real action.

With respect to water, it is not Wayne's world. That is not the hon. member's name but perhaps it is some other world he lives in. No one else in the whole country is aware that there has been a national ban on bulk water exports except the hon. member for

Broadview—Greenwood. That is some constituency he comes from; maybe there is a bubble around it. There has been no national ban on bulk water exports. To suggest that there has been flies in the face of reality. Talk to Premier Tobin in Newfoundland. Ask him if there has been a national ban on bulk water exports. He is calling for the federal government to either institute one or give him the freedom to act provincially, one way or the other.

With respect to the children's legacy, I am not sure what the hon. member was talking about but the fact is that when it comes to child poverty, it is a lot worse. When it comes to the wonderful, tremendous increase in maternity benefits that the minister for human resources was bragging about not so long ago, it is not going to happen until January 1, 2001. Good luck if a woman is pregnant now or is going to get pregnant in the next year. It does not increase her eligibility. All kinds of women who may be expecting between now and then still, even if they get pregnant in 2002, will not be eligible because the eligibility will not have changed.

With respect to Onex, we are going to have a vigorous debate and then we will get screwed. I have seen enough vigorous debates around here to know that they are meaningless unless there are real options on the table and a real commitment by the government because in the end the government will get its way. It will have the sham of a vigorous debate. It might even let a few Liberal backbenchers stand up and say they do not like what is going on to help the Liberals get re-elected in places like Winnipeg. Winnipeg is one of the places that stands to really get it in the ear if this thing goes through. We will have a nice vigorous debate and then we will have our airline industry taken over by the United States. Some comfort.

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am almost loath to interrupt the wonderful, enlightened flow of consciousness from the member for Winnipeg—Transcona. He has really hit the nail on the head in addressing the issues in the throne speech that concern us. I am very happy he has agreed to share his time with me so I can provide some feedback from my perspective and the perspective of our party with regard to the throne speech.

• (1320)

I listened earlier to the new Minister of Human Resources Development. We hope to see some significant improvements to EI and the national children's agenda.

Hearing the minister's comments about living in a wonderful country with such tolerance and compassion conjures up the image of Liberals looking up at the blue sky with the clouds rolling by. I think of my own community of East Vancouver which is predominantly a low income community and what people are really facing. I have to say that what I heard in the throne speech, what I heard from the Prime Minister, what I have heard from the new Minister of Human Resources Development in no way comes close to

*The Address*

dealing with the realities of what many people in Canada are facing.

Many times we have heard the Prime Minister say how proud he is that Canada has been rated by the United Nations as the number one country in the world in which to live. But let it also be said that the same United Nations has condemned Canada for its failure to live up to international covenants, for its failure to deal with homelessness, to deal with equity and equality, to deal with the growing gap between people who are getting wealthier and people who are getting poorer.

When I listened to the throne speech I wanted to hear on behalf of my constituents some clear realistic objectives and commitments that would see a government prepared to bring in a national children's agenda, to bring in program and income supports that would reverse this downward spiral, this race to the bottom that we are in. Apparently the government does not care about this. I was disappointed by what I heard.

I have received feedback from people in my riding, people who are really hard pressed, parents who are working at more than one job, part time jobs, struggling to find child care with their kids on waiting lists. These people are being threatened because their housing is going to be demolished or 30%, 40%, 50% or in some cases 60% of their income is going toward rent. These are the families I deal with. I know that not just in East Vancouver but in other communities hundreds of thousands of Canadians are facing this reality.

I listened to the Leader of the Opposition and his response to the throne speech and his view of Canada. He has such a narrow definition of what a family is or what a family needs. I look to my own community to see the diversity of single parents who are struggling to make a go of it. They may be on income assistance or working in a low wage job in a service sector and do not have enough money to pay their rent or feed their kids. I heard the Leader of the Opposition with his anti-government message that if we just put a few pennies in our pockets through a tax saving, somehow we will have solutions. We can see that the Reform Party is bankrupt in its ideas in terms of addressing the substantive issues in our society.

When we look at the messages in the throne speech and the unfolding of the so-called national children's agenda we have to question why a national children's agenda exists but there is no child care program. Why does a national children's agenda exist but there is no commitment that the poorest of the poor will have the benefit of the national child tax benefit? Why do we have a national children's agenda that supposedly speaks to the well-being of early childhood development and the well-being of Canadian families but it does not contain any substance to develop affordable housing, the most basic human right for all Canadian families and all people?

We have to be very clear. We cannot accept that a children's agenda will exist without a national child care strategy. For decades numerous groups in this country have advocated for the adoption of an early childhood development program, a national child care program.

When we compare the government's commitments today with what was in the red book in 1993, it seems to me that we are moving further and further away from any kind of program the government is committed to, to actually make child care a reality.

● (1325 )

In 1993 the Liberal Party promised 150,000 child care spaces. Where are they? Six years have gone by. Where are those child care spaces? Why are there tens of thousands of kids on waiting lists to get into child care? Less than 10% of kids who need child care have access to the regulated spaces.

The Liberal government has failed on that score. Its national children's agenda is not worth anything more than the paper it is written on unless there is a substantive financial commitment by the government to work with the provinces to produce those child care spaces.

We have some very good models and examples to look at in terms of what has been developed in the province of Quebec. Why are we not sitting down with the province of Quebec? Why are we not sitting down with the other provinces to make those child care spaces a reality?

I will touch on the issue of housing and homelessness. It is ironic that in the throne speech more time was devoted to the issue of endangered species than there was to the issue of people who are dying on our streets because of homelessness, or people who are living in totally inadequate housing.

It is simply appalling that we have had a minister responsible for homelessness who has yet to produce a single unit of housing. It is appalling that in the throne speech there was not one specific commitment to say that the federal government will produce a national housing strategy.

I have a motion that is coming before the House which calls on the government to commit 1% of the federal budget to housing. Where is that commitment from the other side of the House? Where are the specifics? Where are the housing units that need to be developed?

When it comes to other members of society like students, again in the throne speech we heard platitudes and very lofty ideas about access to the Internet and the knowledge based economy. But what about the students who are trying to get through school? What about the students who are suffering from a massive debt load? Has the Liberal government addressed that issue? Not one line in

*The Address*

the throne speech has shown any understanding of the very harsh realities facing students who are trying to get through school.

We were hoping to see a commitment to a national grants program, to a tuition freeze and to a recognition that post-secondary education should be accessible to all young people. That would be a real commitment to building our future, but instead we saw again the lofty ideas and the clouds passing by in the sky in terms of the Liberals' ideas of what the future is. It is a future that leaves behind young people. It is a future that leaves behind poor people. It is a future that has abandoned the commitment to end child poverty by the year 2000. It is a future that apparently has left women off the list.

Yes, we have had some announcement about parental leave but what about the eligibility requirements? What are parents meant to do after that one year of leave? Where will the child care spaces be so that they can return to work?

After examining the throne speech and seeing exactly what is and is not there, then I would agree with my colleague for Winnipeg—Transcona that it is empty and vacuous. It is from a government that has failed to address the real priorities of Canadians. It is something that we will continue to take up in the House.

**Mr. Janko Perić (Cambridge, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, some 33 years ago I was a newcomer to this country. When I was growing up in Croatia I was poor. I came from a large family. I know what poverty is.

Listening to the speech today by the hon. member for Vancouver East I am a little confused. I do not know what country she is talking about, Canada or some other country.

• (1330)

This summer I had the opportunity to visit our RCMP officers in Sarajevo where I was taken to different parts of Bosnia and Hercegovina. That is where poverty is, not in Canada. I am really surprised to hear the bashing of the Liberal government that it does not care about children and youth in Canada.

I have four children. I did not expect any level of government to take care of them. I did not ask the government to provide me with early childhood benefits or whatnot. I had children with my wife because we wanted a family. We were and still are responsible parents.

No one can deny that there are children who deserve and need support from governments. Of course there are. However, it is not at the level that the hon. member for Vancouver East was saying. The hon. member should not portray Canada as the worst place to live when she knows, as well as many of us in the House, that there

are millions of people who would rather live here than in their own country.

An immigration officer asked me how come he brought refugees to this country a year ago and today they are putting down payments on their homes. They are working and they are responsible new members of our society.

In the future, could the hon. member go across the country and see for herself how great the country really is?

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Mr. Speaker, I guess it is a matter of perspective of where we live and what our daily reality is as to whether or not this is a wonderful country. Do not take it from me. I encourage the hon. member to read reports from organizations appointed by the government, such as the National Council on Welfare and the reports from the United Nations that have clearly condemned the Canadian government for its failure to address the abysmal conditions that aboriginal people live in.

I have gone to reserves. I have gone to Metis communities. I have seen houses where people had no running water or no toilet. I do not think those people believe that they live in a wonderful country. They would like to have the same opportunities that maybe the member has had.

When he says he did not expect the government to care for his children, I do not think any parent expects the government to care for his or her children. What Canadian families want to see are the kinds of community supports, programs and services, such as an early childhood development program and a national child care program, that will assist families in coping in what is increasingly a very difficult environment.

I am frankly surprised to hear the member suggest that somehow we should not be doing that. To deny the reality that there are millions of Canadians who live below the poverty line, as described by Stats Canada, is simply to not deal with the truth of what goes on in our country. Yes, there are people who are doing incredibly well and do not need any help whatsoever. However, there are very major issues of income distribution and of how wealth is distributed.

If the member wants, I will take him to my riding and show him what happens when we leave people at the bottom, when we leave society to market forces and when the Liberal Party listens to the business elites and not to the real crowds. I will show him the evidence and the consequences of what that means on the streets. There are people without shelter and without adequate support. There are kids who are going hungry in school. The evidence is there and it is in every community in the country.

*The Address*

• (1335)

**Mr. Julian Reed (Halton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise to address the throne speech and review briefly the six years of effort that have been put in by the government to bring our economy and the state of the country to where they are right now.

I was particularly moved by the words of the hon. member for Cambridge who speaks from his heart about Canada and who, because of his life experience, is able to compare Canada with his country of origin. That says more about Canada today than any of the most eloquent speeches that could be made in the House.

I was very interested that the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition went on television after the throne speech and suggested that there were no specifics in the throne speech and therefore it was not acceptable. I do not know how long one has to be in parliament or how much one has to understand the parliamentary process to realize that the throne speech is not a speech of specifics. Throne speeches are never speeches of specifics. They are always speeches of vision. The specifics come afterward. The Prime Minister, in his response to the Speech from the Throne yesterday, began to put the specifics in place, but it was only the beginning. The next stage will be when the official budget comes out and that is due process. I hope that the hon. Leader of the Opposition over time and after gaining experience will realize that there are stages we go through.

It has been six years that I have had the honour of serving in the House. I can recall coming here with a brand new government and having to deal with a national debt that had gone out of control and with a deficit that surprised us all when it came out at \$42 billion that particular year, and how extraordinary efforts had to be made to reverse the process to try to bring the deficit to a point where it might some day be eliminated.

We have now entered our third year of surplus budgeting and the deficit has been eliminated. That did not happen by accident or by magic. It happened with a very concerted effort and with the co-operation of Canadians from coast to coast. Through the wisdom of our Minister of Finance, it also happened probably in the least painful way it could have.

I must digress for a minute, Mr. Speaker, to advise you that I beg to share my time with the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra. I regret that I forgot to do so at the beginning of my speech.

It is six years later and where are we today? As the Prime Minister said, it is the first time in 50 years I believe that we have sustained a balanced budget or a budget that contains some surplus. We have been able to begin work on paying down the debt. We have made a commitment to never again allow the finances of the

country to get into the state they were when we inherited them six years ago.

Personally, it has been a very challenging and satisfying time for me and I have been honoured to be here over this period.

Now we are in a new phase. It has been suggested that it is more difficult to govern with a surplus than it is with a deficit because once a surplus is seen then the demands come on to do certain things.

• (1340)

We have made a choice on this side of the House which is to share the surplus by increasing the financial strength of the country and, at the same time, restoring those social efforts that have been a hallmark of Canada over the years. We will continue in that direction. It will not be sudden, but it will be measured and it will be responsible.

Tax reduction will be part of the strategy because it will put more money into consumers' pockets. Debt reduction will be part of the strategy because that allows for more tax reduction. The maintenance of a strong economy is essential if we are to move ahead with the restoration of those things which are very important to us, such as health care which is at the top of the agenda at the moment in people's minds in this country, and rightly so.

The preservation of a universal health care system has proven to be the best system that we could possibly devise. With all of its warts and all of its weaknesses, it is still the best system. If we compare it first to the American system and see 40 million souls, greater than the whole population of Canada, without health care, or when we talk to some U.S. doctors, which I have had the pleasure of doing, and find out what it costs them to operate their health care system, we realize that we have never had it so good and that Canada has got something here. Yes, it may be flawed, yes, it may be incomplete and yes, it needs improving, but it is there.

I would remind those who would destroy our health care system of a very personal story about my mother who contracted pneumonia in 1941 and spent 14 weeks in the hospital, in the days before antibiotics I might add. My father spent the rest of his life paying off that debt. I suppose that is why I am considered to the right of centre in the Liberal caucus to a certain extent. However, I must tell the House that the health care system is paramount in the country. If we lost everything else, the health care system is a system we must maintain and continually improve.

Where are we going in the future? We have an economy that is sustaining a surplus budget. We have a bottom line that is stronger than it has been in many years which has enabled us to move on. That is why we consider a children's agenda, for instance, to be of paramount importance. If we understand that early childhood development is a key to a successful life, then we in government

*The Address*

must understand that whatever we can do to support that is positive to the future.

I was also very impressed with our commitment to research and development. There will be 2,000 new chairs in universities to create centres of excellence which will allow Canada to express its brain power to an even greater extent than it does at the present time.

As my friend from Cambridge said, Canada is the best country in the world. If anybody does not believe it, I suggest they go anywhere else.

**Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, that was quite an interesting speech. I would like to highlight a couple of points my hon. colleague made.

• (1345)

He said “We have done this” and “We have done that”. “We have balanced the budget. We have reduced the deficit”. I would remind him that it is the hardworking Canadian taxpayers who have done that work, not he himself or his government. It is the taxes that have been wrung out of individuals, to the tune of \$6 billion from people making \$20,000 a year or less, that have balanced the budget and reduced the deficit, not the Liberal government.

The member also mentioned that Liberals are the defenders of health care. They are the slashers and burners of health care. They have cut over \$21 billion from health care and social services since 1993 and have reinvested, their code word for spending, \$11.5 billion. That is \$8.5 billion less in funding than when they took over in 1993. How can this member boast of his government’s accomplishments when it has slashed and burned the health care system that he says he is defending? How can he do that?

**Mr. Julian Reed:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member must have missed what I said. I did point out that every Canadian participated in the recovery of this country. I would like to point out to him that if those steps had not been taken in 1993 we would not be at the position we are at now. Certain measures had to be taken to get rid of the deficit, to start to pay down the debt and to make the economy buoyant again. It was not painless. I can assure my hon. friend, who will probably never experience this, that hard decisions are hard decisions. However, they have been made and they work.

**Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight something that was not mentioned in the member’s presentation or in the throne speech and that is that there was very little about agriculture and what help needs to be given to that area.

What was mentioned in the throne speech were two things that could very much threaten agriculture and add more burden to our

farmers. One was to implement the Kyoto protocol, the proposed carbon tax and the increased input costs that would result for farmers. The other was endangered species protection legislation, something everybody believes we should have, but the approach the new environment minister has taken is a heavy handed approach that will not work and does not include the co-operation of all people.

I would like the member to comment on those two aspects that could seriously further harm the agriculture sector in this country.

**Mr. Julian Reed:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the hon. member that the steps that have been taken by this government are helping the Kyoto protocol and agriculture at the same time. Maybe the hon. member does not know that since the biomass-derived ethanol program has been put into place nearly \$500,000 of private investment has taken place across Canada, and farmers produce the feedstock for that ethanol production.

**Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston, Ind.):** Mr. Speaker, in the 15 years that I have had the privilege to sit in the House of Commons I have listened to a few throne speeches and it seems to me that what we ought to be considering is putting an end to throne speeches. I question the value of speeches from the throne. I know it is part of the Canadian tradition, but expectations are high. People expect everything to be put into a throne speech, that the government is to outline in great detail its plans for the future. In reality, most Canadians are completely tuned out to this whole debate because they realize it is laced with partisanship.

I would like to ask the hon. member whether he believes that throne speeches are of any real value to Canadians from coast to coast. Would he not agree that instead of beginning a new session of parliament with a throne speech that it would be far more advisable to begin a new session of parliament with a budget so that there would be a specific plan on the table in which Canadians could engage in a real debate about the future of Canada?

• (1350)

**Mr. Julian Reed:** Mr. Speaker, that is a very interesting proposition. However, I would like to point out, and I am sure my hon. friend would agree, that when the legislative process starts it has to start with something, the vision. The purpose of the throne speech, traditionally, has been to present that overall vision to the House and to the people of Canada. Our system of government is a constitutional monarchy, so we have a speech from the throne and everyone knows in which direction the government wants to go.

If we had started without that there would be no vision. We have been accused from time to time of having no vision at all. I would like the hon. member to remember what it would be like if we did have some vision.

*The Address*

**Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I understand the impatience of some hon. members with antique customs. The speech from the throne is a remnant of the 17th century constitutional struggles, down to that knocking on the door by an official to demand that the commons come to the lords and hear the speech from the throne. Antique customs are preserved, and you know this very well, Mr. Speaker. You sit in that very uncomfortable chair which you have inherited from many generations of people overgrown on roast beef and port wine and various other things.

Let us face it, there are traditions. The value of the speech from the throne today is simply that it gives a larger vision of a governmental program that necessarily will be computerized when we have those financial figures, when we know how much of a surplus there is and the battle over the distribution of it can be carried down to the details.

This could be upset, but it is generally agreed that if there is a surplus, and we think there will be a very considerable surplus, as a result, as hon. members might say on this side, of government policies, it will be split at a principle of 50% for tax reductions and amortization of the external debt, and 50% for social programs.

This is something that my constituents have strongly favoured. They have also asked that tax reductions extend to the working middle class who are very capable of creating the jobs, more perhaps than any other section of the community. That is something I will be working on for my constituents. I think it is a necessary part of our program of creating jobs.

The Speech from the Throne outlined the three main areas of our policies on the government side as we go into the new century. One is, as I say, the work on tax reduction and the amortization of the debt. The second is spending on health and social programs. The third, and I will say a few more words on this, is the investment in knowledge as the key to the next century.

My first assignment as a member when I was elected was to get \$167.5 million from the finance minister, who had just inherited in 1993 a \$42.8 billion budget deficit. How does one make the argument? I had to go to the rounds of my colleagues and ministers and explain that there was a thing called pure research, that it did not necessarily bring results tomorrow, but five or ten years down the line it opened jobs and industry. Pure knowledge can be translated concretely into factories, into production and into the creation of skilled jobs. We won that particular battle.

It was easier to do it than in relation to some of the things we are doing now because, of course, education, research in a strict sense, on old fashioned constitutional views, is outside federal power. However, once we made the case and demonstrated that the federal government would provide the leadership, I think we were on our way. We were very tired of giving money to provinces for

education and research and finding it being used to build highways into the never never land that had no ending and no beginning.

• (1355 )

Education is our investment in the future. I take great pride in the achievements, in the centres for excellence, in the centres for innovation and in the culmination of scholarships for the 21st century. Of the professorships there will be 1,200 immediately and 2,000 afterward.

The actual idea was put forward by the president of the University of British Columbia and by the recteur de l'Université de Montréal. The idea was "arrest the brain drain". In certain areas like biochemistry, particle physics, pharmacology, and I could go on, we lead North America. We have world standards, but we run the risk of losing our best and our brightest. These two university presidents put forward the idea of linking this to the centres for innovation that would be presided over by the former president of the University of British Columbia, Dr. Strangway.

This is the idea. Look at the rave headlines from around the country with the president of the University of British Columbia saying it is the answer to the drift in science; it makes us world leaders in science. I see the president of the University of Toronto saying that it is clearly a magnificent blow in favour of science, in favour of research and a recognition of the fact that knowledge is the key to the next century and it is the key to creating jobs, creating skilled jobs for young Canadians. We are very proud of this.

I would pay tribute to caucus, my own and those of opposition parties. I did an informal poll in the last parliament and found that 50 MPs had colleges or universities in their constituencies and 18 or 20 had been professors or teachers. That is a powerful lobby and a group that has brought this emphasis on knowledge, on the investment in knowledge as the key to the new century.

The Speech from the Throne covers many things. I have highlighted the quest for knowledge and the investment in learning as the key to the next century. There are several other matters that I will touch on very briefly, such as hands across the border. I had a letter today from American Senator Voinovich. We are moving more and more to removing that barrier with the United States, those irritating delays in customs and elsewhere for Canadian citizens. This in spite of some pressures put on us in terms of problems in controlling our own entry to Canada from elsewhere. The movement is there. It is part of the Speech from the Throne. It is part of the exchanges between the Prime Minister and President Clinton.

We have built on the record in the difficult area of reconciling our tradition as a country that receives people who want a better life. There are the boat people we have taken in the past. There are the Vietnamese admitted by a decision of a Conservative govern-

ment. That community is one of the best communities in terms of low rates of unemployment and investment in new job creation.

I look at the Ismailis who came here in 1971 under Prime Minister Trudeau, and the people who came from Cyprus when it broke up. We have a commitment to receiving people who have the talent and the will to make a better life.

There are aspects here that are in terms of our international obligations. There is nothing inhibiting the Canadian government under international law from applying appropriate controls to our immigration for speeding up the process of determination of refugee claimants. These are in part touched on in the Speech from the Throne. They will be fleshed out in concrete legislation. I ask all members to address that in the future.

**The Speaker:** As it is 2 o'clock, we will now proceed to Statements by Members.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

### CHANCELLOR ROBERT S. K. WELCH

**Mr. Walt Lastewka (St. Catharines, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to congratulate the chancellor of Brock University on a very special honour. On Saturday, October 16, the Faculty of Education building will be named after the chancellor, Robert S. K. Welch, in recognition of his contribution to Brock University. Chancellor Welch has a long history of public service and deep roots in the Niagara community.

• (1400)

From his first years on the St. Catharines Board of Education, Chancellor Welch rose in provincial politics to head the education ministry and later to the position of deputy premier of Ontario. His many years of service were acknowledged when he was appointed an officer of the Order of Canada in 1994.

The naming of the faculty of education building is a way for Brock to honour a man who has given so much of his time and energy to the institution over the many years.

I join with students, faculty and friends to honour the important work of Robert Welch and the dedication he has shown for education in Niagara and in Ontario.

**The Speaker:** I very rarely add anything to statements made by members, but I know Mr. Welch and it is an honour well deserved. He is one of the truly great people of that part of the country.

*S. O. 31*

## AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we support that as well.

This week, as most Canadians celebrated Thanksgiving Day, Canadian farmers had little to celebrate. Devastated by conditions beyond their control, farmers have been hit by the worst farm income crisis in recent memory and they have been abandoned by this government.

This year thanksgiving did not make it to the farm. What did make it to the farm were record high input costs, record low commodity prices, increasing U.S. protectionism resulting in unjust tariffs against Canadian producers, bankruptcies that are erasing the next generation of family farms, and misguided and inadequate Liberal government contracts.

It is time to reform aid programs to deliver assistance to farmers in need. It is time to give farmers the freedom to market their products as they choose. It is time for a government that will stand up for the farmers at the international trade table.

Canadian farmers need help and they need it now. Farmers, and indeed all Canadians, need and deserve a government that will stand up for them and not this timid, tired government they have now.

\* \* \*

## HAZARDOUS WASTE

**Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, over the past five years hazardous waste imports from the United States into Ontario have nearly tripled. Such imports include explosive chemicals, solvents, arsenic, mercury, benzene and other substances that can pose a threat to public health and the environment.

Regulations in Ontario are such that United States companies find it cheaper to ship their hazardous waste to Ontario rather than dispose of it at home.

The federal government has signed the Basel convention and therefore has a responsibility for the safe disposal of hazardous waste coming across the border. Therefore I urge the Government of Canada to exercise its authority under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act and set strict conditions on the imports of hazardous waste into Canada so as to ensure an environmentally safe disposal.

\* \* \*

## THE LATE ROSS HALL

**Mr. Tony Valeri (Stoney Creek, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I rise to inform the House of the passing of Ross Hall, a talented leader who died October 11 at West Lincoln Memorial Hospital in Grimsby.

*S. O. 31*

Ross was a member of the Ontario legislature for the riding of Lincoln from 1975 to 1981 and chairman of the provincial caucus, mayor of Grimsby, and a Niagara councillor from 1982 to 1988. He was an active and dedicated leader of the community. He was a member of Trinity United Church, the finance chairman of both West Lincoln Memorial Hospital and Grimsby and District High School Board, as well as a member and vice-chairman of the Board of Trustees of Brock University.

He led by example and treated all with a sense of respect and understanding. His character was best described by his daughter, Trish Hall, when she said she will carry always the important lesson and advice her father once gave her: maintain your friendships; call your friends.

Our community has truly lost a model citizen. He will be missed. I ask hon. colleagues to please join with me in offering our sympathy to Ross' wife Alison and his family at this very difficult time.

\* \* \*

**THE LATE WILLIAM KAYE LAMB**

**Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to commemorate the passing of William Kaye Lamb, librarian extraordinaire, who organized our nation's history as founder of the National Library of Canada.

Born on May 11, 1904 in New Westminster, British Columbia, he died August 24, 1999 in Vancouver at 95 years. He was an author and taught history at UBC. In 1934 he was appointed B.C. provincial archivist and in 1940 became UBC chief librarian.

Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King in 1948 appointed him dominion archivist. Lamb then created the National Library and drafted the National Library Act of 1952. He proposed Canada's National Library and Archives which opened in 1967. Before retiring from the National Library in 1969, he oversaw the first computerized library catalogue in the country.

• (1405)

In his last days, a chief joy was sending out his trademark typewritten memos to fellow scholars. Though work took him all over the world, a piece of him will always be in Ottawa. He will be remembered as a British Columbian who was a great builder of Canada.

\* \* \*

**AUTO PACT**

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the World Trade Organization issued an interim ruling ordering Canada to scrap the auto pact, the latest casualty of the Liberal government's liberalization at any cost trade policy.

The auto pact is a model of fair managed trade providing auto manufacturers with duty free access to Canadian markets on the condition that they make significant investments in Canadian jobs and communities.

The auto pact has played a key role in the creation of family supporting jobs in the manufacturing sector. Auto companies working within the rules of the auto pact employ eight times as many workers in Canada as those who do not.

The Liberals say they care about the auto pact but it was these same Liberals who negotiated the rules which the WTO is now using to kill the auto pact. It was these same Liberals who assured Canadians that the auto pact would be safeguarded.

It is incumbent on the Liberals now to find a way to uphold the principles of the auto pact and support Canadian jobs. It must appeal the WTO ruling, rethink its uncritical and simplistic commitment to free trade, and failing all this, develop equivalent policies that reward auto manufacturers for investing in Canadian jobs and communities.

\* \* \*

**ARTS AND CULTURE**

**Ms. Aileen Carroll (Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that Canadian culture figures so prominently in the Speech from the Throne.

[Translation]

The throne speech set out a global strategy to build a better quality of life for all Canadians and to implement policies that make a difference in the lives of individual Canadians.

Writers, singers, actors, filmmakers and artists breathe life into our culture while others record our history and protect our cultural heritage.

[English]

This reaffirms the government's commitment to culture, linking 1,000 institutions across the country to form a virtual museum, putting collections on line, increasing support for the production of Canadian stories and images in print, theatre, music and video.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**JEAN-LOUIS MILLETTE**

**Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, last week, Quebec lost one of its greatest artists, actor Jean-Louis Millette, who had raised his art to the heights of intensity. Everything Jean-Louis Millette undertook grew to significant proportions reflecting his talent.

He approached each work with integrity, generosity and humanity. Humble and simple, he served the author, charmed the public,



and was respected by his colleagues. His talent universally acclaimed, he moved us in the theatre, on television and in film.

The emotion he left us will survive him. The emotion he shared with children, through his Paillason character, is forever in our hearts. While an actor's work is essentially ephemeral, Jean-Louis Millette's interpretations remain.

We thank you, Jean-Louis Millette, for all the joy you brought us.

\* \* \*

[English]

### OKTOBERFEST

**Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, during this past weekend Kitchener—Waterloo welcomed thousands of visitors from across the continent to kick off the 31st annual Oktoberfest celebrations.

In fact members of this House came to Kitchener to join in the great German tradition. This nine day festival is the largest Bavarian celebration in North America with the greatest Thanksgiving Day parade in Canada.

Oktoberfest has become an important cultural event for our nation. It symbolizes what it is like to live in a multicultural nation.

Through the celebration of this spirit of *gemütlichkeit* the local economy is stimulated and \$18 million is raised annually with \$1.8 million going directly to local charities.

I congratulate the over 400 volunteers who make Oktoberfest such a great success each year. In particular I recognize the hard work of Oktoberfest president Auggie Sherban. He should be commended for his outstanding commitment and dedication to this important cultural event.

\* \* \*

### CHILDREN

**Mr. Paul Bonwick (Simcoe—Grey, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have had an opportunity to reflect on the throne speech with great excitement. The Liberal government has clearly outlined a vision of which all of Canada can be proud. In short, our vision and focus is our children. Imagine the legacy. We will ensure an increase in the quality of life for our children.

• (1410)

Sadly, not everyone agrees with this vision of investing in our children. For reasons which I suspect are for political gain, the leader of the Reform Party suggests this is nothing more than fluff, no real substance, I think he said. Let me inform the leader of the Reform Party that my children are not mere fluff. They do have

*S. O. 31*

substance and they do require a government with a vision and a conscience. Sadly the leader of the Reform Party lacks both. We can only assume his comments will continue to be damaging to himself and to our children.

On behalf of the children all across the country, I say thank you to the Liberal Prime Minister for having a vision. That vision is that children are our number one priority.

\* \* \*

### ROBERT MUNDELL

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, three years ago Reform's finance critic at the time, Herb Grubel, told me that the best primer on economics was a book called *Man and Economics* by Robert Mundell. Believe it or not, I checked all the major bookstores in Canada and could not find it. Finally by a happy coincidence I found Mr. Mundell's book in the discard bin in the public library in the little town where I live. And yes it is a wonderful lucid book.

Robert Mundell was a man in advance of his age. He was a prophet without honour in his own country until yesterday. Yesterday Robert Mundell, born in Kingston, Ontario and raised in the interior of B.C., was awarded the Nobel prize for economics.

Today governments around the world are applying his supply side tax cut ideas and their economies are booming and providing their citizens with jobs and prosperity, including right here in Ontario.

On behalf of the official opposition, we extend hearty congratulations to Canada's Robert Mundell.

Finally I would like to offer a copy of the book to the finance minister, as long as he will read it and give it back to me.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### COMMUNITY CARE WORKER WEEK

**Mr. Yvon Charbonneau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to remind the House and all Canadians that the week of October 11 to 17 is Community Care Worker Week.

The professionals, paraprofessionals and volunteers who provide health care in the community are an integral part of our health care system. They are the front line workers providing home care, long term institutional care, meal distribution services and community support programs.

[English]

To acknowledge the invaluable contribution workers make to the health of Canadians, the Canadian Association for Community

*S. O. 31*

Care together with Lifeline Systems Canada has initiated the Community Care Worker Award which is presented every year during Community Care Worker Week.

[Translation]

I invite you to join me in thanking community care workers throughout Canada for their contribution to the health of Canadians.

\* \* \*

**WORLD DAY FOR THE REFUSAL OF MISERY**

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, October 17 has been proclaimed World Day for the refusal of misery by the United Nations. The theme of that day, which is dedicated to the victims of poverty, is “Children want a world that is fair to everyone. With them, let us refuse misery”.

This day will stress the exclusion and isolation experienced on a daily basis by an increasing number of women, men and children, while also urging us to take a hard look at our way of doing things, so as to eliminate this wall of shame for our society.

Beyond any statistical consideration, poverty means being excluded from any form of full participation as a citizen; it means that one cannot participate in the benefits of economic growth and it also suppresses the fundamental right to work. Poverty means the outright withdrawal of freedom of speech for those who are affected by it.

Tackling poverty is an enormous challenge. We must do so with determination, with our heads high, and we must not be afraid of telling things as they are, while being receptive to those who live in poverty.

\* \* \*

**LIBERAL GOVERNMENT**

**Ms. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as we begin this new session, let us take a look at the parties in the House of Commons.

The Reformers are squabbling among themselves; the Conservatives are trying to find themselves; the New Democrats are slowly disintegrating. As for the Bloquistes, they have yet to find a reason to exist except, perhaps, their pensions, unlike the Liberal government, which knows exactly where it is headed.

The Liberals are governing according to the priorities of Canadians, so as to provide them with a better economic, social and political future.

Congratulations to the Liberal government.

[English]

**FISHERIES**

**Mr. Charlie Power (St. John's West, PC):** Mr. Speaker, since the supreme court ruling on the hunting and fishing rights of native Canadians, a crisis has grown in the lobster fishery on the east coast.

• (1415)

This is just the first manifestation of a serious problem that lies ahead for all regions of Canada from Newfoundland and Labrador to British Columbia. If a reasonable, fair and lasting agreement between native and non-native fishers cannot be achieved, further conflicts are a certainty and the potential for more violence remains very high.

Parliament must act immediately to demonstrate the leadership that the federal government has failed to provide. I urgently request the agreement of all parties to facilitate the immediate reinstatement of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans. The committee should immediately go first to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia where tensions are tearing traditionally peaceful communities apart along racial lines. Let us hear directly from those involved, accept the responsibility entrusted to us and seek to establish a constructive environment for agreement. We all want a peaceful solution.

The PC Party of Canada is prepared to take this action. I call on all my caucus colleagues and all members of the House to join us in—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

\* \* \*

**WILLIAM HEAD INSTITUTION**

**Mr. Gary Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, convicted wife killer, Patrick Lees, has just begun his sentence at William Head prison in Victoria. Inmates refer to William Head as Club Fed. Why? The inmates reside in condominiums, no steel bars, no locks on the doors, many of the bedrooms have TVs and VCRs and each condo has its own living room, dining room and kitchen. Let us not forget its waterfront location equipped with golf course, fishing pier and much more.

Spousal abuse is a huge problem in our society. Patrick Lees violently murdered his wife, left two young children without a mom and now we see this wife killer sent to Club Fed. There is a place in the system for institutions where inmates must learn to care for themselves. However, prisoners must earn the right to transfer to these institutions.

*Oral Questions*

I am working on a private member's bill where an inmate would not be eligible for this type of institution until they have completed at least 50% of their time. I urge all members to work with me to change the system.

\* \* \*

**PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

**The Speaker:** Colleagues, I am going to change things just a little bit for today. I want to draw to your attention the presence in the gallery of Her Excellency Libuse Benesova, President of the Senate of the Czech Republic, and her parliamentary delegation.

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

---

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[*English*]

**FISHERIES**

**Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the government's ad hoc plan for restoring peace to the east coast fishery came apart yesterday, just hours after the fisheries minister assured us everything was under control. Thus far the minister's strategy has done nothing but increase tensions in the east coast fishery and the potential for violence.

Thirty years ago when the Prime Minister was minister of Indian affairs he professed to believe that assigning rights to different people based on their race would only lead to further discrimination, recrimination and the kinds of violence that we see now in New Brunswick.

Why has the prime minister and his government abandoned that position?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I said in the House of Commons that treaties were signed by the government of the day, by Her Majesty the Queen of England at that time.

We have an obligation to respect the treaty that was entered into by previous governments, particularly with the natives. These agreements were signed. The supreme court passed a judgment and we have to respect that within the confines of the judgment that gave collective rights. We have the right to impose measures to maintain the conservation that is needed so that stocks can be there for years to come.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, no one is saying that the aboriginal people do not have rights but the non-aboriginal people also have rights. They have rights granted by the government under its constitutional power to

manage the fishery. What the supreme court should have been doing in the Marshall case is balancing these rights not just affirming one side.

Why does the Prime Minister not take control of this situation, ask the supreme court to stay its decision and return to a fisheries policy that is based on equality under the law and conservation not race?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the treaties were signed with the natives of the day. It is an obligation of the government and of the nation to respect the obligation that we have taken with them.

• (1420)

There was a judgment by the supreme court that said that it is a collective right that has to be managed within the need for conservation. This is exactly what the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans is working on at this moment.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is not listening to what is being said.

No one is denying the fact of aboriginal rights. However, the government, under its constitutional authority for the fishery, has also granted rights to others to fish. That is what a fishing licence is. What we are looking for is some leadership from the government in balancing these rights.

I ask the Prime Minister again, why does he not ask the supreme court for a stay of this judgment and why does he not come up with a fishery policy that recognizes equality under the law not special entitlement simply based on race?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, these rights have been confirmed by the court. The Leader of the Opposition takes pleasure in saying that he respects the rights but does not want the judgment implemented. That is like having your cake and eating it at the same time.

Some licences have been granted for a long time, but this judgment adds new fishermen to the business. This has to be worked out in conjunction with those who were there before and those who have new authority from the supreme court to use their fishing rights. We have to get the two parties together.

To have your cake and eat it all the time like the leader—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Delta—South Richmond.

**Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of asking for a stay of judgment is to ask the court to clarify its decision.

The month long window to petition the court to stay this decision and clarify it is up in three days. So far the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and the Prime Minister have opted to allow chaos and violence to determine the course of events.

*Oral Questions*

Is the Prime Minister now so comfortable with a race based fisheries policy that he will not even ask the supreme court to clarify its decision?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, every time there is a conclusion by the courts that the natives of Canada were here before, they always refer to it as a racist situation. They were here before we were. The king of the day told the settlers who were coming to Canada to make treaties with them. It is our obligation to respect the words of Her Majesty the Queen of those days.

**Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, let me give the Prime Minister examples.

It is unclear what the supreme court means by a modest living or whether non-status natives will enjoy this preferential right to fish that is allowed by the Marshall decision.

Flawed as it is, this decision needs clarification to establish the place of non-aboriginal fishermen in this fishery, fishermen whose families have been fishing these waters for 200 and 300 years.

Why is the government refusing to return court for clarification of this irresponsible and unrealistic decision?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the judgment has been rendered. We have to live with the judgment. We are obliged to respect judgments. We can ask for a stay to gain some time to plan a proper regime. However, whenever some rights are recognized for the first people of the land, the Reform Party always attacks them as racist. It is absolutely not Canadian.

\* \* \*

• (1425)

[Translation]

**GM PLANT IN BOISBRIAND**

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Minister of Industry called Quebec Minister Landry irresponsible for putting forward a plan to save the only automobile plant in Quebec, the GM plant in Boisbriand and, with it, thousands of jobs in the region, when there are 14 such plants in Ontario.

How can the minister make such statements? And when he does, is he not behaving more like Ontario's Minister of Industry than the federal Minister of Industry?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the Bloc Québécois is so in favour of an offer for a company such as this, which has made phenomenal profits.

In Montreal, *La Presse* asked the question of the day, that is: "Quebec is prepared to put up \$360 million to save GM in Boisbriand. Do you think it should?" And 19% said yes, while 81% said no.

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, that is not much of an answer. It does show, however, that the Liberals are well organized when it comes to contacting *La Presse*.

This morning, I spoke to Luc Desnoyers, Quebec's delegate to the CAW. I also spoke with the president of the union at the GM plant in Boisbriand. Both said that the minister was dragging his feet, that he had done nothing for the cause, and that he was doing nothing to defend Quebec's workers.

I ask the Prime Minister, who talks to us about collaboration, partnership and understanding, how he can stand by and watch his minister do absolutely nothing to help save the Boisbriand plant. It is a disgrace.

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is not true that we are not doing anything.

In fact, it was the Government of Canada that first sat down with the Boisbriand workers. We were the ones who funded the project to put together a presentation for GM officials. We were the ones who carried the case forward with the GM officials in Detroit. I personally arranged a meeting with the president of GM in the United States, in Detroit, and invited Premier Bouchard to attend, just as Mr. Harris had gone to Seattle a few months ago to talk with Boeing.

Mr. Bouchard sent Mr. Landry. Together, we discussed the future of the Boisbriand project with GM.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we learned from this morning's *La Presse* that the automotive manufacturers are being offered some extremely attractive incentives to stay in the U.S. or to develop new plants there.

We learned also that Bernard Landry has made an interesting proposal as part of the efforts being made on the North American continent to save the Montreal plant.

Does the Minister of Industry seriously think he is going to be believed when he says he has done everything to save GM, when he has in fact stood back with his arms crossed, to all intents and purposes, for some time?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, does the hon. member seriously think that offering a lot of money before any demands are even made is a good negotiating approach?

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, like the rest of Canada, Quebec has to compete internationally, and we need to be proactive when it comes to saving jobs.

*Oral Questions*

Bernard Landry was proactive. He sought a way of saving the plant. It would be nice to be able to say the same of the minister.

I would like to ask the following question: why is he so hot to set up a lottery to save hockey clubs in Ontario, while the situation in Quebec is of no importance? We just have to wait.

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely false, because we, the Government of Canada, are the ones who tried to help GM find solutions for Boisbriand.

He does not understand that the problem is not a financial one. It is not a problem that could be solved with a donation from the taxpayers to a highly profitable company. It is a matter of finding a model, a future for a project.

Why has GM invested money in Ontario without getting any federal funds, as have other automobile manufacturers? Why?

\* \* \*

• (1430)

[English]

**AGRICULTURE**

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. The federal government's response to the farm income crisis has been a disaster. For Saskatchewan and Manitoba farmers AIDA has been a disaster. Less than half of those needing help qualify, and for those who do the payments are too low.

Most provincial ministers of agriculture are in Ottawa today. Will the Prime Minister take this opportunity to admit that AIDA has been a disaster and announce a plan that will work for prairie farmers?

**Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I met with the ministers of agriculture from two western provinces today. I reminded them of the money that has been put into the AIDA program.

I remind the hon. member and the House that for Saskatchewan alone, for example, the AIDA program has already put over \$70 million into Saskatchewan. NISA withdrawals are \$110 million. We made changes to crop insurance. We made changes to the NISA program. We made changes to the AIDA program and we continue to look for all the resources we possibly can.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, first the Prime Minister refused to visit the flooded farm communities. Then his throne speech was silent on the farm crisis. Now the Prime Minister ducks the question.

What is the Prime Minister's message to prairie farmers? Is it why should I care about your farm crisis? I think we heard that from a previous Liberal prime minister as well.

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am following the situation very closely. I talked with the premiers of Manitoba and Saskatchewan many times. However, it is a problem that is being dealt with very effectively at this time by the minister of agriculture, who has the authority to speak on behalf of the government. That is why we are working with the ministers. It is the crisis that is a problem.

We put money in last year, \$900 million. That is still available for farmers to meet this crisis. Long before the leader of the party was aware of the problem money was already on the table to solve the crisis.

\* \* \*

**FISHERIES**

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans stated in the House "We have a solution in place and we have a plan". He was referring to the fishery. While he was saying that, the aboriginal leaders were meeting in Moncton, New Brunswick.

Last night when I informed the minister that the chiefs had decided to shut down the moratorium, he stated that he had not been contacted by the chiefs.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Given that the chiefs have now stated that they have no trust in the minister of fisheries, will the Prime Minister personally accept responsibility for this situation and step in immediately to resolve it?

**Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is important to look at the facts. The moratorium was on a voluntary basis by the chiefs. What has happened now is they have said that they will leave it up to the individual chiefs.

I talked to Chief Sark today from Lennox Island and he said he would continue with the moratorium. It is left up to the individual chiefs to decide on their own. We have a plan for the short term and the long term. It is working and I will continue with it.

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC):** Mr. Speaker, last week when the minister of fisheries went to Halifax to try to negotiate a settlement for the crisis in the fishery, the minister could not get an agreement. In fact the agreement came from the chiefs themselves.

Today, because of the actions of the minister's department, the voluntary moratorium which restored peace to our communities back east has now collapsed. Native leaders now say they simply cannot trust the minister, and that was their quote.

*Oral Questions*

My question is for the Prime Minister. Does the Prime Minister understand that the number one barrier to a negotiated solution to this issue is his own minister? I am begging the Prime Minister to step into this situation and deal with it.

• (1435)

**Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we should make sure we understand the facts. I was in Atlantic Canada. I met with the commercial fishermen. I met with the aboriginal community. I met with the processors. I was there to listen to them, to make sure we had a dialogue.

As a result of the discussions the chiefs decided on their own that they wanted to have a voluntary moratorium. It is always hard to get 35 chiefs to agree to a unanimous decision. They have decided now that they will leave it up to individual chiefs. Some chiefs will continue with it. In fact the vast majority of chiefs will not be fishing; they will be continuing on the moratorium.

\* \* \*

**AGRICULTURE**

**Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, with all the agriculture minister says that he has done for farmers, why are thousands of dirt poor farmers still getting nothing, no cash?

To date the government has done nothing to address the crisis in any serious way. AIDA does not work and there is no replacement in sight. Families are losing their farms right now, not tomorrow, and the government sits idly by. Why is the Prime Minister allowing our farmers to head into winter with no hope and no cash?

**Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I find these comments very interesting, coming from an hon. member who stood in the public a year ago and said farmers should stop their crying.

The government knew that farmers needed help. We have put \$900 million there. We have made changes to the net income stabilization program that enabled the withdrawal of more than \$120 million in that program. We have made changes to the crop insurance program and all those things. We are continuing to look at it, work with the industry and work with the safety net advisory committee. We are not the party. They are the party that was going to take \$640 million—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake.

**Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the agriculture minister is a liar. I did not say—

**Some hon. members:** Withdraw, withdraw.

**The Speaker:** I ask the hon. member to please withdraw that statement.

**Mr. Howard Hilstrom:** Yes. I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that is not an appropriate statement.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**GM PLANT IN BOISBRIAND**

**Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, whatever the Minister of Industry may say or do, he is not helping matters with his attitude and his remarks.

My question is for the Minister of Industry. Given his attitude, are we not totally justified in asking whether he does not intend to sacrifice the Boisbriand plant in favour of plants in Ontario, his home province?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, that question is totally strange, because, as I said, we worked with GM to save jobs at Boisbriand. In fact, another car model needs to be found for manufacture at Boisbriand.

I told him that significant investments have been made in the Canadian automobile industry in the past five or six years. There has never been a need for the federal government to invest because we are very competitive.

At Boisbriand, the employees are top quality and highly trained and could compete with—

**The Speaker:** The member for Témiscamingue.

**Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in its throne speech, the government mentions partnership a lot. We did not think there would be an example so soon. I would like the Prime Minister to say whether he does not consider the example and the attitude of his minister with regard Boisbriand do not reveal the essence of the word partnership. Is that what partnership means?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think the minister has handled this matter very well. As he explained earlier, he even organized and invited the authorities in Quebec to meet the president of GM in the States to make sure that, once the model they are currently making in Boisbriand disappears in a few years, the company will develop a new model.

• (1440)

He did a very good job, but, as he has said, the problem right now is that major changes are being made in the whole of the GM organization throughout North America, and Boisbriand is in competition with the others. Investments have been made in Canada, and at no time in the automobile industry in recent years have we—

**The Speaker:** The hon. leader of the Reform Party.

[English]

## AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the government's response to the western farm crisis is an absolute insult to western Canada. The realized net income for all farmers in Manitoba and Saskatchewan collectively will be down by 98% for the four year average. Does the Prime Minister understand that 98% means down from \$916 million a year to \$16 million?

The government's response to date has been pathetic: an aid program that does not work, an income stabilization program that does not work, and no high level attack on the European subsidies which are at the root of the problem.

When will the Prime Minister take some personal interest and show some personal leadership—

**The Speaker:** The Right Hon. Prime Minister.

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to see the Leader of the Opposition getting up when I read page 42 of the Reform program, the Reform taxpayers budget which calls for \$640 million to be saved by downsizing the department of agriculture. It further calls for \$690 million to be saved by cutting all regional sector specific funding to the department of agriculture.

That is what they say to gain votes. Now that we have put money on the table they just flip-flop completely and want us to spend money when—

**The Speaker:** Order, please. I would ask both the questioners and those who answer to please keep their questions within 35 seconds.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister should have kept on reading from that statement because the next sentences talked about Reform's proposal for a trade distortion program that would have solved this problem.

Incidentally the member who proposed that program is now just about five seats away from becoming the premier of Saskatchewan. This is not just about statistics. This is not a statistical problem. It is families that are suffering not just the loss of their livelihoods but their farms—

**The Speaker:** If the Prime Minister wants to address himself to the preamble, I would invite him to do so.

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will reply in 90 seconds and not in 90 minutes. Before the last budget the government put \$900 million on the table and the provinces put \$600 million directed toward this problem.

## Oral Questions

Why does the Reform Party complain all the time when we spend money? Now he wants to cut money and have a new program. He cannot have it that way.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## AIR TRANSPORTATION

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in the Onex issue, the Minister of Transport is now prepared, after having suspended application of the Competition Act and after having refused to let the transport committee sit during the summer, to set aside the 10% ownership rule.

Is the strange behaviour of the minister in this matter dictated by the cozy relationship that exists between Onex and his government?

[English]

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, it became quite evident over the last few months that Canadian Airlines was in trouble. It either needed a cash injection from the government, in other words a bailout, or we had to let it slide into insolvency or we had to find another way to solve the problem.

We invoked section 47 which allows us to find market driven solutions but which also allows the government and parliament to pronounce upon any agreement that comes forward with shareholders and to set conditions in the public interest. I have enunciated five principles. I said them yesterday and I could say them again, but the government will do what is in the best interest of Canadians.

• (1445)

[Translation]

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the president of Onex, Mr. Schwartz, also said that the delays imposed by the Competition Bureau would, in his opinion, be too long.

Can the minister tell us whether or not, and regardless of the opinion of the president of Onex, this transaction will be reviewed by the Competition Bureau?

[English]

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, under section 47, which we use, the Competition Bureau is engaged. In fact it is giving us advice on restructuring and that advice will be made available within the next couple of weeks and certainly will be made public.

The fact is that the Competition Bureau's role is one that has been underlined. It is still there and it will still be involved in any consideration.

*Oral Questions*

As to any specific agreement, I do not believe that it is my role to talk about any proposal that is now before the shareholders of a private company. When that company decides, when the shareholders decide, then the government will act in the public interest.

\* \* \*

**GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS**

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Claude Gauthier, owner of Transelec, donated \$10,000 to the Prime Minister's campaign after winning a CIDA contract. He then bought a \$500,000 piece of land from a company in which the Prime Minister has a financial interest and the bidding for that was, shall we say, suspicious.

It turns out that Transelec is not quite doing the job and the government has been worried about being on the hook ever since.

Why is the Prime Minister putting his political interest ahead of the public interest?

**Hon. Maria Minna (Minister for International Cooperation, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, first, CIDA does not hold the contract with Transelec. The contract is held between the government of the African Republic of Mali and Transelec.

Second, CIDA funds the project and pays the bills according to the Mali government, as they are submitted.

Third, this company's bid was 30% lower than the next lowest bid.

The project will be finished in the near future and it will be done at no additional cost.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.):** What a steal of a deal, Mr. Speaker. That is great comfort.

Let me paint a clearer picture for the Prime Minister himself. Perhaps I could join the dots for him: a \$10,000 donation, plus a \$6.3 million contract, plus a \$500,000 land deal. That equals really bad optics.

The minister talks about the awarding process and the process for bidding. It was certainly suspicious at the very least. It is a process for a pal.

I would like to ask the Prime Minister this. How in the world are his friends going to make a living when he retires?

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

**The Speaker:** I would urge members on both sides to be very judicious in their choice of words.

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are used to the hon. member, so it never surprises us that she would like to be at that level.

I would just say that when somebody makes a bid 30% lower than the others, when it is the lowest bid, \$3 million lower than the others, I think the government of Mali did pretty well in giving the contract to that contractor.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**PARENTAL LEAVE**

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, one of the most popular measures mentioned in the throne speech is the proposal to double the length of parental leave. This is good news.

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

**Mr. Paul Crête:** It is good news, and we all agree on that, but why will this measure come into effect in 2001 and not now?

[English]

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, recognizing the changing relationship between the workforce and Canadian families, this government knows that it is appropriate for parents to be at home in the early years with their children.

Yesterday the Prime Minister announced a doubling of parental benefits for Canadian families. That is a significant investment in our children and in our families, and are we ever proud.

\* \* \*

● (1450)

**AGRICULTURE**

**Mr. Murray Calder (Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

Yesterday the WTO issued a ruling on Canada's imports and exports of milk. Can the minister tell us whether this in any way threatens our excellent system of supply management for dairies?

**Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to assure everybody in this House and in the dairy industry across Canada that this ruling in no way, shape or form affects supply management. It is a domestic marketing system.

We were very pleased with the tariff rate quotas for fluid milk. The appellant body overthrew the ruling of the panel on that in Canada's favour.

A little portion of the export of dairy products from Canada will be affected by the ruling, but the dairy industry itself has said that it is all right, they can adjust to that little portion, which does not affect supply management in Canada.



*Oral Questions***GOVERNMENT GRANTS**

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister took office he failed to disclose under conflict of interest guidelines a \$200,000 asset owed to his numbered company.

His same company later happened to benefit from a land sale to the lucky winner of a huge CIDA contract, land enriched by a government grant to a nearby hotel.

What was the Prime Minister trying to hide by not disclosing the \$200,000 asset?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, everybody knows about it. I have been informed that the person who owed the money has paid it all. There is no debt any more.

I filed the form as it was presented to me and there was no such request. But if we have to declare when we deposit \$5 in the bank that the bank owes us \$5, probably we would have to write it in the form the next time.

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, on June 8 the Prime Minister said in the House: "Before I became Prime Minister I sold those shares and I gave the problem or the receivable to my trustee with my other assets".

It was an asset which he did not disclose under his own conflict of interest guidelines. The Prime Minister must know how important it is to the Canadian public that they have confidence in his ethical standards. If his behaviour is above reproach, why has he refused to table the documents which will lay all of these questions to rest?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the trustee is managing this problem. The government has given a clear indication that there was no such request from anybody.

My trustee was given all the assets and managed them. I pray to God that when I am not Prime Minister 10 years from now there will still be some assets that I can get.

\* \* \*

**CHILD CARE**

**Mrs. Michelle Dockrill (Bras d'Or—Cape Breton, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the throne speech passed over Canadian children rather quickly by neglecting to mention any concrete plans for national child care.

Canadian children need good quality care, not just in the first year of life but in all of their pre-school years. Canadian families need good quality, affordable child care now. Canadian children cannot wait.

Will the minister commit today to a national child care program that her government promised six years ago?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we made a proposition on child care to the provinces and they said no. We respect the jurisdiction of the provinces. It was part of our program. We wanted to do that, but all the provinces, including the NDP governments of British Columbia and Saskatchewan, refused to have a joint program on day care.

We found another way to help families and we were successful.

• (1455)

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is trying to get off the hook. The fact is that when it comes to kids the government is full of baffle-gab. Let us try to get a clear answer.

Does the Prime Minister understand that a so-called children's agenda is worthless unless it includes child care? Will the minister and the Prime Minister remember that children have to be included in a children's agenda? When are we going to see the national child care program? Exactly where are the 150,000 spaces that were promised?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I just explained that the NDP governments of the land rejected the offer we made to them. With the refusal of the so-called left governments, which are to the right of the Liberal Party, we found other ways, through tax exemptions and other tax incentives, to help families because we were more preoccupied about child care than the NDP governments.

\* \* \*

**FISHERIES**

**Mr. Greg Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest, PC):** Mr. Speaker, here is the minister's record up to now in the east coast lobster crisis: no moratorium, homes burned, businesses destroyed, neighbour fighting neighbour, and 200 years of harmony between natives and non-natives jeopardized. The fear and uncertainty in this free-for-all continues.

Can we expect more of the same from this minister: no leadership, no plan and no hope of a successful resolution?

**Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that hon. members recognize the difficult situation. That is why we have to be careful not to inflame the situation.

We have set forward a short term plan as well as a long term plan. I think what we have to do now is work toward ensuring that the aboriginal community can exercise that treaty right toward a long term plan. That is exactly what we are doing. I am encouraged by all of the co-operation that is happening at the community level.

### Oral Questions

At the community level people are talking. Union members, native and non-native fishers are getting together.

**Mr. Greg Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I just cited the minister's record on the short term plan. It is a disaster.

We have eighth generation fishermen whose livelihood is threatened. There is a crisis in the community and the minister talks about a plan that does not exist. If the minister does have a plan, can he show us what that plan is? The only plan the minister has now is a plan for continued chaos. Will the minister act, and act quickly?

**Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, yes, we are already acting. We are talking to all the parties. I have talked today to the fishermen's union. I talked to the chiefs. We are working on it right now. My colleagues and I are working as a government to make sure that we have a dialogue, we have co-operation and we bring people together. The real solutions are at the community base, where people start talking to people, coming up with real solutions for the long term. That is exactly what we are doing.

\* \* \*

### CHILD CARE

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Haliburton—Victoria—Brock, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in light of the recent announcement by the Prime Minister that parental leave will be extended from six months to one full year, can the Minister of Human Resources Development tell this House what effect this decision will have on working Canadians?

[Translation]

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today the daily *Le Devoir* writes "After some difficult years, Ottawa wants to take advantage of its sound fiscal position to improve parental leave. Bravo".

Mr. Speaker, we deliver.

\* \* \*

[English]

### EMPLOYMENT

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the government has known for over one year that the WTO would rule against the auto pact. Yet, the government has done nothing to assure Canada's auto workers that their jobs would not be threatened as a result of this new ruling.

Why has the minister's department not put in place a strategy to assure Canada's auto workers that their jobs are safe, knowing the likely result of this ruling?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the member of my full confidence in the automobile industry of this country. It is a strong and very healthy industry.

Yesterday we received a confidential interim report, which could be seen in the *Globe and Mail* this morning as well as a number of others papers. It is a 400 page report. We are looking into it. We are analyzing it. We will continue to have very close consultations with the stakeholders and with the provinces as well. The Government of Canada will make its comments to the panel in due course. We will wait for the final decision of the panel, this one being only an interim one.

\* \* \*

• (1500)

[Translation]

### NATIVE PEOPLES

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is not true that things are fine in the aftermath of the Marshall decision. Nothing is fine anymore.

Yesterday, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans announced that 33 out of 35 band councils had agreed to the moratorium. Today, the number is zero. We are in troubled waters and the one voice we do not hear is that of the new Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs. I give him an opportunity to explain.

Since his government and the supreme court have confirmed the right of native peoples to a regulated fishery, why is the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs not negotiating his own moratorium with them and offering them compensation?

[English]

**Hon. Robert D. Nault (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will be having a meeting with all the partners. The partners, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and I are working on a long term plan and I hope to announce it next week.

**Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I should remind the government that there is no lobster fishery going on in the Rideau Canal. This is day 27 after the Marshall decision and there is still no leadership from this government.

The Prime Minister himself said the parties have to get together. Instead of hiding behind government bureaucrats in Ottawa, why are the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans not down in the maritime region right now dealing with the stakeholders? Why are they not committing the necessary resources to meet the negotiations before something comes up that we cannot handle?

Will the minister commit today to go down to the maritime region?

**Hon. Robert D. Nault (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am here answering his question. The answer to it is they will be coming here on Monday. We will be talking about how to deal with the Marshall case. Then we will be announcing the long term process to all the House.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### FISHERIES

**Ms. Angela Vautour (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, PC):** Mr. Speaker, the rejection of the 30 day moratorium on fishing in the Atlantic region shows clearly that the minister is continuing to ignore the seriousness of the situation. This government has shown the people most directly concerned that it has absolutely no leadership.

Through its clumsy handling of the situation, the government has struck fear into the hearts of fishers in towns and villages throughout Atlantic Canada.

What has the government done and what does it intend to do to restore a feeling of security and peace of mind to people in native and non-native communities?

[English]

**Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is obvious the member was not listening to the answer just given a few minutes ago.

We are working on a long term plan. We are meeting with the aboriginal community. I think the hon. member will be able to check that what we said earlier answers the question pretty clearly.

\* \* \*

### PRESENCE IN GALLERY

**The Speaker:** I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of the Honourable Govind Raj Joshi, Minister for Water Resources of the Kingdom of Nepal.

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

\* \* \*

• (1505)

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is great that I get a question. At least once a week I am assured of this.

### Business of the House

I would like to ask the government House leader, who has all of this wisdom about what is coming up in the House of Commons, what the nature of the legislation is for the remainder of this week and next week. I would also like to know whether or not the government is going to stop the legislation coming forth on the Nisga'a agreement because as you know, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to fight, fight, fight on that issue.

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am equally pleased to answer the question because it is once a week when I get to answer a question.

Today, tomorrow and Monday we will continue with the address debate. There will be votes at the end of the day today, as well as at the end of the day on Monday on the main amendment to the throne speech.

On Tuesday morning we will have the debate on my motion to refer Bill C-2, the elections legislation, to committee before second reading. This debate may last up to three hours. Once it is completed, we will consider the electronic commerce bill that will be reintroduced tomorrow. In the last session that bill was Bill C-54. It is being reintroduced in the same form as it stood at prorogation. In order to assist members and hopefully to expedite passage I have asked that a special early print of the bill be made available to all hon. members as soon as it is reintroduced tomorrow. I expect the debate on this bill will carry us through the rest of the day on Tuesday and possibly as late as next Wednesday.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the government House leader with respect to government business and the legislative agenda.

The government House leader will recall that the government made a commitment in the last session of parliament to bring in legislation with respect to a national ban on the bulk export of water. There was no mention of this in the throne speech but it had at one time or another been indicated that it might be part of the legislative calendar. I wonder if the government House leader can tell us, will there be such legislation and when will it be forthcoming?

**The Speaker:** I am going to permit the question today but usually the Thursday question sets up our business for the week. If there has to be other information, perhaps we can get it in another manner, but I will permit the government House leader to respond if he wants to.

**Hon. Don Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, as far as I know it is still the plan of the government to introduce such legislation in the fall sitting of this parliament. As to an exact date, there are ongoing consultations between House leaders. I will inform my colleagues as soon as possible. At the present time it is still part of the fall legislative agenda.

*Privilege*

**The Speaker:** Before I recognize the member for York South—Weston, I would simply remind him that this has to do with legislation being put forth by the government for the House to consider in the next week. With that in mind, I turn the floor over to the member for York South—Weston.

**Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston, Ind.):** Mr. Speaker, the minister indicated that it is the plan of the government to send the elections bill to committee before second reading. That is an unusual procedure to follow. There are established rules in the House that require a second reading debate before a bill is referred to committee.

Could the minister explain why he is taking this unusual route with this bill?

• (1510)

**The Speaker:** This is part of our body of rules right now. It is my understanding the minister will make known his reasons. When he introduces the bill he will be the first speaker. It is part of our body of rules and as I understand it has been since 1997.

**An hon. member:** Since 1993.

**The Speaker:** I will check into it. I was told it was 1997.

\* \* \*

**PRIVILEGE**

CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

**Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make what I consider to be a very serious question of privilege.

This question of privilege arises from a lawsuit that was launched against me in 1996 but does not pertain to the actions of the individual who filed the lawsuit. Rather it concerns the activities and conduct of a government agency, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, during the course of this lawsuit.

To begin, I want to say that I do not question the established precedent that prevents a member from using privilege to guard against the lawsuit for what is said outside of the House. This question of privilege has absolutely nothing to do with that. Instead, I will provide prima facie evidence to the Chair that demonstrates how the conduct and activities of CSIS regarding this case form what I believe to be a new and disturbing method of intimidation of a member of parliament.

I will show that CSIS improperly collected information and then subsequently disclosed that information in clear violation of CSIS policy to a third party. I will show that CSIS abandoned the traditional non-partisan role of the public service by taking an active role in the preparation of a lawsuit against an opposition

member of parliament, including having its legal counsel provide the plaintiff and the plaintiff's lawyer with advice.

Finally, I will show that CSIS misused its extraordinary authority to protect national security, was twice sanctioned for misconduct and deliberately misled the court to frustrate my ability to resolve the lawsuit.

Thus the gist of my question of privilege is the deliberate effort of CSIS to intimidate me from speaking freely in the House of Commons and from performing my role as official opposition critic.

I raise this issue today because this is the first opportunity to do so since the completion of my court case. Although the standing orders state that the sub judice convention only applies in a civil lawsuit during the trial days of the proceedings, I undertook an agreement with the Board of Internal Economy not to utilize this lawsuit for political purposes. At the time I entered into that agreement, I was unaware of the role that CSIS had played in the case up to that time, nor could I possibly have envisioned the role that CSIS would subsequently take in this case. I have lived up to my obligation with the BOIE and have bided my time until today, my opportunity to raise this issue.

As I previously mentioned, this form of intimidation is unprecedented. However in Erskine May, 21st edition, page 115 states that an offence for contempt "may be treated as a contempt even though there is no precedent of the offence. It is therefore impossible to list every act which might be considered to amount to a contempt, the power to punish for such an offence being of its nature discretionary".

On October 29, 1980, a Speaker of this House had this to say:

—the dimension of contempt of parliament is such that the House will not be constrained in finding a breach of privilege of members, or of the House.

This is precisely the reason that, while our privileges are defined, contempt of the House has no limits.

• (1515)

Let me provide this brief summary of the evidence in the documents that I have before me that confirms their efforts to intimidate me. I am prepared to read it all but would prefer just to provide it to you, Mr. Speaker. Almost all the information contained in the plaintiff's statement of claim originated from CSIS. In fact the statement of claim contains a copy of my press release which bears the fax identification of the former solicitor general which was sent to CSIS.

The plaintiff's affidavit of documents consists of 107 documents which included some of my press releases, as well as newspaper clippings, radio and television transcripts from media outlets across the country. Every one of them came from CSIS, some of them before and some of them after the commencement of the lawsuit.

The plaintiff also included four video tapes of media reports, all of which were recorded by CSIS and forwarded to the plaintiff. In a discovery of the plaintiff conducted on February 17, 1998, the plaintiff admitted in regard to the video tapes that "they were provided to me without my asking". Both the plaintiff and his lawyer admitted during the proceedings that CSIS assisted the plaintiff in the preparation of his lawsuit.

In a letter dated July 20, 1998, from the plaintiff's lawyer to my lawyer the following passage is included: "certain members of CSIS have co-operated with the plaintiff in preparation of his case".

At a discovery of the plaintiff at the federal court on November 3, 1998, the plaintiff acknowledged that part of the reason he had contacted a senior manager at CSIS was to discuss the means by which he would proceed with his lawsuit. As well, at that same discovery the lawyer for the plaintiff admitted that "the legal counsel for CSIS had spoken with me from time to time, and I am sure with the plaintiff from time to time, trying to give us advice".

Thus it is clear from these comments that CSIS played a role in the preparation and conduct of the lawsuit against me. What is of particular concern is the fact that throughout the discoveries it was confirmed that it was Mr. Tom Bradley who played the key role in providing all this information to the plaintiff. This is of concern because Tom Bradley is, or was until recently, a senior member of the CSIS secretariat.

On the CSIS organizational chart the secretariat answers directly to the director of CSIS and among their duties was liaison between CSIS and the solicitor general's office.

**The Speaker:** Order, please. This is a question of privilege. It does affect all of us. I invite members, if they have other meetings, to please carry them on in the lobby. I am sure that I as well as many others want to hear what the member is saying.

**Ms. Val Meredith:** Mr. Speaker, the CSIS Act clearly limits what information CSIS can collect, generally restricting it to information that may on reasonable grounds be suspected of constituting threats to the security of Canada. I would suggest that the CSIS collection of all this information was improper.

As limiting as the laws are restricting the ability of CSIS to collect information, they are equally restrictive with regard to the ability of the service to disclose any information collected. Section 19 of the CSIS Act severely restricts the information it may disclose and nowhere in this section does it permit the disclosure of information to a private individual to assist his lawsuit against a member of parliament.

In addition to the CSIS Act, section 3.(7) of the human resources policy manual states that employees must not support or oppose

### *Privilege*

any person, organization or product by using information obtained through their employment by the service except when authorized by the director. It is quite clear that the disclosure of this information to the plaintiff was in violation of the service's own policy.

Unfortunately CSIS was not satisfied with the role in assisting with the preparation of the lawsuit against me. They proceeded to directly involve themselves in the case in what can best be described by the following: In July 1998 Madam Justice MacLeod of the Ontario court ordered that the plaintiff must answer 38 questions that he had refused to answer at discovery.

• (1520)

Immediately following the court's granting of the aforementioned order, counsel for CSIS filed a certificate of objection signed by Jim Corcoran, CSIS deputy director of operations, with Madam Justice MacLeod pursuant to sections 37 and 38 of the Canada Evidence Act. In that certificate Mr. Corcoran claimed that disclosure of the information requested in 32 of the 38 questions which were ordered to be answered would be "injurious to the national security of Canada". The remaining six questions were considered personal.

In July, I was forced to challenge the validity of that certificate through a notice of application filed in the federal court.

In August, Mr. Justice Teitelbaum of the Federal Court of Canada issued an order which, among other things, instructed that cross-examination of the affidavit should occur prior to October 5, 1998. CSIS filed the affidavit by Barry Denofsky, director general of analysis and production, on September 11. However, in direct contravention of the order of Mr. Justice Teitelbaum, they refused to make Denofsky available for cross-examination.

On October 5, Mr. Justice Teitelbaum ruled that CSIS must make Denofsky available for cross-examination and costs were awarded against CSIS. Mr. Denofsky appeared for cross-examination. However he refused to answer almost all questions of substance, 51 in total.

My lawyer filed a notice of motion requiring CSIS to produce Mr. Denofsky for further cross-examination, requiring him to answer the questions he had previously refused. The day before the federal court hearing on January 14, almost 11 weeks after Mr. Denofsky's cross-examination, CSIS provided responses to 39 of the 51 questions they previously had refused to answer.

On January 15, 1999, the hearing before Mr. Teitelbaum took place and Mr. Justice Teitelbaum ruled on March 5. He ordered CSIS to answer an additional three questions, which meant out of the original 51 questions that CSIS had refused to answer only nine of them, less than 20%, were deemed to be valid objections. Once again costs were awarded against CSIS.

*Privilege*

It is clear from the behaviour of CSIS that its main objective was to drag out the proceedings and deny me the opportunity of having this case heard in court. However the delaying tactics of CSIS were only part of the process. The content of its responses was even more troubling, which I have included in the documentation.

In answering a question about the information the service passed to the plaintiff they neglected to mention the 107 press releases. CSIS also stated that it had passed the video tapes to the plaintiff in response to a request from him. However, as I have mentioned before, the plaintiff in discovery said that they were provided to him without his asking.

In addition it mentioned that only one CSIS policy document was passed to the plaintiff. Yet the very affidavit that this discovery was about lists five different CSIS policy documents. In other words, of the three points that CSIS made in this answer all three of them were incorrect.

I cannot imagine, after making inquiries, that any member of a professional intelligence agency would be so incompetent that they could possibly inadvertently overlook all of this information, including the very affidavit that was being reviewed.

The last piece of evidence that I will mention concerns the very certificate of objection that CSIS filed. When CSIS filed the certificate on July 7, 1998, the deputy director of operations, Jim Corcoran, certified that he had carefully reviewed and considered all the questions set out in that statement. He then certified that "the information sought by this motion, either by confirmation or denial of the said information, would be contrary to the public interest as it would be injurious to the national security of Canada".

One such question was where the plaintiff refused to state during discovery whether or not it was normal that a full scale security investigation be done for people getting their security clearance renewed. Despite the claim of CSIS that the answer to this question would be injurious to the national security of Canada, I have obtained the answer to this question from the Treasury Board's public website, listed under personal security standards.

• (1525)

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have provided you with sufficient evidence to find that there is a prima facie case of contempt against the Canadian Security Intelligence Service. As an opposition critic who has previously been critical of CSIS, its role in this case has effectively prevented me from raising concerns about it for three and a half years.

In addition, CSIS has sent me and all members of the House a clear message that it is keeping track of us, watching what we do and listening to everything we say, and that it is prepared to pounce if it objects to the way in which we conduct ourselves. It has also shown that it is prepared to misuse the extraordinary authority that parliament has given to it to put us in an unwinnable situation.

The premier of Quebec launched an inquiry when officials in his government improperly released information about a federal member of parliament. While not raised in a question of privilege it was considered wrong and an inquiry was ordered. The National Assembly of Quebec chose to take action against this activity, and this parliament should do the same in the case concerning CSIS.

In my case CSIS conducted certain activities and utilized significant resources against me. The evidence shows that CSIS certainly took a role in orchestrating the lawsuit against me. As I have shown, CSIS improperly collected information and then subsequently disclosed that information to a third party in clear violation of CSIS policy.

I have shown that CSIS abandoned the traditional non-partisan role of the public service by taking an active role in the preparation of a lawsuit against an opposition member of parliament, including having its legal counsel provide the plaintiff and the plaintiff's lawyer with advice.

Finally, I have shown that CSIS has misused its extraordinary authority to protect national security, that it was twice sanctioned by the federal court for misconduct, and that it deliberately misled the court to frustrate my ability to resolve the lawsuit.

One of the basic tenets of democracy is that opposition politicians have the ability to oppose the government without fear of intimidation. I suggest that the Canadian Security Intelligence Service has tried to introduce intimidation into Canadian politics.

I believe it is vital that this form of intimidation is stopped immediately. Opposition critics need to know that they can fulfil their function of criticizing a government department without fear that the department will retaliate by orchestrating a lawsuit against them.

I therefore encourage you, Mr. Speaker, to make a precedent in this case by finding the behaviour of CSIS in this case in contempt of the House. I will provide the document I have here to support this claim. If you find that there is a prima facie case of privilege, I will move that this issue be sent to the appropriate committee for consideration.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank you for entertaining what I think is a very important question of privilege. The detail has been gone into at some length here. I invite you to examine that record and the more detailed information that the hon. member will provide to you.

What I think it comes down to is this, and it is a very important thing. There are a couple of important things to remember about this question of privilege. First, as has already been detailed by the hon. member, the question of contempt is an open-ended one. It may not be with precedence, and I do not think you will find precedence for this, Mr. Speaker. Certainly I was not able to find precedence in a question of privilege, but contempt of parliament

is an open-ended subject and in this particular case I hope you will find a prima facie case for contempt and will refer it to committee.

• (1530)

The second thing I want to mention, which the member did not bring up but which is important for all members to remember, is that if a member of parliament is sued by anyone else in Canada and the person who does the suing receives substantial support from a government department, there is no way that a member of parliament, with few exceptions, has deep enough pockets to fund an adequate defence against an entire government agency.

I can think of another very troubling case that was settled some time ago involving former Prime Minister Brian Mulroney over the airbus incident. I do not want to cast any idea of who is right or wrong, but what was interesting was that the government eventually had to settle for over \$2 million to pay for the legal bills that Mr. Mulroney, because he is a wealthy man, was able to put forward in his own defence.

How many members of parliament could have ever done that? If he had been an ordinary member of parliament without those kind of deep pockets, I think Mr. Mulroney would be hanging on the ropes today instead of free and clear of that issue because he was able to fund that defence.

That is why I think it is important that a government agency versus an ordinary member of parliament is an unequal fight and a contempt of parliament and we should see it that way.

**Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, as the solicitor general critic for the official opposition, I draw to your attention a meeting of our standing committee on May 25 with Director Alcock of CSIS.

Mr. Speaker, if you have an opportunity to review the committee report of that session, you will find that the director exhibited the kind of culture and characteristics that have been spoken about by my colleague. As my colleague has pointed out, it is very important that parliamentarians are free from any sense of intimidation, in particular in the case of the meeting on May 25. It was so troubling to all members of parliament, government members and all opposition members, that we subsequently held a second meeting to find out what our remedies would be in trying to get instruction to a very reluctant witness. In this particular case it was Director Alcock who just basically refused to respect the questions from the people in the Chamber.

I draw that to your attention, Mr. Speaker, because I think it adds something to the picture that we are looking at here.

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened with attention to

### *Privilege*

the initial presentation made by the hon. member and the subsequent statements that were made.

First, I do not believe that Mr. Speaker should be influenced between a criminal case against a civilian and a civil case against a member of parliament. The two comparisons that were made have, quite frankly, nothing to do one with the other and the references to them are immaterial. I do not know what they do to the seriousness of this issue.

I am prepared to acknowledge that the accusations themselves are obviously quite serious. It has been alleged that CSIS offered assistance to a former employee in a civil case involving a member of parliament. It is alleged that this action then constitutes a question of privilege or possibly contempt or both.

If I understood what the hon. member requested, it is that this case should be brought to the attention of a parliamentary committee for review.

Given the seriousness of these accusations, I want to remove the other materials stated by other members of parliament. I do not think some of them had anything to do with this issue.

I would ask Mr. Speaker for a stay on the ruling he intends to give, whether this constitutes a prima facie case of privilege. I would ask that I be given a little time, and possibly other members might want to contribute toward what has been alleged today. In a few short hours we will have a *Hansard* or at least a fast version of *Hansard* giving us the details of what the hon. member has said. If I understand correctly, she has offered to table some documents with Mr. Speaker. If some of us could perhaps have those documents made available to us we could further contribute before Mr. Speaker makes his initial determination as to whether this constitutes a prima facie case of privilege.

• (1535)

To repeat what I said earlier, I would ask for a stay in the Speaker's ruling on this matter, given the issue in question and the considerable amount of information made available to us by the member of parliament in question, to permit us to at least examine the material, then contribute and perhaps Mr. Speaker will consider ruling only at that time.

**Ms. Val Meredith:** Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to table this information.

**The Speaker:** These allegations are indeed serious if the allegations are true and if I decide that we will go ahead with a prima facie case. I want it understood that it is not just for opposition members for whom we are talking. We are talking about the rights of Canadian parliamentarians specifically. I of course invite the hon. member to submit to me any and all documents.

I also invite the member for Kootenay—Columbia, seeing as he quoted or said that it was in a committee report—either he could do

*The Address*

that or I could direct my clerks—to make the information from that meeting and a subsequent meeting that he mentioned available to me before I make my decision.

Seeing that there are no more interventions at this time, I intend to review everything that has been said and everything that has been written about this particular point and I am going to give this latitude. It may be a point of privilege and it may be contempt. I am going to look at it in both venues. I am not going to stand here on splitting a hair. It may be privilege or it may be contempt. I will decide that after I have it all laid out in front of me.

The hon. government House leader has asked that I stay my decision. I have said that I would do that. I would entertain information if it pertains directly to what was said by the hon. member here in the House or what is in the documents which she is going to provide to me. Any other statements will not be heard by me. They must be specifically to those points.

I will take this information under consideration now and I will get back to the House with a decision on this case.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

#### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed consideration of the motion for an address to Her Excellency the Governor General in reply to her speech at the opening of the session, of the amendment and of the amendment to the amendment.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** At the time that the debate was interrupted the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra had five minutes remaining for questions and comments. There were two minutes left in the presentation and then five minutes questions and comments. Would the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra like to proceed directly to questions and comments or take the two minutes to sum up?

• (1540)

**Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I had essentially completed my remarks which were on the knowledge century in the new millennium, the 21st century professorships. I had also made some brief remarks on several other matters. I think we could take questions at this stage if there are any questions from hon. members.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** There being no questions or comments on the intervention by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra and before we get into debate, I would like to make something clear because there was a misunderstanding a little bit earlier.

During the time for questions and comments that are usually five minutes, if there are a number of members standing when I call for questions and comments who have indicated that they would like to participate in the questions and comments, then I will try to advise who will be called for questions and comments. At that time, it is obvious that if there are five minutes to spend on questions and comments and three people who wish to make a question or a comment, it requires about 30 to 40 seconds with a little bit of leeway. After that, the point is going to have to be made and the response is going to have to be made with equal brevity. If we do not do that, we are not going to get the opportunity to have as many members participate. If there is only one member standing then we will have much more latitude for the question, comment or response. That is the way we have been proceeding for the last two years. That is the way I intend to proceed, in the absence of advice otherwise, for the next two years.

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with my colleague for Brandon—Souris and I will be splitting it equally.

There are a lot of issues that need to be addressed. A lot of people were waiting for this wonderful vision for the millennium and thought that was exactly what they were going to get. They thought that they would see things that would turn things around throughout Canada, from the east coast to the west coast. A lot of people were very disappointed after the throne speech came out.

We know that the good book says, “where there is no vision the people perish”. That has been the situation in Canada under the government because so many people are hurting. I thought there might be something there for the Atlantic region. I know the MPs from the Atlantic region were waiting for the throne speech because they thought there would be something there with regard to regional development. I heard one MP say that she was so pleased with the throne speech that she was going to dance in the streets. I have not found anyone else that wants to be her partner while she is dancing. She is going to dance all by herself. The lack of vision was truly sad.

The one good thing that came out of the throne speech was the infrastructure program. Having been a mayor, and many of us in the House of Commons were mayors before, I know how we fought for that infrastructure program. The government is saying it is going to continue the program. I have talked to the people from FCM and they are very pleased about that. I am also pleased about that.



*The Address*

However, we should have been back here September 1, not the middle of October. Let us look at what is happening with our airline service. We are not sure where it is going. In my city of Saint John, New Brunswick, we are not sure what is going to happen. If we do not have airline service then what happens to the economy? What happens to the people?

Let us take a look at the other issues, the immigration issue and the illegal immigrants coming into Canada. No one has dealt with that very serious situation. Let us take a look at the fishery.

I asked those questions today in the House. The fisheries is a serious situation and violence can and will occur unless the Prime Minister of Canada himself steps in. The Prime Minister has to go to the table. I had aboriginal people in my office at nine o'clock this morning. These are not people that live on the reserves, but the minister of fisheries has refused to meet with them. He and the Prime Minister have to meet and talk with them.

• (1545)

There was a great deal in the Speech from the Throne about children. I have two children of my own and two grandchildren and like everyone else I am very concerned about the future. I want to make sure there is a strong foundation for my two little grandchildren.

I feel very strongly about families. I feel very strongly that we have to help them. We have to make sure that there is a strong foundation to continue to build on and assist the family unit. It is very important that we reduce personal income tax. We should be putting money back into the pockets of those parents.

It is also very important that the transfer payments be increased so that we can have health care back where it should be. One would not believe the horror stories in my riding office that have happened through health care. We have lost in our part of Canada many of our specialists. They have gone to the United States. That is where they are at. We just lost another one. We cannot replace them. We cannot afford to pay them the same salary. It is a major concern. We have to reduce our massive national debt. I do not want our grandchildren to have to pay for it. I want us to work and do it right.

When I took over as mayor the city was in a very poor financial position, just like the country is in a very poor financial position, and I wanted to get us into a borrowing debt free position. I asked the commissioner of finance to give me three programs to look at to try to get us into a borrowing debt free position.

When he put those programs before me it just so happened that on my council I had a professor at the time. That professor said to me "Elsie, come here to the window". I went to the window and I looked. He said "That little man down there sweeping the street works for us, Elsie. We have to make sure that man continues to

work. We do not want to slash, burn and cut to the point that he has no way to feed his family". We did it in a very responsible way. This has to happen again at the federal level.

I have waited, and I am sure a lot of people across the country were waiting, for something in the throne speech on defence, something in that speech to help merchant mariners so they are not back here on the Hill on a hunger strike again. If we do not resolve the compensation issue for merchant mariners they will be back up on the Hill by November 11 and they will be on another hunger strike.

Of those men who were here on a hunger strike, one of them has been in the hospital for two operations since he went back. If he comes here again we will be burying him from the steps of Parliament Hill. That has to be resolved and it has not been resolved. It is truly sad when we take a look at how the Liberals have cut the defence budget to the point that our troops that have to go to Croatia, Kosovo and East Timor do not have the equipment they should have.

This is the international year of seniors and seniors were never mentioned in the throne speech. What an insult for the seniors of Canada. They must have been hurt. I have looked at the cutbacks in programs that used to be there for them. They are no longer there and the seniors are having a difficult time.

The government needs to raise the basic income tax exemption to \$10,000. This could eliminate a lot of people from the tax rolls, more than two million lower income workers. The solutions rest in the strengthening of the family unit with lower taxes, with better co-operation among Ottawa, the provinces, the territories and our communities. We have to look at the quality of life.

Since the government came into power in 1993 it has increased personal income taxes by 15%. In five years it did that. In five years a lot of middle income Canadians are worse off today than they have ever been. I know that myself. My daughter-in-law said to me "Mom, I find it hard these days to make ends meet". I said "I know, dear, because you are paying more in taxes than ever before". I have to say right now that things have to change, that things have to turn around.

• (1550)

It was a throne speech. It was supposed to be for all the people. However, there had better be a better vision than what was contained in that throne speech if we want to turn Canada around. If we want to do what is right for families, if we want to do what is right for all Canadians from coast to coast, there is a lot more that needs to be done.

[Translation]

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I listened closely to the member for Saint John and I think she gave a

*The Address*

fine speech. I also see that she has the same health problems in her riding as we have in Quebec.

The present federal government, led by the Liberals, has always given us to understand that only Quebec had problems with its health system, because of its sovereignist government. Its sidekick in Quebec, the Liberal Party, has said the same thing. I am therefore happy to note that the member for Saint John has the same problems in her region.

But, given the Canada-wide problems the member pointed out, I would like to know what this government, which has helped itself to provincial transfer payments, should have done right away in the throne speech, instead of promising action for 2001 or 2002. I would like the member for Saint John to tell us what she would have liked to see in the throne speech that would have solved health problems in Canada.

[English]

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne:** Mr. Speaker, I would have liked to have seen money injected immediately into our health care, our educational system and transfer payments for both, along with social programs, and not in the year 2001. That is two years down the road.

We are suffering now and steps have to be taken now to correct it. In the year 2001 we will be worse off than we are today. Steps have to be taken. We have to push the government to make sure that it puts that money in there before the year 2001.

[Translation]

**Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I have also listened to my colleague. She said that there was absolutely nothing for seniors. I say that this is scandalous, when we are in the International Year of Older Persons.

Last week, I saw some publicity on seniors clubs while watching television at home. Mr. Boulianne from my riding was on the program—and this very honourable gentleman did a very nice job, I might add—but they paid to get some coverage. There are other equally honourable people who cannot get on TV and they are forgotten. Why are only a few people shown on television while others without a cent to their name are forgotten?

There are many seniors living in almost dire straits. I will let the hon. member respond to that shortly.

Reference is made to youth and children. In 1988, the House of Commons voted unanimously for there to be no more poor children by the year 2000. There were a million of them at that time, and today there are 1.5 million. That is shocking. A policy has been announced. I am not saying it is not helpful, but it is not applicable until the year 2001.

I am asking what the hon. member for Saint John thinks of this.

• (1555)

[English]

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne:** Mr. Speaker, as I stated, we need to have policies right now. The government has cut the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation housing project. We had a number of housing projects for seniors in my riding which gave them a beautiful quality of life. It also put carpenters, electricians and cabinetmakers to work. It created a good economy for us, but there is nothing for these people now. I have 1,000 families in Saint John, New Brunswick, that are in need of housing and there is no program at all.

They do not want to tell me that the year 2001 is good. It has to be done now.

**Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC):** Mr. Speaker, it is always difficult to follow the member for Saint John. I will try my best to live it up, but as I said it is somewhat difficult to match that enthusiasm.

I am very pleased to be able to respond to the Speech from the Throne as presented by the new governor general. We all congratulate and welcome Adrienne Clarkson to her new post as governor general.

I am pleased to stand in this august House to represent my constituents of Brandon—Souris. I certainly thank them for giving me the opportunity to represent them. I assure them that I will do my best to represent them to the best of my capacity. I will certainly pass on their concerns to the government.

As one of the members of the government said, the throne speech was not supposed to have any substance to it but was supposed to show the vision of the government going into 21st century. By the way, the government succeeded in not having any substance in that speech, but it did not succeed very well in showing the vision of the government going into the 21st century.

My colleague from Saint John talked about a specific area that was neglected in the throne speech, that of housing. It is incumbent upon the government to see where Canadians want to be not only next year or five years from now but ten and fifteen years from now. Housing is only one cog in the wheel of what Canadians require for their well-being and livelihood. I will touch on a couple of others.

The Liberals succeeded in putting forward a very warm and fuzzy Speech from the Throne. They touched on some of the hot buttons, the points of issue Canadians feel very comfortable about. They touched on the environment. That is very good and very positive. The environment is very important to all of us as Canadians. We have to breathe air and drink water and make sure we have sustainability in our agriculture community so we have food to sustain us through the next decade and the next century.

*The Address*

They touched on health care but they talked about the research requirements in health care. They did not really talk about where health care would be going in the next 10, 15 or 20 years, or about what Canadians would like to see as their health care system unfolds into the 21st century. This is not something that we can say is status quo. We have to look to the future.

They talked about children and youth, a very important aspect of our society. The children we bring into this world and this country are obviously a resource and we have to look after them. Unfortunately they did not go far enough with respect to children and youth in our society.

The problem with Canadians today in listening to the throne speech is that they have a tendency not to believe governments any longer, in particular this government. The government has a history of perhaps saying things Canadians would like to hear but of perhaps not implementing them in the way Canadians feel they should be implemented.

I do not have to go very far. I simply have to look at the record. I have to look at the red book. I have to look at the scrapping of the GST which did not come to fruition. I have to talk about the free trade issue. They were going to rip up the agreement, which is one of the major reasons the budget is now balanced. It is the reason the Liberal government can now take credit for something that was put into place by a government that had vision, that could look 10 and 15 years down the road and say that what is right for Canadians now is a free trade agreement so that we are a partner in the globalized trading world of today. If it were a Liberal government that had to put that into place, we would still be hewers of wood and drawers of water.

• (1600)

The Liberals have not fulfilled any of their promises. Canadians today will be somewhat skeptical when they look at the throne speech that was presented two days ago.

The Liberals talk about taxes that will be reduced. Canadians do not believe them because right now taxes are taking a larger portion of their pay packets than what they did previous to 1993.

The Liberals talked about health care and they talked about the research components of health care. What they did not tell us is that by 2003, with the \$11 billion put back in by the Liberal government over five years, we will be at the same level of support in health care that we were at in 1993. That is the wrong way to head into the new century. We are going backward, not forward. The Liberals hold it up as being a centrepiece of their platform. The fact is they do not know where they are heading with health care and Canadians are concerned about that.

I think Canadians wanted to have a good feeling as to where this government wanted to head in the future with respect to the retirement of our debt. Our debt did not come to us immediately. As a matter of fact it came to us over a number of years inclusive of the Liberal government and Mr. Trudeau and inclusive of other governments.

We have to put a plan together so that we can reduce that debt. It has to be a well thought out logical plan that extends a number of years into the next century. But there was none of that. What was in the throne speech was that yes, they will deal with it if they possibly can. That is not a plan.

The throne speech did not talk about an area that is very close and dear to my heart and my constituency of Brandon—Souris, which by the way I think reflects society in general, an urban rural area. We have people who are rich and poor. We have people who are young and old. My constituents wanted to hear something about agriculture. Not once was the word mentioned, with the exception of WTO and trade and agriculture put together.

Agriculture is the backbone of this country and always has been. I am frustrated and disappointed. We did not have to come up with the solutions. What we needed was the vision. A government member said “we do not deal with substance, we deal with vision”.

Where are we going with agriculture? There is no support. We are not supported against the Europeans and the Americans right now. All the government had to say is that philosophically agriculture is a very important component to this society, that it believes in a very strong, domestic supply of food for our country. That is all the government had to say. It had to say that the environment is very important and agriculture is an important part of the environment. It had to say that with the endangered species legislation the government talked about, it is important that we deal with agriculture and producers to make sure the endangered species legislation works. The government never said that. It never tied into it. That is vision and that is what is lacking in the throne speech.

That is where we had to head with vision and that is what I did not see.

We talk about the seniors. What about vision with respect to the baby boomers that are now among the seniors? Why do we not talk about retirement in 2010 or 2020? That is vision. This is a reactive government, not a proactive government. I would rather have had something in the throne speech that said there is a change in what is happening in society right now. A huge population is aging. We have to look at retirement. We have to look at government policies as to how those people plan for retirement. There was none of that. What was there? In the last budget the Liberals put into place they increased the CPP contributions by twice as much. That is their

*The Address*

plan for retirement into the future. There is no vision. That was lacking in the throne speech.

A pet peeve and a soap box I like to get on is the world of work. Work is changing all around us. There is contract work. People are now doing work in their own homes. There are people who are part time employees, whether they want to be or not. That is the vision. The Liberals have to put a plan in place to accommodate those people in 2000, 2010 and 2020. I am disappointed. What we got were warm fuzzies with no substance. Yes, that is what the Liberals attempted to do and that is what they achieved.

First, we do not believe the Liberals will do anything that they said they would do. Second, it did not go far enough.

• (1605)

If this is the vision of this government, if this is the direction in which this government wants to take us after January 1, 2000, then I am very concerned. Our citizens are concerned.

I have to register my final complaint. It goes back to agriculture. For the government not to have said a word about it is absolutely disgusting. Canadians from coast to coast needed some assurances and confidence. They got nothing in the throne speech and I am very concerned about our direction in the next century.

[Translation]

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to the speech by the hon. member for Brandon—Souris. I would have liked him to have said what he thinks about the measure on parental leave.

The government tells us that we need to help young families to have children, but then it organizes things in such a way that parental leave will only take effect in the year 2001, and takes the money from the employment insurance fund. I would like to hear the hon. member address this point.

[English]

**Mr. Rick Borotsik:** Mr. Speaker, I left the parental leave to my colleague from Saint John and I thought she handled it very well.

I have two children. I believe very strongly that children should have access to their parents during their formative years, particularly between one and three years of age. I did it as a father. My wife did it as a mother. I am very proud of the way we had our children grow up and develop.

At that time we did not have many supports from the federal government. If those supports are available, we will encourage it absolutely. We have to make sure that our children are taken care of

because that is the resource we are going to depend on over the next number of years.

**Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member has a vested interest in the agricultural industry and the family farm crisis being experienced throughout Canada, especially in the prairie provinces. He is very close to the industry in the Brandon area.

What does the hon. member think about the concentrated control of our food and drug industry in North America and the world? A handful of multinationals control the food input and output costs of the farmers and the farmers are vulnerable. The farmers want to be as independent as they can be, but they are at the whim of the multinationals with commodity prices, input prices, herbicides, drugs, pesticides and seed costs. Now biotechnology is coming into play. All farmers have to pay for the research and development of these technologies coming in. The Liberal government seems to be very proud of this biotech division, but the farmers are being led through an evolutionary change on the family farm.

I would like to hear the hon. member's comments about that.

**Mr. Rick Borotsik:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. It is an excellent one.

I go back to my comments about having an understanding as to where we want to go in agriculture. Do we want Canadians to have a reliable domestic food supply? I think that if we asked Canadians, they would say yes. Canadians would say yes to an affordable food supply. We have to talk about the multifunctionality of agriculture with respect to the environment. I think Canadians would say it is an important factor. Do we want to have an independence in that sector and that industry? I think Canadians would say yes.

Those are the questions the government did not ask. If Canadians say yes to all of those, then we have to put a philosophy together that says we will make sure that agriculture is going to exist in our country in the next 20 years and that it is going to be in family farms, as the hon. member has said.

Family farms have changed with evolution, too. Family farms now are anywhere from 4,000 to 5,000 acres in my area, where a family farm used to be one section or less.

We have to be flexible enough to recognize that there is an evolution in agriculture, but we have to make sure that there is still an independent ownership of that agriculture, of the people who live in our communities and who want to continue to grow crops in those communities. We have to protect them against some of the issues the hon. member just mentioned. We have to protect them against some of this intrusion into their flexibility and independence.

*The Address*

• (1610)

**Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am sharing my time with the hon. member for Guelph—Wellington.

It is an honour for me to speak today to show my confidence in the government and the programs set out in the Governor General's Speech from the Throne. I would like to offer my humble thanks to Her Excellency Madam Clarkson for the gracious speech which she addressed to both Houses of Parliament and to all Canadians.

There is much to talk about the millennium and what the next century holds. After hearing the Speech from the Throne I am certain we will enjoy a fruitful millennium, one which the Canada we know today will continue on its course of greatness in the next century and beyond, the Canada we know which looks after all citizens and creates a positive environment allowing them to maximize their potential as individuals and as collectivities.

I could go on for days describing the wonderful state in which we live, but I am here today to show my support for our government and its plans for the coming years, its plan that will lay the foundations for generations inhabiting this great land.

I see the Speech from the Throne as a symbol of the incredible progress we have made over the last six years. We have gone from inheriting a Canada where the future looked bleak to being well prepared for the challenges a new world brings us. It is by far one of the most promising and well thought out programs I have had the pleasure to be part of. I would like to commend the government on its foresight. We are honoured to be part of a plan that takes into consideration not only the needs of middle class Canadians, but also recognizes those Canadians who may be in a less fortunate position.

We see before us a government that is ready to commit to children and youth, to rebuilding communities, strengthening the environment, increasing disposable income through tax relief and improving our place in the world. We should be proud of our commitment to Canada and proud we are.

I am also greatly pleased that so much of what our program entails is going to directly benefit my home province of Prince Edward Island. Children are going to enter the millennium with a better education, better standard of living and a better future than has ever been seen in our history as a nation. New parents are going to have an edge over my generation. Mothers and fathers alike will be able to raise a family without having to worry about the future.

I remember a time not so long ago when the thought of raising a family in the 21st century concerned a lot of people. It concerned us because under the last government we were headed toward a

society where families would have been ignored. Today we can look forward with hope.

We can be hopeful because we are taking steps to invest in the future. Children are the future of our nation. Without them our liberal democratic tradition will not continue. They represent our legacy.

This government will help parents spend more time caring for young children while ensuring that they have the resources to meet their children's needs. Our plan will do this by reducing income taxes for families, extending employment insurance parental leave benefits and adding an additional \$1.7 billion a year to the national child benefit making it easier for low income families to break the cycle of poverty.

We must also invest in today's youth. They are acquiring knowledge and skills at an earlier age. They are at home in the wired world using tools that are rapidly changing the way we think. We are experiencing a technological revolution.

When I was younger we used to use our two feet to look for a job. We would pound on the doors. We would pound the pavement. Now our young adults can use the Internet to look for employment. They can also shop, trade stocks, say hello to a relative, all with the flick of a mouse. It has changed the way in which we work. These youth need to be given the tools to succeed under these conditions. Our plan will give Canadian youth an edge as the technological revolution continues so that we will surpass all other nations in the world when dealing with technology's challenges.

Our plan will help Canada's youth realize their potential as leaders. The government will help them learn about their country and its citizens, use their skills to help others and use their creativity to contribute to Canada's culture. This will be achieved by drawing on the expertise of young Canadians to help connect rural and urban communities to the information highway by hiring our youth to put in place additional Internet access sites for public use. This will increase the participation of rural Canadians on the Internet while giving our youth valuable work experience.

We will also give 100,000 young Canadians every year a chance to learn about another part of the country through exchanges Canada. This will solidify our youth as knowledgeable Canadians while increasing their awareness of regional issues. Clearly technology investment is a thoughtful investment for the future of a strong Canadian federation and a strong Canadian youth.

But all of this investment in youth, in family and children which I just spoke about is worthless if we do not have safe strong communities, communities that are free of crime, and a strong voluntary sector to tie them together.

*The Address*

• (1615)

Strong communities rely on the participation of all members. Our government is committed to strengthen this partnership with communities and the voluntary organizations which contribute to them. We will do this by developing a national accord with the voluntary sector to lay the foundation for stronger partnerships with voluntary organizations.

If I may take this a step further, our investment in communities is part and parcel of our long term economic and social well-being. Our investment in children and families is also a long term investment. We are however at a loss if we do not include the environment in our long term goal to enter the millennium with force.

A clean and healthy environment is central to our quality of life and as time progresses the demands that are made on mother nature will become even more severe. The government recognizes this and will continue to build partnerships at home and abroad which focus on sustainable development and improve the quality of the environment in our communities. We will set and enforce tough pollution standards, reduce greenhouse gases, clean up contaminated sites on federal lands and support innovative clean-up technologies.

Canada has always symbolized a nation that appreciates the environment. As we enter the 21st century we will continue this tradition of environmental preservation by extending Canada's national parks system.

The financial stability of Canadians is also very important as we enter a new century. Financial freedom allows Canadians to maximize their potential, gives them the freedom to grow and to put something back into the country. Having said this, I cannot stress how important it is that we receive tax relief. This is the best way to give our economy a kickstart and to give the children of the future a solid foundation on which to grow. We cannot just provide children with a positive learning environment; we must also give them the financial support in which to flourish. To give our families more disposable income so they can provide their children with the foundation to grow will certainly make Canada the place to be in the 21st century.

Just recently I sent out questionnaires to my constituents asking them what they thought we as a country could do to increase our standard of living. I also asked them how we could increase our productivity. Over 80% of the responses I have received so far demand that the tax burden be reduced. It is clear that we must give Canadians an incentive to build. I look forward to our government's response to the overwhelming demand that exists for tax relief.

In the Speech from the Throne Her Excellency the Governor General addressed tax relief issues. Our government will put more dollars in the hands of families with children. Our government will also continue to create a better environment for economic growth and enhanced productivity by reducing the debt burden, initiating more tax cuts and making strategic investments. The economic spinoff from a tax cut will add to the economy. People who have more money at their disposal will stimulate the demand for goods and in turn will create more jobs. It is a win-win situation.

I would like to join the millions of Canadians who have embraced our program. May we enjoy its benefits and grow as a nation as we enter the 21st century.

The Speech from the Throne is an ingenious formula for success. It contains measures that will strengthen elements of society so that as we enter the millennium we will be the best country in the world. Let me explain this.

Our families need a dynamic economy in which to raise their children. We are giving them this through tax relief. Our children need strong, safe communities in which to learn successfully. Our government is giving them this. To learn successfully children need a strong health care system and our government is giving them this. Each of these realms promotes individual development. Our plan promotes the maximization of individuals' potential, young and old. Once we achieve success in every realm of individual maximization our quality of life as Canadians will improve and in turn our place in the world will improve.

It is quite clear that we are responding positively to the daunting task of preparing Canada for the new millennium; and yes, we are prepared.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, what is amazing with this government is that it has a lot of money.

What is even more amazing, however, is that it does not have money for this year or for the year 2000. This government is suffering from the wait and see disease. We have to wait. And what about people who are waiting for the government to do something?

I ask my colleague opposite if he could make representations within the Liberal caucus to get the government to bring forward the implementation dates with regard to both parental leave and the infrastructure program. This is another ambiguous issue. The government says that studies will be conducted between now and the end of the year 2000 and that maybe, in the 2001 budget, it will be able to respond to the request made by municipalities.

I ask my colleague opposite to be clearer and more precise than the Prime Minister of Canada was yesterday.

*The Address*

• (1620)

[English]

**Mr. George Proud:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question. The government has laid out a plan for the future and the next budget in February will lay out the details on the tax cuts and other issues that have been raised.

He asked me if I would intervene. I am always intervening on behalf of my constituents and on behalf of all Canadians to make sure that the government does things as quickly as it can, but there are rules it has to go by and it is going by those rules.

However, I am sure, as I have read in the headlines of the papers over the past few days, that the people in Canada are very pleased with the throne speech.

**Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I have always had a lot of respect for the hon. member for Hillsborough. I know he is here for the right reasons, to do the right things on behalf of his constituents. However, I have to admit that his speech was fairly wishy-washy, if I can use that term and it can be translated properly. It gives the impression of warm and fuzzy. It gives the impression that there is nothing wrong. It gives the impression that everybody is fat, dumb and happy in this country of ours, so just sit back and do not worry because things are being handled well.

He said that all of the newspaper headlines indicated how wonderful the throne speech was. I wonder if he saw the headlines recently about agriculture, which was not mentioned. I wonder if he saw the headlines about transportation, which was not mentioned in his speech, with respect to a potential monopoly situation in the air. I wonder if he saw the headlines with respect to the fisheries, where people are actually committing violence against one another. Is that the type of Canada that he sees, or does he not see that through his rose coloured glasses? Does he not believe that it is the responsibility of his government to try to come up with solutions to those issues?

**Mr. George Proud:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his questions. Yes, I have seen those headlines. I happen to live in an area where some of those problems are taking place. I have confidence that the government, as it has always done, will take care of those problems.

The member heard in question period today the question on agriculture. That has been taken care of. The question of the native and non-native fishery is a very volatile problem and I hope that cooler heads will prevail and that the government, the native fishermen and the non-native fishermen can get together to work out a solution.

I said that we live in a great country and that things are great. Things have never been so good, but there are still a lot of people suffering. That is why the government has come forward with programs to help these people, with tax cuts, with child tax benefits and with all of the things that will happen over the next couple of years.

**Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Guelph—Wellington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in today's debate. It is an important one.

This week's Speech from the Throne was great news for my riding of Guelph—Wellington, and for all of Canada, quite frankly. It outlined a commitment to protect and improve the social programs we all hold very dear while not abandoning our commitment to fiscal responsibility.

Fiscal responsibility is very important to all Canadians. When the federal Liberals came to power in 1993 we inherited a deficit of \$42 billion. We know that the Conservative government did not handle things very well, much to the sadness of every single Canadian. Canadians from across Canada at that time left only two Conservative members in this House. They said no, that the Conservatives were not on the right track.

We refused to let this era of deficit spending continue. By 1998, just five short years later, we had not only balanced the budget, we had posted a surplus of \$3.5 billion. That is an improvement of \$45.5 billion. It is an accomplishment of which every one of us can be proud because each Canadian helped to do that.

• (1625)

Obviously our balanced plan is working and we will continue to pursue that plan because it is working.

The Speech from the Throne renews our commitment to fiscal restraint. We have renewed our commitment to ensuring that the nation's finances never get out of control again. We have renewed our commitment to ensuring that the debt to GDP ratio remains on a downward track. We have renewed our commitment to continue cutting taxes while making strategic investments in this country's future.

The Speech from the Throne contains a promise to further reduce taxes. People in my own riding as well as many Canadians across Canada have asked for that. We will put more money back into the pockets of all Canadians.

The next budget will also lay out a multi-year plan for tax reduction. This is important to my riding because Guelph—Wellington has seen that this multi-year plan worked in slaying the deficit and it will work in tax reduction also.

Targeted tax cuts and broad based tax cuts are both priorities in my riding. I have done a survey in Guelph—Wellington and that is what my constituents have told me. However, I also want to stress

*The Address*

that Guelph—Wellington believes, and I know many Canadians across our great country agree, that we must not cut taxes at the expense of our valued social programs. That would be a serious mistake.

When asked where new spending should be directed, my constituents identified post-secondary education as a priority. I am pleased to report that our government is committed to ensuring that Canada has a strong infrastructure to improve our skills, promote innovation and conduct research. That is great news for the University of Guelph.

The University of Guelph is a world class, world renowned institution located in the heart of the golden technology triangle. It is an important part of the academic community and of our local community. Consequently, we are all very pleased with the federal government's promise to increase support for granting councils, enabling them to forge new partnerships with universities and to attract more of the best research minds in the world. This is very important to all Canadians. Places like the University of Guelph do wonderful research that benefits all Canadians in the areas of health, animal research—just name it, we do it in Guelph.

This will be done through an innovative program called 21st century chairs for research excellence. We will invest \$60 million in the first year, \$120 million in the second year, \$180 million in the third year. The program will be ongoing, with the goal of creating 12,000 positions in three years and 2,000 in the very near future. It is fantastic.

The federal government also will foster greater international research collaboration by Canadian universities, and research institutes will help to expand Canadian scientific expertise in a variety of areas. Legislation will be tabled to create Canadian institutes of health research and the commercialization of research from universities and government research centres. They all will be improved.

The federal government will also work with our provincial partners to develop an action plan that sets out common principles, objectives and a funding framework for all governments to increase their resources dedicated to post-secondary education. Together we will find ways to ensure that skills development keeps pace with the evolving economy and makes it easier to finance lifelong learning. For anybody who has worked in a community, we all know that lifelong learning is absolutely paramount in this economy. It is very important.

The survey that I did also indicated that health care is very important and on people's minds. People want access to quality universal health care, and the factor really is a very high quality of life. People want that. Our health care system represents our society's belief in compassion and in caring. It is one of our proudest national achievements and it is an example for many other nations.

Many times we hear the Reform Party talk about the United States and how wonderful the United States is. Canada's crime rate is far below that of the United States and Canada's health care system is much better than that of the United States. We are certainly very blessed.

In the Speech from the Throne we have promised to strengthen the federal government's own research and science capacity to better protect the health and safety of Canadians. We will strengthen the food safety program and take further steps to address the health risks posed by pesticides and will table legislation to modernize health protection.

• (1630)

Over the next two years we will support our partners in testing innovations in home care and pharmacare and integrated service delivery, then consider what further significant investments need to be made.

We will also build a modern health system to make health information more accessible, not only to health professionals but also to citizens like you, Mr. Speaker, and I.

More and more we are learning that the quality of our health is affected by the state of our environment. Canadians have long recognized that a clean and healthy environment is essential to maintaining and enhancing our quality of life. Guelph—Wellington is known for its environmentally friendly practices, such as its state of the art wet and dry recycling facility.

Just recently we had five members of parliament in attendance at an event held at the recycling plant. This was really a great show of support from the government for recycling and environmental issues. I believe other communities can and will learn from our example, especially given the federal government's commitment to further developing and adopting green technology.

A clean and healthy environment is a wonderful legacy for our children. Children are our future and Guelph—Wellington believes that they deserve the best possible start in life. On this issue once again the Speech from the Throne reflects the priorities of my constituents.

The 1999 throne speech includes the commitment to help families by cutting taxes and leaving more money in their pockets. The federal government will also increase funding for the national child benefit by 2002, further helping parents to provide for their children. We will lengthen employment insurance benefits for parental leave. Children always come first with the government.

I am very proud of the Speech from the Throne. It reflects our balanced approach, combining fiscal prudence with a commitment to social programs. In a recent survey my people identified health care, post-secondary education, tax cuts, the environment and the future of our children. The throne speech has all of these elements.



*The Address*

The Prime Minister of Canada has listened to the people of Guelph—Wellington again.

The throne speech lays out our path as we enter a new century and a new millennium. The initiatives it outlines will help us to maintain a dynamic economy, strengthen our communities and further advance Canada's place in the world. I know that the future holds many wonderful things for Canada. With the guidance of the federal government, we will work together and achieve our goals.

I would like to finish with a quote from our Prime Minister. Yesterday He said "Canada belongs to the 21st century and Canada will be the place to be in the 21st century. The world has seen the future and it is Canada".

**Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I listened very closely to hon. member's speech. She spent a high degree of time raving about the government's environmental concern.

Since the government took office, the environment has gone from the sixth largest department to the twenty-first largest department in government. This is also a government that waited six years to pass its first environmental piece of legislation since taking office, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, Bill C-32, which was not exactly a watershed bill. As the House knows, the environmental members of the Liberal caucus, those very learned members in terms of the members for Lac-Saint-Louis and York North, all expressed concerns on that piece of legislation.

My question is very simple. Does the hon. member think one piece of legislation passed in six years is a watershed leadership on environmental legislation?

**Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my speech, there is no question that Guelph—Wellington has been a leader in environmental concerns. Many communities have studied our recycling wet-dry facility and many areas are following our example. The federal government has just put a huge amount of money into that so that all communities can learn. The government has been doing this consistently. It has been going across Canada and putting money into projects that really do work and really make a difference in all of our lives on a daily basis. In the end this will benefit all of us and will leave a legacy for our children that we can all be proud of.

• (1635)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the member would have us believe that there are no problems in Canada or almost none. She is certainly on the same wavelength as the Prime Minister, who is constantly saying that Canada is the best

country in the world, that we are rich and that everything is fine. He keeps repeating that like a parrot. It is not necessarily true.

How is it that the government is offering so little, and nothing before the year 2001? Between now and then, what is it offering children? What is it offering the many teenagers across Canada who take their own lives because there are problems? We must not bury our heads in the sand. The truth must be told.

There are a lot of problems in Canada but the government prefers not to see them, because that is less painful. What will be done between now and the year 2001 since most programs will kick in only after 2001?

[*English*]

**Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Quebec said that we need to spell out the truth. He is indeed quite right. We do need to spell out the truth.

We have a party across the way, the Bloc Québécois, that wants to break this beautiful country up. It is disgraceful because the reality is that we do live in the best country in the world. We have been named six times as the best country in the world. As President Clinton said when he was here, I do not know of any country where people can get along better by being on their own and breaking a country up.

When Quebec needed help who helped it? Every province from across Canada helped Quebec and it was happy to take that help. The Bloc members should be ashamed of themselves. Do they want to hear the truth? They should be proud Canadians and proud to live in this great land of ours.

**Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I wanted to rebut the \$42 billion but I will pass on that.

The member for Guelph—Wellington mentioned that she had five Liberal MPs in her riding recently. Why could she not have had those five Liberal MPs visit me over the past summer to see the devastation of the farms, the loss of hope, the despair, the depression and the violence within the families because of the situation they are dealing with? Why could she not bring her colleagues down to see that in her rosy little world?

**Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain:** Mr. Speaker, I will invite my colleagues to go to my hon. colleague's riding.

I know there are serious problems in Canada, but there is no question that we live in the greatest country in the world, bar none. The reality is that the Liberal government will continue on a path of trying very hard to make sure social problems are addressed and that we are financially and fiscally responsible. We pledge to that.

**Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to the Speech from the Throne

*The Address*

today. The issue I would like to address is the issue we discussed last night in this place in the take note debate, in particular the Marshall decision of the Supreme Court of Canada and the suggestion I made to the minister that he go back to the court to seek a stay of judgment and a rehearing of the case.

The reason I want to address that issue again is that the intentions of my suggestion have been repeatedly misinterpreted not only by the government but also by opposition members on this side of the House, both Conservative and NDP. It is sad that has happened because the reality is that if we do not go back to the court, if we continue on the path that the minister has taken, the minister will be sitting at the table with no cards in his hands and no chips on the table.

• (1640)

The fact is that the decision by the court has taken away the minister's bargaining position. He has nothing to negotiate. The court has very clearly allowed a native preference and a native priority to fish as a result of this Marshall decision. The court has very clearly stated that. It has also not imposed any limits on it. The court has again said that natives have the right to fish and earn a moderate living. The minister has in fact made matters worse by suggesting that he will allow that right and recognize it as a communal right.

The reality is then that rather than a fisher going out and earning a moderate living from that fishery, it could very well be expected that moderate living could apply to all the Mi'kmaq in the maritimes, all 12,000 and some-odd of them. If one out of four of those Mi'kmaq decides to exercise the right that the court has granted, there will be no room at all for anyone else in that fishery. That is the pure, hard, cold facts of the matter.

The disappointment I had with the debate last night was that nobody seemed to be speaking for the current participants in this fishery. Nobody in the House was addressing a concern about those people.

**An hon. member:** You did.

**Mr. John Cummins:** My colleague says I did. Yes, I did, but it seemed that I was a voice in the wilderness in this place.

If the federal government believes that non-native fishermen have a place in this newly defined fishery, it ought to say so. If the Governments of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and indeed Quebec believe that non-aboriginal fishermen have a place in this newly mandated fishery, they ought to say so. If other members of the House believe that non-aboriginal fishers have a place in this fishery, they had better say so.

It is going to take more than just saying so. It is going to take convincing the minister to go back to the court to seek a stay of judgment. The reason for that is quite simple. If he goes back and

seeks that stay of judgment, it is going to give him some bargaining chips. He will have something on the table in front of him that will allow him to negotiate from a position of strength. As it is now, he has nothing. The courts have given the proverbial ranch away.

The question is: how outrageous is this request to seek a stay of judgment? Is it somehow trying to avoid the decision? Is it somehow trying to work around the decision and avoid it? No, it is not. The stay of judgment is asking the court to back off to allow for a cooling off period. It is asking the court to define its intentions with regard to, for example, a moderate livelihood, and to define or clarify whether non-status natives are going to be covered by this decision.

This would give some guidelines for the minister to take to the negotiating table. This would allow the minister to bargain from a position of knowledge. If no effort is made to define the rights of non-status natives, if there is no effort made to define whether or not the courts were including them as people to be covered by this treaty, it is best to know that now because as sure as the Lord made little green apples that matter will end up in the Supreme Court of Canada. If it is not done now at the request of the minister, it will be done two or three years from now. It will be there. We could have two or three years of negotiation with the Mi'kmaq people to try to find a place for non-aboriginal fishermen in the newly mandated fishery, and after two or three years of debate find all of that tossed out the window because all of a sudden we have about another some 36,000 non-status natives at the table as well saying that they too have a priority right to fish as a result of this treaty.

• (1645)

It is critical that a decision is made to go back to the court. That decision has to be made within the next three days, because the government had 30 days from the time the decision came down to ask for a stay of proceedings and for this redefinition. If the government allows that time to go by without making application, it has lost it. There is nothing on the table. The minister has given it up. He has walked away. He has turned his back on fishermen in the maritimes. It is as simple as that.

Why my request would be denied by the NDP and by the Conservatives is beyond me. Why they would deny strengthening the minister's hand so he could clarify the situation that is before us, so he could determine the level of participation of non-aboriginal fishermen in this fishery, is beyond me. Why would they deny guaranteeing non-aboriginal fishermen access to this fishery?

As I said, there is no guarantee now that there will be room for non-aboriginal fishermen if this decision goes unchallenged. Clearly the Mi'kmaq could use up the total access that we now have to the resource. There is no question at all that they have a priority right to that fish and could very well utilize the total allowable catch we now have.

*The Address*

The request that I made is not outrageous. Last night the member for Vancouver Quadra mentioned an article by Jeffrey Simpson which appeared in the *Globe and Mail*. In that article Mr. Simpson was referencing the 1954 decision of the U.S. supreme court in *Brown v the Board of Education at Topeka*. That particular ruling challenged the separate but equal doctrine which had allowed for the segregation of educational institutions in the southern United States. It declared that separate educational facilities were inherently unequal.

I would like to apply that consideration to the decision the supreme court reached in the *Marshall* case. That information should be presented to the court when we ask for this stay, because I do not think it was the intention of the court to create this separate but equal fishery.

If we look at the *Gladstone* decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, that decision gave the Heiltsuk band of the central coast of British Columbia the right to fish herring roe on kelp. It said they had an inherent right to fish herring roe on kelp, but at the same time it acknowledged that others had also acquired rights.

If the government went back to the court it would acknowledge that others have rights. I would advise the government to seek that balance and perhaps some give some guidance on how that balance could be achieved. Unless the government seeks the stay, I do not think we will have the benefit of that advice from the courts.

**Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the remarks of the member because I too am deeply troubled by the supreme court decision in the *Marshall* case.

• (1650)

I do not agree with him however that we should seek a stay and go back to the courts for interpretation. I suggest to the hon. member that the courts have already done enough damage with their decisions. To leave it to the courts to determine what a moderate livelihood is would be like a game of Russian roulette. I am afraid parliament and both sides of the dispute will be the ones who will suffer from it.

I address my remark to the member. My own feeling is that surely the better way to approach this problem is for parliament, through its elected government and through the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, to put his own interpretation on moderate livelihood and apply that interpretation. That court decision is so vague. As somebody who has spent my life in words, I find that the judges have actually put words into a treaty that did not exist and used that as a basis for an interpretation. It really reduces this place to insignificance when courts can apply judgments to laws that we have not created, as they have done in this case with the British treaty of 1760.

I ask the member, if it were a choice, is it not better for the government to act swiftly and unilaterally and do its own interpretation?

**Mr. John Cummins:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the member opposite. Yes, it would be beneficial if the government could act unilaterally and fix this problem. Unfortunately it cannot. The supreme court has stated what the law of the land is, and the law of the land gives the Mi'kmaq a priority right to commercial fish. The only right the minister has to interfere is the right to interfere in the interest of conservation. That is the only way he can interfere in this matter.

The court looked at the current regulations in place and struck them down. It said that those regulations interfered with the treaty right and therefore they had no place.

What is interesting is that we arrived at this situation not unwittingly. The information that we present to the court enables the court to make decisions. It will make a decision in our favour against it, if we want to look at in those terms, but if we do not give the court the information we are at its mercy. Not only must we give them the information, but we have to be careful if we make any concessions. The government made two critical concessions when it argued this case before the supreme court.

In the first one the crown's expert witness described the prohibition on Mi'kmaq trading with others and the restriction that they only trade at truck houses. The crown's expert witness allowed that that could be interpreted by the courts as somehow a right to trade. It was anything but a right to trade. It was a restriction on a trading right, but the crown allowed that restriction on a trading right could be interpreted as a right to trade.

The second mistake the crown made was that this treaty did not mention fish as a trading item. Fish had no value as a trading item and was readily available to anybody. Yet the crown allowed and the government allowed that fish could be included as a trading commodity. From a restriction on trading, from a treaty in which fish was not mentioned at all, we arrived at a place where preferential right to fish has been given.

We have a very difficult situation. It is easy to criticize the supreme court and I have done it because it deserves to give this situation the sober second thought that it did not get by the government.

There are other issues the government did not mention that are worth mentioning. Since the signing of the Magna Carta in British common law there has existed something called the public right to fish. That public right to fish was in operation at the time this treaty was signed. This treaty ignored that public right. That should have been brought to the attention of the government because there was nothing done when this treaty was signed to revoke the public right. The government should have brought that to the court's

*The Address*

attention. It did not and that has been allowed to stand since that time.

• (1655)

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in response to the throne speech on the issue of immigration.

Immigration issues were some of the issues that were in the forefront. Certainly they were issues that were most important to Canadians over this past summer. Yet it received only five words in the throne speech, five words that were tucked away in a long statement. Clearly the government is out of touch with Canadians when it comes to dealing with issues that are important to them. The government has shown this by its neglect in the throne speech.

There was not even a broad statement in the throne speech on what the government intends to do with immigration. That is real neglect on the government's part. Just to back this up, Angus Reid released a poll yesterday which shows that when we look at issues most important to Canadians right now, health care is the number one issue and immigration is the number two issue across the country, tied with taxes. We all know that taxes are of high importance to Canadians. They want taxes to be lowered.

Twenty per cent of Canadians see immigration as the most important issue to them, up from 3% in the last poll that Angus Reid did. I believe the reason for this is that Canadians have recognized the government's bungling in terms of dealing with the issue of illegal migrants over this past summer, in particular illegal migrants coming by boat, although certainly at the airports and borders as well. Only 5% to 10% of all people who come illegally to our country come by boat. The rest come through the airports or across the borders.

Canadians have finally recognized that our government losing control over people coming into the country is a real threat to national security. It is a true threat to national security. I believe this issue has moved up to occupy second place when it comes to issues of importance to Canadians.

If we look at cities like Vancouver and Toronto, immigration right now is by far the most important issue to people in those cities. It is an issue which the government completely ignored despite having 41 of 43 seats in the greater Toronto area and having seats in the Vancouver area. I think it is really shameful neglect.

Our immigration system today is dysfunctional, not only in terms of dealing with people coming into the country illegally but also in terms of dealing with those that we want to attract through our immigration system the people who are designated as people Canada wants to attract by the immigration department. Our

system is completely dysfunctional when it comes to those people we want to attract and that is what I intend to talk about today.

I want to start with the government's handling of the whole issue of illegal migration over the summer. With this summer's arrival of illegal migrants by boat, about 600, which represents only 5% to 10% of illegal migration, what was the government's response? The government's response to this very serious breach of national security, this loss of control over our borders, was silence.

After prodding from the official opposition and from Canadians across the country the minister said "I am going to expedite the system. I am going to make it so that the people coming by boat illegally will have a hearing within six to seven months rather than the eleven month average we have now". That is only the initial hearing. It has nothing to do with appeals. That timeframe does not include appeals. An appeal could take a year or more beyond that. We have seen appeals lasting for years and years. It is not that uncommon any more.

The government's response was to expedite the process. That process has been expedited so much that as of last week out of the roughly 600 people who came by boat only 4 have gone through the process. I am talking about just the initial hearing. We have had no appeals so far.

• (1700)

What is the significance of this system taking so long? The significance is certainly high to Canadians generally, and to those who have had their lives put into limbo through this process that is so dreadfully slow.

We have people who have come to this country believing in many cases that they are coming to establish a new life. Certainly they know that they are using illegal means to get here in most cases, but they do not understand that they will be led into a life of servitude, that they will be a part of a virtual slave trade, the new slave trade. For this to be happening is shameful. We will look back in history 30 or 40 years from now and wonder how Canada could have been so negligent in handling this situation.

The people who have come will have their lives put on hold for months and years, and then many will be deported back to their countries of origin. What will be left for them two or three years down the road? I would suggest very little.

In the meantime, what about Canadian taxpayers? They are footing the bill for this system that is not functioning well at all. They are paying millions and millions of dollars because the process is so slow and so flawed. It is shameful. By ignoring this in the throne speech the government has demonstrated that it is just not willing to deal with tough issues such as this. I think we need a government that will show some leadership.

*The Address*

Members of the Reform Party do not only criticize, we also propose positive solutions. What we proposed over the summer, and in fact over the past six years, is that first we should detain all people coming to this country until their hearings, but that the hearings be held within days or weeks rather than months or years as is now commonly the case. Then, once a determination has been made, it should be acted upon. The people who are found to be genuine refugees we should help to settle in our country. However, people who are found to be bogus refugees should be deported immediately. That is what we have called for.

We have also called for the people smugglers to be dealt with firmly. They are the people who are initiating this activity, who are most often members of organized crime, and the people who actually operate people smuggling rings.

Yesterday in the House the minister said that Canada has some of the toughest laws on this issue. I do not know what she was comparing us with, because in fact we have extremely weak laws in terms of dealing with people smugglers when compared with the United States, Australia or other countries. Not only that, the maximum 10 year sentence has never been implemented. The maximum sentence that has ever been imposed on someone involved in people smuggling in this country is somewhere around three years. That is completely unacceptable and it clearly demonstrates a lack of leadership by this government.

I would like to speak next about this system not working for the people for whom it is intended to work. There are three streams of immigration. The first stream is the independent category, which is made up of people who come because they have special education or special skills, or because they are going to invest in a business or operate a business.

The second stream is the refugee stream. Most experts would suggest that through our refugee stream probably 60% are bogus refugees. They are not legitimate refugees as laid out in the UN convention on refugees.

The third stream is family reunification of both of these previous groups.

I would ask if any member of the House could honestly say that they do not have a huge problem in their constituency when it comes to processing people whom we desperately need in this country, those people who bring a special skill or education, or reuniting them with their families from their countries of origin, or reuniting a Canadian with someone they have recently married. I know that not one member of the House would say honestly that the system is not so badly broken that it is not working for these very people for whom it is intended to work.

Not only is the system not working for those it is intended to work for, it has been a disaster in terms of screening people for whom it is not intended to work. It should be clear to Canadians

that we need leadership on this issue. We are not getting it from the government. I implore the government to deal with this issue. If it will not, and I assume it will not—it has shown no will to do that—then we will when we form the government in two years.

• (1705)

**Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to reassure the member for Lakeland that there are those on this side of the House who share some of the views he has just expressed about the urgency of coming to grips with the problem of the migrants on the west coast.

In my six years in the House I think I have only once heard a suggestion from the Reform Party that I fully agreed with and that was the suggestion that the migrants should be detained until their cases are disposed of and it is determined whether they are refugees or not.

This seems like a harsh thing to do. We are actually keeping people confined, as they would be in any kind of detention, which is a type of jail. The alternative is too much to even contemplate. What we are really dealing with is trafficking in human beings. So long as these people are released back into the community—and I know the Department of Immigration has already experienced this—they are immediately drawn into absolute slavery. The condition of their passage is to work it off in one manner or another.

In that sense I think the hon. member is entirely correct, even though the prospect of detaining people is very unpalatable to anyone who wants to give people the benefit of the doubt and freedom in the process thereof.

While I am certainly in agreement that the refugee system needs fixing, I do have to acknowledge that the problem really is with the charter of rights, which unfortunately gives the full rights of citizenship to anyone who sets foot on Canadian soil. It is that which is the root cause of the problem. I wonder if the member would comment on that.

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit:** Mr. Speaker, the member has hit on a key point. The Singh decision and other decisions have said that those who arrive at our borders or even in territorial waters are entitled to the full set of rights that a citizen would be entitled to. I believe that decision does have and impact on this situation.

However, I believe that even with those restrictions in place, this government, if it had the will, could speed up the process to the point that it could process people coming illegally in days or weeks rather than months or years as is now the case. Then detention is not such a big issue. People then are detained for days or weeks. If they choose to appeal it could be longer, but we could speed up the appeals process rather than detaining them for months or years. Therefore we deal with both problems.

*The Address*

We also deal with sending the message to those involved in people smuggling that if they want to make money smuggling people into Canada they are no longer going to be able to do it because, by gosh, Canada deals with these situations quickly, firmly and we act on the hearings while still respecting the UN convention on refugees.

I believe we can respect the UN convention on refugees fully. I believe we can get around the Singh decision, which I believe was a very bad decision, and the other decisions and speed up the process to the point that it will work quite well.

I would further say that if necessary, and I do not believe it is necessary, this government should invoke the notwithstanding clause to override the Singh decision and to give control over immigration back to the Government of Canada, to the elected representatives of the people of Canada. The courts should not be making law in this country.

It is interesting that the member who spoke before me talked about the courts making law and I am talking about the courts making law, saying that is clearly wrong in a democracy. Let us give control over policy issues back to the government. The government could take it back. It would be rare that it would involve invoking the notwithstanding clause. It just takes the will on the part of government.

• (1710)

**Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to see you in the chair. The new session has started well with you gracing our presence.

I am also happy to have the opportunity to take part in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, a speech which was read by our new Governor General, Her Excellency Madam Clarkson, on Tuesday. I join with all members of the House, and of course with yourself, Mr. Speaker, in congratulating her on her new role and in wishing her the very best in the years ahead as Her Majesty's representative in Canada.

Since I have also been given a new role in the federal cabinet, I am pleased to take part in this debate and to have the chance to talk about an issue that I have been connected with all my life, that of protecting the environment.

[*Translation*]

As we heard in the throne speech, Canadians understand very well that the high quality of life we enjoy in this country, as well as our health and the health of future generations, depends on a clean and safe environment.

Canadians also understand that the quality of our environment is closely linked to that of the world environment. They understand

clearly that any progress in this area requires initiatives to be taken on both the national and the international level.

The Liberal government intends to make environmental issues central to Canadian public life in coming weeks and months. To that end, we are going to take action on a number of different fronts, and to step up our environmental protection measures.

[*English*]

As I am sure hon. members fully appreciate, the Government of Canada does not have jurisdiction over all environmental and species protection issues in this country. That is why we will be working in close, harmonious partnership with provincial governments, municipalities, first nations, the academic community, the business community, environmental groups and, of course, individual Canadians who are concerned. We no longer have the luxury of pretending that environmental questions amount to a zero sum game of jurisdictional tradeoffs, a game where a win for the environment is somehow a loss for business, or a win for business is a loss for the environment, or a win for the provinces is a loss for the federal government and so on.

We must reinforce the fact that a clean environment, human health and a strong economy go hand in hand and that we must work together to achieve those common goals. Therefore, I will be working closely with my provincial counterparts because in many areas we share responsibility for protecting the environment. I believe that provincial action can be influenced by the federal government even in situations beyond our strict constitutional jurisdiction.

The Government of Canada has an overarching responsibility to protect the environment and the health of all Canadians. That is a responsibility we are committed to upholding in all areas, from species protection to climate change, to providing cleaner air and cleaner water, to controlling toxic substances, to developing green technologies for our industries, to meeting our international commitments and promoting eco-efficient practices within the government and throughout our society and our economy.

With respect to species protection, for example, there is a long history of co-operation among the federal, provincial and territorial governments through such things as the designation of protected areas, implementing international wildlife agreements and a commitment to biodiversity.

In 1996, some three years ago, wildlife ministers agreed to the accord for the protection of species at risk. I am pleased, in fact I am delighted, that all governments in this country have agreed that any species protection legislation must include provisions for the protection of the critical habitat of endangered species. This is absolutely fundamental: no habitat, no species.

We are now working under that accord with our provincial colleagues to develop stewardship programs and other collaborative and voluntary measures to protect species at risk. One such program is the Vancouver Island Marmot Recovery Foundation which is close to my home on Vancouver Island. Environment Canada is working with the B.C. Ministry of the Environment, Lands and Parks, B.C. Hydro, MacMillan Bloedel, the forestry company, the World Wildlife Fund, the Toronto and Calgary zoos and many others to try to save one of this country's most endangered species from extinction. I believe the Vancouver Island marmot is North America's most endangered mammal.

• (1715)

The federal legislation to protect species at risk mentioned in the Speech from the Throne will complement and strengthen provincial legislation with programs and voluntary initiatives. The federal approach aims to build on the excellent efforts to protect endangered species which are already being made and measures already being taken by so many individuals and groups. I salute them.

The only sustainable way to preserve species and their habitats is to ensure that appropriate incentives and knowledge are available to encourage each Canadian to do the right and responsible thing. We expect this to work in the vast majority of cases but when it does not, prohibitions must be available to prevent extinction and critical habitat destruction.

[Translation]

We are also working to protect our water resources. Protecting Canada's fresh water is not a question of economics or trade; it is a question of ecology.

Water is vital to human health, for our ecosystems, agriculture and industry. Canada's sovereignty over its water resources is total. Water in its natural state is not a commodity, and therefore not covered by NAFTA.

In order to ensure an enforceable Canada wide solution using an ecosystem approach, we are working jointly on an agreement under the terms of which each jurisdictional area would establish laws, regulations or policies prohibiting the removal of large quantities of water from Canadian water basins, including for export.

That includes federal legislative measures through amendments to the International Boundary Waters Treaty Act. They will be introduced this fall and will give the federal government the legislative authority to prohibit the removal of large quantities of water from bodies of boundaries water, such as the Great Lakes.

[English]

We have also made a request with the United States to have the International Joint Commission study how water consumption removals and diversions could affect our Great Lakes. Our objec-

### *The Address*

tive here is not to plan for removal but to provide a basis for ensuring a consistent management regime for water shared with the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I know that your riding is at the end of the Great Lakes and the beginning of the St. Lawrence River. I am pleased to report to you that the interim report of the commission which was released in August supports our strategy and agrees that removals are harmful to the ecosystems that they support.

The report recommends an immediate moratorium on bulk water removals until the full report is completed, which we expect to be early next year. The commission is consulting widely with Great Lakes communities through public meetings which are currently under way.

Canadians are especially concerned about air quality. Residents in many areas are subjected to unacceptable air pollution caused by ground level ozone and airborne particles which combine with other air pollutants to produce smog. That is particularly so in our urban centres.

• (1720)

We have taken several measures to reduce smog over the last few years but I have to say a great deal remains to be done. For example, measures are now being taken to reduce the level of sulphur in gasoline. We want to reduce those levels by 90% by 2005. Why? Because the health benefits alone will be of enormous benefit to Canadians.

An independent panel of health and environmental experts predicts that a reduction to that level would prevent some 2,100 premature deaths, 92,000 incidents of bronchitis in children, five million other health related incidents such as asthma attacks, and eleven million acute respiratory symptoms, such as severe coughs and new cases of pneumonia and croup. That would be over a 20 year period. With those figures I wonder whether anyone could argue that those steps should not be taken to protect the health of Canadians. I do not think many would.

[Translation]

It also gives me satisfaction to be able to note that the government is determined to work with provincial governments and other levels of government to improve the country's physical infrastructure in the coming century. We must ensure that our increased trade and our improved economy are matched by an increased capacity to move people and things in complete safety.

In order to maintain the quality of life in our cities and rural communities, we must ensure our air and water are clean.

[English]

Under the last two infrastructure programs the Government of Canada, the provinces and the municipalities invested hundreds of

*The Address*

millions of dollars in water treatment and sewage management to protect our waterways and the health of Canadians. We are committed to work with other levels of government and the private sector to reach by the end of next year agreement on a five year plan for improving the physical infrastructure in urban and rural regions across our country.

This agreement will set out shared principles, objectives and fiscal parameters for all partners to increase their resources directed toward infrastructure, with a particular focus on the environment, as well as health and safety, transportation, tourism, telecommunications and culture. I would like to describe this program that we will be developing as a green infrastructure program because I am sure that when we examine the needs of this country that in fact is the way it will be.

I would like to say a word about contaminated sites. We will be dealing with the clean-up of contaminated sites and how we can improve our performance in that area. That again was mentioned in Her Excellency's speech. I must warn Canadians that this will be a long term program. We have had, as reported by the environment commissioner, starts and stops before. I want to see a clear outline, a program, to achieve substantial clean-up of our contaminated sites over the next 20 years.

Recently we have committed some \$38 million to the clean-up of the Sydney tar ponds which is Canada's most contaminated site. Of course more will be required on the financial side and more will have to be done. There are literally thousands of contaminated sites which are under federal jurisdiction, thousands more under provincial jurisdiction and many which we describe as orphan sites where there is an abandoned mine and there is no possibility of finding an organization which will pick up the clean-up costs.

The tar ponds remind us of why we must change our approach to the environment. We need to prevent pollution before it occurs rather than paying the enormous costs which sometimes result from clean-up after the fact. That is why we must be more diligent in conducting our environmental assessments. It is why we have made pollution prevention the cornerstone of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, or CEPA.

• (1725)

The renewed CEPA provides the government with stronger powers to protect the environment and therefore human health. Essentially it marks a shift from after the fact clean-up to proactive prevention. After investing a very lengthy period of more than five years in renewing this legislation, I believe we can now move forward on implementing stronger environmental protection to give Canadians the cleaner environment that they deserve.

I announced two or three weeks ago that \$72 million would be put forward in new funding to strengthen our scientific and enforcement capacity under the new CEPA. This is in addition to the \$40 million that was announced earlier this year to conduct scientific research into toxic substances that harm human health and the environment, including endocrine disrupters, the so-called gender benders and toxics that may have serious effects on all species, including the human species.

[*Translation*]

Under the act, all substances currently used in Canada will be examined for their level of toxicity. As well, the act provides firm deadlines for the control of toxic products and requires the virtual elimination of the most dangerous ones.

The act gives Environment Canada officials significant new powers to act with respect to a polluter breaking the law.

It will also help Canada honour a number of international environmental commitments and enable people to initiate proceedings if the federal government does not ensure compliance with the law.

[*English*]

The act includes new provisions for regulating vehicles and fuels and new abilities to regulate less traditional sources of air pollution such as lawn mowers and off-road vehicles. The government has already begun discussions with manufacturers of these devices so as to reduce toxic emissions and greenhouse gases. We are committed to clean air. We are prepared to take the action necessary to prevent the build-up of greenhouse gases that are responsible in part for climate change.

This may eventually mean some changes in lifestyle choices for many Canadians, but I am confident that Canadians understand there will be even greater adverse lifestyle changes if we do not take action at the present time on this problem.

On climate change, in 1997 Canada joined with 160 other nations in negotiating the Kyoto protocol on climate change. We set a target of reducing our emissions of greenhouse gases to 6% below the 1990 levels. This would be achieved in the years between 2008 and 2012. Incidentally, that target was announced by the Prime Minister.

The fact that other countries have agreed to comparable reduction targets does not make the 6% reduction any less ambitious or challenging for an energy dependent country such as Canada. To meet these targets, given the projected growth in our economy and population, we will have to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions by approximately 25% below the business as usual projected levels for 2010. Those targets cannot be reached without significant changes to the way our economy functions and to our lives as individuals.



*The Address*

The scope of these challenges must not prevent us or delay us from taking appropriate action now, because one of the most dangerous attitudes toward climate change is that because there is still some scientific uncertainty we should do little or nothing. The most credible evidence that we have available tells us that climate change due to human activity is a reality.

I could give more on climate change. I have many pages in my speech explaining the problem and giving examples of it. I will simply say that I will be happy to discuss this with the member over lunch some time. I am sure the member agrees it is important to make sure we have a system that is acceptable to Canadians which achieves the goals in question.

• (1730)

Many opportunities will be provided by our environmental programs such as developing new environmental technologies. The opportunities for export, et cetera, are there. Therefore we have many provisions which again could be mentioned, but I will pass over them quickly and simply say that we will find economic opportunities which will flow from our efforts to improve the environment in Canada.

In conclusion, Canadians understand the linkages between the environment and health and between environment and economic growth. They understand that we need to have development and growth. That has to be sustainable in the future. They also understand that we must act decisively or in essence we will be guilty of robbing our children and grandchildren of a safe, secure and prosperous future. I am sure all members of the House will actively support our actions in this regard.

**Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this minister and his B.C. Liberal sidekicks have shown very little regard for the problems and rights of the vast majority of B.C. citizens.

First, there is the expropriation of the provincial land at Nanoose Bay in the face of incredible opposition, something never done before in Canadian history. Second, there is the lack of protection of B.C.'s children by their appalling inaction on the court's decision on child pornography. Third, and I address this to the former minister of fisheries, over a period of time they have failed to effectively solve the problem of the preservation of the salmon stocks on the west coast and have downsized the fleet so that hundreds of fishermen and their families are bankrupt. Fourth, there has been inaction on closing the loopholes on Canada's immigration laws that saw hundreds of illegal immigrants come to the shores of Vancouver Island this summer. Fifth, there is a total lack of compassion for non-native residents on Musqueam lands who will soon be kicked out of their homes. I can go on and on, but I think that is enough.

Why should the people of B.C. have any confidence in the Liberal promises made in the throne speech when they have that appalling record before them?

**Hon. David Anderson:** Mr. Speaker, I remind the hon. member that in poll after poll the Liberal Party in British Columbia receives double the support of his party. If these issues are so important to the people of British Columbia as he has described them, he should recognize the people of British Columbia recognized that the balanced approach of the government to improve expenditures on health care and on the social side, the reduction in taxes and in debt, is the appropriate way for Canada to go, and that this is very beneficial to British Columbia.

Were he correct, his party might perhaps have more support than it currently does. He is a member of a party whose own leader thinks the party should disintegrate and disappear. When we compare that side to this one, no wonder we have the support of sensible British Columbians, which the vast majority are. They are firmly on the side of the government party. Poll after poll in the last many months have shown our support to be double that of Reform.

Clearly he does not represent the people of British Columbia. Clearly he does not understand the issues affecting British Columbia. Clearly he is continuing to put the Reform Party ahead of the interests of British Columbia. That is why he and his friends are so consistently rejected by the people of British Columbia.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I listened very closely to the new Minister of the Environment. I am very happy to hear him say that he wants to take action, but I think he has forgotten to check Bill C-32, which was passed in the House last spring. Under this legislation, the Liberal government will no longer be consulting the provinces. It has decided to set national environmental standards.

• (1735)

For his part, the minister says he is going to consult so as not to interfere in areas of provincial jurisdiction.

The minister also tells us he is going to take action immediately. But there is a big problem in Canada right now. Canada wants to import plutonium from Russia and the United States. I have not heard what our Minister of the Environment has to say about that.

Right now, Canada is flying in the face of everything other countries are doing. It wants to put more energy into getting nuclear power plants to burn plutonium. I would like to know where the Minister of the Environment stands on this, and if all Canadians and parliamentarians will have a say before Canada makes a decision on this issue.

*The Address*

**Hon. David Anderson:** Mr. Speaker, first I thank the hon. member for Jonquière for her questions.

Her first question was about co-operation between the federal and provincial governments. I can assure the hon. member that I have already had meetings with provincial ministers. We have had very productive discussions on endangered species. We all shared the same views, as I mentioned in my speech. We set the objectives three years ago. The purpose of the meetings held a few weeks ago was to discuss ways to achieve the goals that we set together.

There is truly a great deal of co-operation between the various levels of government, because we know that Canadians want us to take action. They do not want us to carry on constitutional debates. They want concrete action on the environment, not constitutional debates.

[*English*]

The second thing that she mentioned was the issue of the very small amount of weapons grade plutonium, the MOx which is to be burned in the Chalk River reactor.

The reason this is important is that the world has literally tens of thousands of nuclear weapons that are rusting in former soviet union territories and need to be disposed of, to be eliminated. We have to take risks. It is true that she is correct. There can be very minor risks related to transportation, but if we are not willing to take the small risk to achieve a much greater gain for society our children and grandchildren will know that we have failed because we simply are delaying a problem to them.

This is a very important issue. It is truly an example of the biblical injunction to beat the swords into ploughshares, to destroy weapons for good. Can we think of anything more symbolic of turning evil into good than turning these weapons of mass destruction into light and power for human use? Is there anything more symbolic of the type of thing we should be doing?

Yes, I admit to the member that there are risks, but I challenge her to think also of the risks of doing nothing. The worst thing we can commit as legislators is to simply say there is a problem and do nothing, leave it alone, ignore it, let our children have the problem and inherit something much worse than if we dealt with it now.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment. I know he referred to this in his speech but perhaps he could clarify it.

Just what is the government's intention with respect to how it plans to live up to the motion passed in the House in February this year having to do with the government placing an immediate moratorium on the export of bulk freshwater shipments and interbasin transfers and, according to the motion, introducing legislation to prohibit bulk freshwater exports and interbasin transfers?

I know the minister has spoken about boundary waters, but this motion actually talked about a national ban, not 10 separate provincial bans which would not be undesirable. At the same time it is not the motion that was passed and not the motion the government supported. The motion that was passed called for a national ban on the bulk export of water.

● (1740)

I asked the government House leader today under House business whether there was legislation forthcoming. He said as far as he knew there was. I would like to ask the minister if he could clarify just what we can expect in this regard by way of national legislation, a national ban, because as he knows the provinces, particularly Newfoundland of late—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** I am sorry to interrupt. The hon. the minister will have about a minute to respond.

**Hon. David Anderson:** Mr. Speaker, once again I thank the hon. member for an excellent question. I will go a lot further than he proposes. We will be having a meeting of provincial ministers and myself, because as I mentioned to the hon. member for Jonquière we believe in the importance of co-operation in this regard and many aspects of control of water are provincial.

We will move together with them through the accord. As the hon. member has correctly mentioned, in the last few days Newfoundland has come on board of the accord concept for the elimination of exports. We are delighted with that.

In addition, I am going further by discussing with them not just the elimination of exports of bulk water. I should distinguish between bulk water exports and containers of water, which are a different matter. In addition, we do not believe there should be any major diversions from watershed to watershed whether or not they cross international boundaries.

We will be discussing with the provinces an accord which essentially lives up to the International Joint Commission report of the Great Lakes area but in addition deals with the issue of interbasin transfers for water beyond just exports.

**Mr. Myron Thompson:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is seldom that we are able to have some time to question a minister regarding some of these issues. As incompetent as some of them are, I am sure that all of us would agree to another 10 minutes of questioning of the minister with agreement from the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** The hon. the member for Wild Rose has requested the unanimous consent of the House to extend the period provided for questions and comments by 10 minutes. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

*The Address*

**Some hon. members:** No.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is a good thing that we have an opportunity to discuss the throne speech delivered earlier this week and entitled “Building a higher quality of life for all Canadians”.

When I look at that title, certain questions come to mind. The first one is: Who was left out of this speech?

Of course, since I take a particular interest in the agri-food sector, I must tell you that I have the distinct feeling that agriculture was completely left out in this speech. One would need a magnifying glass or would have to be an expert at crisscross puzzles to find something that applies directly to agriculture.

On the contrary, even with this magnifying glass, I can hardly see any interest at all for agriculture. And God knows this industry is going through serious difficulties caused by a reduction in subsidies to Canadian farmers while those given to European and American farmers keep increasing. These difficulties are also caused by a drop in prices, which are unstable or low for agricultural commodities, both animal and vegetable, as well as by natural disasters.

This brings me to the issue of the crisis Canadian agriculture is facing today. There is a national program called Agricultural Income Disaster Assistance, or AIDA, but it is inadequate.

One just has to look at the numerous releases that were sent to us over the last year to understand what I am talking about. We saw all kinds of changes being made to the program, all kinds of adjustments to try to make it acceptable to farmers. But I wonder if government officials sat down with a farm family to see how these people can fill out these kinds of forms.

• (1745)

Some of the farmers who spoke to me of their distress told me that filling out the form can cost them \$1,000 or so in accountants' fees, because an accountant is needed. The farm's taxation year is not the year in which the products are sold. There are therefore two kinds of figures and generally a person who is very busy and used to doing farm work is not going to be an accountant as well.

There is one delay after another. Why so? People do not enrol in this program because the forms are too hard to fill out and the results are very questionable. Yet when this program was implemented, there was a national revenue advisory committee, which asked that there to be no payment ceilings for farmers, that asked for use of negative margins, and for no linking to NISA, the Net Income Stabilization Account. All that was forgotten. Yet the people consulted knew their business and could have been of great service to the agricultural sector.

So here we are facing a crisis that is far more acute in the west than it is in the rest of the country, and which is reflected accurately in the letters children write to the Prime Minister or the Minister of Agriculture. These children write that:

[*English*]

“They need more than one job to survive on the farm”.

[*Translation*]

Basically, they are complaining that their mother and father have to hold down two or three jobs in order to make ends meet until the end of the month, if not the end of the day or week.

Another child, Terryl Drisdale, wrote:

[*English*]

“Farmers are a unique type of people. I am very sure that you personally don't work the hours annually that the farmers do for the pay that they have at year end”.

[*Translation*]

It is moving, because these are sixth grade children writing the Prime Minister or the Minister of Agriculture. It is like a cry of dismay at that point in social terms.

How will they cope with this crisis? Not with what they currently have at their disposal. Suppliers waiting to be paid for 1998 commodities have been very patient again in 1999. Will they continue to be?

When things are not going well in one sector of society, the wolf is at the door. So too there are people waiting to buy dirt cheap the land that is often family heritage and has been cleared and maintained by dint of hard work.

Yet, the government believes in rural life and in the diversification of farms, but all these fine principles the government states in public do not come about in a single day. The rural world is fragile. The work done on it must follow the seasons.

There is also income security. Not a peep in the Speech from the Throne on income security. Not a word on a review of stability programs.

In Quebec, we have a 25 year old farm income stability program, which adapts to federal programs, because we are partners. But here we realize that the program changes every three or four years. How can events be followed over the long term if the programs change?

There were references in the throne speech to research and development. It mentioned increased funding for research and development. And it is high time, because nothing has changed since 1993, despite the efforts in the last budget.

*The Address*

What is important, and needs to be mentioned, is the need for those doing basic research to be independent. The programs now in place often involve partnerships. Sometimes not much is said about the partner, but when its involvement runs to 90%, as it does with certain large corporations, the large corporation picks the research topics and they do not include basic research to help the public. All these partnerships inhibit research.

• (1750)

There is also the issue of genetically engineered organisms, one in which I have a great interest. Yesterday, we heard the Prime Minister begin his speech by stating that the next century will be the century of the Pacific. But, if we do not resolve firmly to label genetically engineered products, we will not get very far selling to the Pacific.

Are we prepared to lose Asian markets? This is a very good question which must be asked and which has a major impact on the country's farmers. I would like to conclude—I could go on at great length about genetically engineered organisms, but I will address the matter at another time—by referring members to page 19 of the throne speech, which reads as follows:

The Government will protect the health of Canadians by strengthening Canada's food safety program, by taking further action on environmental health issues, [—] pesticides [—]

This sounds like the bill that died when Parliament was prorogued, but it is reminiscent of the premises of Bill C-80, a superstructure with no accountability, where failures in the health system make us fear the worst. We cannot add all this to the work of Health Canada when we already know that the brain drain has left it unable to evaluate all the services the government should provide. So I have some major concerns.

Despite its lofty title, the throne speech leaves me, as agriculture critic, very puzzled.

**Mr. André Harvey (Chicoutimi, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the comments made by the hon. member on a sector that has been overlooked, but I would like to get her opinion on one specific issue.

We are faced with a rather pathetic if not immoral situation in Canada. On the one hand, the federal government is getting richer thanks to free trade and the GST—which brings in \$20 billion—and tax surcharges that bring in an additional \$20 billion. On the other hand, the provinces are getting poorer and cannot meet the urgent needs of their citizens in the areas of health, education and family policy. There are also individuals who are getting poorer because of the very heavy tax burden. Let us not forget that in the United States the maximum tax rate of 40% is imposed on an income of \$264,000, while in Canada a rate in excess of 50% is applied on an income of \$60,000.

How does the hon. member explain the fact that the federal government, whose role should be to support the activities of the provinces—considering that it cut \$33 billion over a six year period in the Canada social transfer—persists in creating new programs in the areas of family, education and health, at a time when Canadians have to travel to the United States to get medical treatment? I would like to know the hon. member's view on this situation.

**Ms. Hélène Alarie:** Mr. Speaker, that question is virtually a whole program itself. There is something interesting in what my colleague has said: each province that has capitulated to the federal government is experiencing delays with the transfer of assets. I have said a lot about agriculture because it is the area with which I am perhaps the most familiar, but there are provinces that do not negotiate on the provincial to federal government level, but instead wait for federal public servants to do it all. Expand this situation and their jurisdiction has been totally lost just to get what they need. We have seen how this happened with social affairs. Everything was turned over to the feds to solve the problem. Now there is a heavy price to pay.

**Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak in the debate on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

This partisan document once again follows along the main thrusts of the September 1997 throne speech. There is continuity here: it is a document continuing centralization and non-respect of Quebec's jurisdiction.

• (1755)

The Prime Minister and his so-called strategists have taken each of the themes of 1997, changed their titles and added paragraphs. A fine makeover, with the maple leaf in the background.

The Liberals' Canadian policy is clear, as is the Canadian model they are defending. It involves spending budget surpluses in areas of provincial jurisdiction, avoiding problems at the federal level, such as employment insurance and air transport, and presenting a long shopping list with items that could create new federal-provincial friction.

The editorial of *Le Devoir* of October 13 provides in this regard: "It would be good news for once to hear that the federal government wanted to honour the principle underlying all federal regimes, which is the sharing of jobs and jurisdictions and proposed to its partners that the provinces come up with a consensus on joint policy. New real desire remains to be proven, however, especially since the speech includes a number of projects that could rapidly become irritants".

This centralizing recipe now includes a social union sauce, which could well further spoil relations between Ottawa and Quebec City.

*The Address*

I smile at the thought of Liberal ministers and members talking partnerships, agreements with their partners. How could we be expected to believe such a philosophy when the government itself cannot respect jurisdictions and is continually encroaching on their jurisdiction?

The day after the throne speech, the federal government received several warnings that it was heading off on the wrong track. I quote from *La Presse* of October 13 in this regard: "The Conseil du patronat is expressing concern over federal government spillover. The Quebec university students association went so far as to accuse Ottawa of invading provincial jurisdiction in the field of education".

Examples include the case of the national plan on skills and learning for the 21st century, future health research institutes and the five year infrastructure program.

On this issue, the federal government has made a commitment, but we will have to wait until the end of the year 2000, not the end of the current year. Yet, during the prebudget consultations, all the municipalities of the electoral district of Lotbinière asked me to urge the federal government to take immediate action.

Another vague promise, with no specific funding, and we will have to wait for the 2001 budget to know the specific commitments of the federal government. I have made a diagnosis of this government. It is suffering from a new political condition called acute wait and see syndrome. The government makes a promise and then waits. It makes a promise now, but only for 12, 15 or 24 months from now. In the meantime, those who need the money suffer.

Let us now go back to employment insurance. Considering that 60% of the unemployed currently do not qualify for benefits, what do we find in the throne speech to give some hope to these people? Not much. Yet, when the federal government talks about fighting poverty, it should give priority to the employment insurance program, which is one of the causes of poverty and one of the main reasons why people are leaving the regions of Quebec.

What have the Liberals done to help regional development? They have come up with minor partisan measures and they made a big deal about some small subsidies, as they did last month when they sent a delegation of five federal ministers headed by the new minister of patronage, assisted by the new secretary of state for professional sport—I mean amateur sport, but given his recent statements, I am more and more convinced that his job is geared primarily to helping professional sports.

But let us go back to unemployment and regional employment insurance rates. This is an absurd situation which jeopardizes the very foundation of the employment insurance program.

In my riding of Lotbinière, the regional rate set for the regional county municipality of Lotbinière is very detrimental to the people

there, compared to the riding's other RCMs. Having two regional rates create two classes of unemployed in the riding. People constantly contact my offices to condemn this social injustice.

• (1800)

The Corporation de défense des droits sociaux de Lotbinière, social and economic stakeholders and the unemployed will mobilize in early November to convince the new Minister of Human Resources Development to correct the mistakes made by her predecessor.

Once again, I would like to explain this administrative nightmare. The rate, which is determined arbitrarily by Statistics Canada and considered to be realistic, means that one must work 630 hours to be eligible for benefits for a period ranging from 17 to 40 weeks.

In the other RCMs in my riding, the regional rate is 11.2% and the number of hours required is 490 to be eligible for benefits for a period ranging from a minimum of 23 weeks to a maximum of 45 weeks. It is a gross injustice for the RCM of Lotbinière, since the socio-economic profile is the same for the whole riding. Therefore, setting a single employment insurance rate for the whole riding that is in line with our true socio-economic profile is of the utmost importance.

Businesses are also penalized by this regional rate, since they do not have access to the same federal subsidy programs as businesses from other areas in my riding.

In the Speech from the Throne, the federal government expressed its intention to make the Internet accessible to everybody. First of all, a lot of parents cannot even afford to buy a computer. Second, in our opinion, the CRTC should ensure that all Canadians have access to an individual telephone line so that they can connect with the Internet. Right here at home on the eve of the third millennium, certain regions in Quebec and in the rest of the country still do not even have the basic services necessary to access the Internet.

This government is completely cut off from the daily lives of people in our society.

This government has not changed since the beginning of the 36th Parliament: it remains a centralizing government, now pushing its social union agreement, a government that stops at nothing except tackling the problems that come under its jurisdiction, some examples being EI, the airline industry, and provincial transfer payments.

But it is in a big rush to get its hands on our money. The budget surpluses belong to all taxpayers, not just the Minister of Finance, who fiddles with the books and conceals the real state of the country's finances.

The Minister of Finance already has the necessary leeway to announce immediate tax cuts for middle income taxpayers, those

*The Address*

whose hard-earned money paid down the federal deficit, unemployed workers, youth, the sick and the poor.

In short, my conclusion is very simple: the federal government has money to spend in fields of provincial jurisdiction, but not a cent when it comes to problems for which it is accountable. That is the Canadian way of the Liberal government as I see it.

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the member for Lotbinière on his excellent speech. I think he is very close to his constituents. He has shown us that the Speech from the Throne truly has nothing to do with the real concerns of the people. The federal government has chosen to spend in sectors that are not its responsibility and not to make appropriate decisions in those that are, such as employment insurance.

I would like the member for Lotbinière to explain the whole question of the map used to determine how employment insurance will apply in a given area, a problem he mentioned in his speech, which is being experienced where he comes from especially. It is an important matter for the unemployed that are concerned, but it is also a problem throughout Canada, because in this case as in others, the federal government is refusing to revisit the current employment insurance legislation.

• (1805)

All sorts of situations are getting worse, and I would like him to tell us more about those concerning the map that governs the rates of unemployment and that defines the number of weeks that people need in order to receive benefits.

**Mr. Odina Desrochers:** Mr. Speaker, as far as the regions are concerned, this is again an invention by this government, an invention for interference, differing regional rates, so as to penalize all of the unemployed.

The problem does not exist in Lotbinière alone, but also in the neighbouring riding of Frontenac—Mégantic, and colleagues everywhere speak to me of this situation, which must be addressed. Now that I am regional development critic, I must say that this is a situation that is greatly harmful to regional development.

Here is an example. I am in my office and someone comes in to tell me “I am 10 hours short of eligibility for employment insurance”. So I explain the legislation to the person, who goes away. He then meets a neighbour who lives 20 kilometres from him, and that person is getting employment insurance. How is an MP who wants to be fair, and wants to see all his constituents treated justly, to explain such a crazy situation?

There are two major regional county municipalities in my riding, along with three others. There are three Human Resource Develop-

ment offices. Apart from that there is not a single public servant in my riding, which has a population of 70,000.

This is abnormal, and once again it is the outcome of the famous employment insurance reform, which penalizes everyone in Quebec.

[English]

**Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I did not hear an emphasis with respect to tax reduction in terms of what this country clearly needs. This country needs broad based tax reduction. A number of speeches have been made in this House that have focused on the necessity to have broad based tax reduction. We have seen growth in those jurisdictions. We have seen it in Ireland. We have seen it in the province of Ontario.

Does the hon. member believe that the government's rhetoric in the throne speech with respect to tax reduction is just that, or is the government capable of providing tax reductions that Canadian families need so desperately?

[Translation]

**Mr. Odina Desrochers:** Mr. Speaker, my answer to the Progressive Conservative member is this: let him find one single line that is clear in the Speech from the Throne.

It is a bunch of vague promises, with no real commitments. The only concrete measure will not be taken this year. It will not be taken in the year 2000, but it might be taken in the year 2001.

**An hon. member:** Like abolishing the GST.

**Mr. Odina Desrochers:** How do Canadians and Quebecers react to such a document? As I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, I compared the throne speech from 1997 with this year's speech. I added small paragraphs and changed some titles and the end result was the same.

The 1997 speech was just as vague in terms of commitments. Two years later, nothing has changed. The plight of Quebec's unemployed is glaring. We are faced with a crisis in the fishery. The government is trying to pass legislation to intrude into provincial jurisdictions, and is using this document to try to make us believe that this is the Canadian way. This sure bodes well for the future.

[English]

**Ms. Susan Whelan (Essex, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour as the member for Essex to speak to the throne speech which was so eloquently delivered by Her Excellency Adrienne Clarkson whom I would like to congratulate on her appointment as Governor General. I know that she will bring respect, integrity and enthusiasm to her new position and will serve the Canadian people both gracefully and honourably.

*The Address*

Today I would like to reaffirm my thanks to the constituents of Essex for giving me the privilege and opportunity to represent them in the House of Commons over the past six years. As many members know, my riding of Essex is situated in southwestern Ontario, the southernmost part of Canada and consists of the newly amalgamated towns of Amherstburg, Essex, Kingsville, Lakeshore, LaSalle, part of the town of Tecumseh and all of Pelee Island.

• (1810)

Windsor and Essex county has been the core of Canada's automotive sector and industry since 1925. Daimler Chrysler Canada's operations are headquartered here, along with major facilities for both Ford and General Motors. Since 1991 their combined investment has totalled over \$6 billion. Their presence has attracted over 500 manufacturers of auto related parts, supplying state of the art machinery, machine tools, moulds, stampings, dies and automation transfer equipment.

With less than 2% of Canada's population, our region is home to 20% of all tool and die makers, 50% of industrial mould manufacturers and 80% of the automation transfer machine companies operating in Canada. Our workforce is diversified, dependable and disciplined with old-fashioned work ethics.

Keeping our workforce in tune with technology is a top priority among our manufacturers and educational institutions. The University of Windsor has established itself as one of Canada's foremost research universities. In partnership with government and industry, it has initiated programs pioneering the development and deployment of advanced technologies. In addition, the Chrysler Canada University of Windsor Automotive Research and Development Centre, a joint venture, brings together the best business and educational minds to create both company driven and research oriented solutions.

As well, St. Clair College of Applied Arts and Technology concentrates on management productivity, trends and skills development and manufacturing technologies in tool and die and mould making. We are responsive to the industry's needs where training is carried out on the factory floor where students gain access to the latest in technology.

As chair of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Industry in the last session of parliament, and as the member for Essex with such a vibrant technology based community, I was pleased to hear the Governor General outline the steps that we will take to improve our infrastructure of skills innovation and research. The industry committee took action on this front and held extensive hearings since 1997. It met with individuals from the university community, research councils and the private sector, and listened to their suggestions and recommendations.

At one of our hearings, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, the Canadian Association of University

Teachers and the Canadian Consortium for Research, the Humanities and Social Sciences Federation of Canada, and the Canadian Graduate Council highlighted their focus together in the opening paragraph of their submission by stating:

Canadians realize that innovation is vital. It is the foundation for our economic and social prosperity and our ability to compete in a global market. To be successful, we need a steady stream of new ideas, a well-educated workforce for the knowledge economy, and mechanisms to transfer effectively ideas from the laboratory bench to the marketplace. And we need to ensure that the innovation process is built on a strong and healthy foundation.

The increased support to the granting councils will ensure that a healthy foundation exists. It will enable them to forge new partnerships with our universities such as the University of Windsor, to attract the best research minds in the world. This will be developed through the innovative program of 21st century chairs for research excellence that the Prime Minister outlined in his speech. Through the research granting councils the Government of Canada will fund the creation of 1,200 chairs.

The industry committee in its 19th report entitled "Research Funding—Strengthening the Sources of Innovation" recommended that funding to the granting councils be increased. I am very pleased to see that the government is acting on the request in response to members of the committee and members of parliament.

The committee also heard that the number of students in the natural sciences and engineering is increasing and the need for support for funding their research in this area is increasing correspondingly. We also know that the government must intervene and act in order to help the challenges of commercialization.

As Robert Giroux from the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada said, "To me, the major impediments are the ability of the universities to identify the potential for a research product, and secondly being able to move that product to the marketplace".

We know the throne speech identified that the Canadian government will help to assist in the commercialization of research from universities and government centres. This is now a priority of the government.

The government also understands that Canadians cannot be productive and prosperous if they are not healthy. In the throne speech we confirmed our continued commitment to ensuring that our health care system will meet the needs of our growing population.

We will build on our health record by supporting partners and testing innovations in home care, pharmacare and integrated service delivery over the next two years. A modern health information system will make health information more accessible to professionals and our citizens.

*The Address*

● (1815)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** It being 6.15 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the amendment to the amendment now before the House.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Call in the members.

● (1845)

[Translation]

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

*(Division No. 1)*

## YEAS

## Members

Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bigras	Blaikie
Borotsik	Brien
Brisson	Canuel
Cardin	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Fournier
Gagnon	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Guay	Guimond
Hardy	Harvey
Herron	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	Laliberte
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Marceau
Marchand	Muise
Ménard	Nystrom

Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Power
Price	Proctor
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Solomon	St-Hilaire
St-Jacques	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Vautour	Venne
Wasylycia-Leis	Wayne
de Savoye—66	

## NAYS

## Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bailey	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Bélair	Bélanger
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Carroll
Casson	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chatters	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Copps
Cullen	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepolo	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Elley	Epp
Finlay	Fontana
Forseth	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Grose	Guarnieri
Hanger	Harb
Harvard	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Johnston
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knudson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Lincoln	Longfield
Lowther	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
Matthews	Mayfield
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McNally	McTeague
McWhinney	Meredith
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
Normand	Nunziata
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Obhrai
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry



*Business of the House*

Penson  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pratt  
Provenzano  
Redman  
Reynolds  
Robillard  
Saada  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Serré  
Solberg  
St-Julien  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Strahl  
Telegdi  
Thompson (Wild Rose)  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Wappel  
White (North Vancouver)  
Wood—181

Peric  
Pettigrew  
Pillitteri  
Proud  
Ramsay  
Reed  
Richardson  
Rock  
Schmidt  
Sekora  
Shepherd  
Speller  
St. Denis  
Stewart (Brant)  
Stinson  
Szabo  
Thibeault  
Torsney  
Valeri  
Volpe  
Whelan  
Wilfert

[English]

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

[Translation]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative members vote no on this motion.

[English]

**Mr. John Nunziata:** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the good people of York South—Weston I will vote yes to this motion.

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

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Caplan
Dumas	Mercier
Nunziata	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)

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

*(Division No. 2)*

## YEAS

## Members

Adams  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Bakopoulos  
Beaumier  
Bennett  
Bevilacqua  
Blondin-Andrew  
Bonwick  
Bradshaw  
Bryden  
Byrne  
Bélanger  
Calder  
Carroll  
Cauchon  
Chan  
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)  
Coderre  
Coppes  
DeVillers  
Dhaliwal  
Discepola  
Drouin  
Easter  
Finlay  
Fry  
Galloway  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Guarnieri  
Hardy  
Hubbard  
Iftody  
Jennings  
Karetak-Lindell  
Keys  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Kraft Sloan  
Lastewka  
Lee  
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)  
Longfield  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Marleau  
Matthews  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Milliken  
Minna  
Murray  
Nault  
Nunziata  
O'Brien (Labrador)  
O'Reilly  
Paradis

Alcock  
Assad  
Augustine  
Baker  
Barnes  
Bellemare  
Bertrand  
Blaikie  
Bonin  
Boudria  
Brown  
Bulte  
Bélair  
Caccia  
Cannis  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Charbonneau  
Cloutier  
Collenette  
Cullen  
Desjarlais  
Dion  
Dromisky  
Duhamel  
Eggleton  
Fontana  
Gagliano  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Grose  
Harb  
Harvard  
Ianno  
Jackson  
Jordan  
Karygiannis  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)  
Knutson  
Laliberte  
Lavigne  
Leung  
Lincoln  
MacAulay  
Malhi  
Manley  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
McCormick  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Miffin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Mitchell  
Myers  
Normand  
Nystrom  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The house resumed consideration of the motion.

**The Speaker:** Pursuant to order made earlier today, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion of the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons.

The question is on Motion No. 1.

[Translation]

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I think you will find unanimous consent to record the members who voted on the previous motion as voting on the motion now before the House, with Liberals voting yes.

[English]

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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

[Translation]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois vote no on this motion.

*Business of the House*

Patry  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pratt  
Proud  
Redman  
Richardson  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Serré  
Solomon  
St-Julien  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Valeri  
Volpe  
Wasylcyia-Leis  
Wilfert

Peric  
Pettigrew  
Pillitteri  
Proctor  
Provenzano  
Reed  
Robillard  
Saada  
Sekora  
Shepherd  
Speller  
St. Denis  
Stewart (Brant)  
Szabo  
Thibeault  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Wappel  
Whelan  
Wood—158

Kenney (Calgary Southeast)  
Laurin  
Loubier  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Marchand  
McNally  
Muise  
Obhrai  
Perron  
Plamondon  
Price  
Reynolds  
Sauvageau  
Solberg  
St-Jacques  
Strahl  
Thompson (Wild Rose)  
Turp  
Venne  
White (North Vancouver)

Lalonde  
Lebel  
Lowther  
Marceau  
Mayfield  
Meredith  
Ménard  
Penson  
Picard (Drummond)  
Power  
Ramsay  
Rocheleau  
Schmidt  
St-Hilaire  
Stinson  
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Vautour  
Wayne  
de Savoye—89

**NAYS**

## Members

Ablonczy  
Anders  
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)  
Bailey  
Bergeron  
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok  
Bigras  
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)  
Brien  
Canuel  
Casson  
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)  
Dalphond-Guiral  
Desrochers  
Duceppe  
Epp  
Fournier  
Gauthier  
Godin (Châteauguay)  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Guimond  
Harvey  
Hill (MacLeod)  
Hilstrom  
Jones

Alarie  
Asselin  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Bellehumeur  
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—  
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Borotsik  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Brisson  
Cardin  
Chatters  
Crête  
Debien  
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)  
Elley  
Forseth  
Gagnon  
Girard-Bujold  
Grewal  
Guay  
Hanger  
Herron  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Johnston  
Keddy (South Shore)

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Dumas  
Nunziata

Caplan  
Mercier  
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)

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

It being 6.50 p.m. the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6.50 p.m.)



# CONTENTS

Thursday, October 14, 1999

<b>Interparliamentary Delegations</b>			
The Speaker .....	109		
<b>ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS</b>			
<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>			
Mr. Lee .....	109		
<b>Interparliamentary Delegations</b>			
Mr. Proud .....	109		
<b>Canada Elections Act</b>			
Bill C-2. Introduction and first reading .....	109		
Mr. Boudria .....	109		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	109		
<b>Youth Criminal Justice Act</b>			
Bill C-3 Introduction and first reading .....	109		
Mr. Boudria .....	109		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	109		
<b>Competition Act</b>			
Bill C-201. Introduction and first reading .....	109		
Mr. McTeague .....	109		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	110		
Mr. McTeague .....	110		
(Bill deemed read the second time, referred to a committee, reported with amendments) .....	110		
<b>Criminal Code</b>			
Bill C-202. Introduction and first reading .....	110		
Mr. McTeague .....	110		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	110		
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ..	110		
<b>Auditor General Act</b>			
Bill C-203. Introduction and first reading .....	110		
Mrs. Gagnon .....	110		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	110		
<b>Employment Insurance Act</b>			
Bill C-204. Introduction and first reading .....	110		
Mr. Szabo .....	110		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	111		
<b>Income Tax Act</b>			
Bill C-205. Introduction and first reading .....	111		
Mr. Guimond .....	111		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	111		
<b>Access to Information Act</b>			
Bill C-206. Introduction and first reading .....	111		
Mr. Bryden .....	111		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	111		
<b>Criminal Code</b>			
Bill C-207. Introduction and first reading .....	111		
Mr. Vellacott .....	111		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	111		
<b>Crown Liability and Proceedings Act</b>			
Bill C-208. Introduction and first reading .....	112		
Mr. Hanger .....	112		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	112		
<b>Criminal Code</b>			
Bill 209. Introduction and first reading .....	112		
Mr. Hanger .....	112		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	112		
<b>Bank of Canada Act</b>			
Bill C-210. Introduction and first reading .....	112		
Mr. Marceau .....	112		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	112		
<b>Income Tax Act</b>			
Bill C-211. Introduction and first reading .....	112		
Mr. Crête .....	112		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	112		
<b>Canada Labour Code</b>			
Bill C-212. Introduction and first reading .....	112		
Mrs. Guay .....	112		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	112		
<b>Shipbuilding Act, 1999</b>			
Bill C-213. Introduction and first reading .....	113		
Mr. Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière) .....	113		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read for the first time and printed) .....	113		
<b>Treaties Act</b>			
Bill C-214. Introduction and first reading .....	113		
Mr. Turp .....	113		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	113		
<b>Tabling of Treaties Act</b>			
Bill C-215. Introduction and first reading .....	113		
Mr. Turp .....	113		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	113		
<b>Treaty Approval Act</b>			
Bill C-216. Introduction and first reading .....	113		
Mr. Turp .....	113		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	113		
<b>Treaty Publication Act</b>			
Bill C-217. Introduction and first reading .....	113		
Mr. Turp .....	113		

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)	113
<b>Conclusion of Treaties Act</b>	
Bill C-218. Introduction and first reading	113
Mr. Turp	113
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)	113
<b>Business of the House</b>	
Motion No. 1	113
Mr. Boudria	113
Division deemed demanded and deferred	114
Mr. Boudria	114
Motion No. 2	114
(Motion agreed to)	114
Mr. Boudria	114
Motion No. 3	114
(Motion agreed to)	114
Mr. Assadourian	114
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>Gasoline Additives</b>	
Mrs. Ur	114
<b>The Constitution</b>	
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	114
<b>Agriculture</b>	
Mr. Borotsik	114
<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
Mr. Lee	115
<b>Request for Emergency Debate</b>	
<b>Immigration</b>	
Mr. Benoit	115
The Deputy Speaker	115

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Speech from the Throne</b>	
<b>Resumption of debate on Address in Reply</b>	
Mr. Strahl	115
Mrs. Redman	115
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	117
Mrs. Redman	117
Ms. Bulte	118
Mr. Kenney	119
Ms. Bulte	120
Mr. Harris	120
Ms. Bulte	120
Mr. Solberg	120
Mr. Harris	121
Mr. Solberg	122
Mr. McNally	122
Mr. Solberg	122
Mr. Kenney	122
Mr. Herron	124
Mr. Kenney	124
Mrs. Kraft Sloan	124
Mr. Kenney	125
Mr. Clouthier	125
Mr. Obhrai	126
Mr. Clouthier	126
Mr. Godin (Châteauguay)	127
Mr. Clouthier	127
Mr. Mahoney	127

Mr. Mahoney	128
Mr. McNally	128
Mr. Mahoney	129
Mr. Laliberte	129
Mr. Mahoney	129
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	129
Mr. Mahoney	129
Mr. Bergeron	129
Mr. Turp	129
Mr. Loubier	131
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	132
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	135
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	136
Mr. Crête	136
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	136
Mr. Harvey	137
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	137
Mr. Blaikie	137
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	139
Mr. Blaikie	139
Ms. Davies	139
Mr. Perić	141
Ms. Davies	141
Mr. Reed	142
Mr. McNally	143
Mr. Reed	143
Mr. Casson	143
Mr. Reed	143
Mr. Nunziata	143
Mr. Reed	143
Mr. McWhinney	144

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

<b>Chancellor Robert S. K. Welch</b>	
Mr. Lastewka	145
<b>Agriculture</b>	
Mr. Casson	145
<b>Hazardous Waste</b>	
Mr. Caccia	145
<b>The Late Ross Hall</b>	
Mr. Valeri	145
<b>The Late William Kaye Lamb</b>	
Mr. Forseth	146
<b>Auto Pact</b>	
Mr. Blaikie	146
<b>Arts and Culture</b>	
Ms. Carroll	146
<b>Jean-Louis Millette</b>	
Mr. de Savoye	146
<b>Oktoberfest</b>	
Mrs. Redman	147
<b>Children</b>	
Mr. Bonwick	147
<b>Robert Mundell</b>	
Mr. Solberg	147
<b>Community Care Worker Week</b>	
Mr. Charbonneau	147
<b>World Day for the Refusal of Misery</b>	
Mrs. Gagnon	148

<b>Liberal Government</b>	
Ms. Jennings .....	148
<b>Fisheries</b>	
Mr. Power .....	148
<b>William Head Institution</b>	
Mr. Lunn .....	148
<b>Presence in Gallery</b>	
The Speaker .....	149

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

<b>Fisheries</b>	
Mr. Manning .....	149
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	149
Mr. Manning .....	149
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	149
Mr. Manning .....	149
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	149
Mr. Cummins .....	149
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	150
Mr. Cummins .....	150
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	150
<b>GM Plant in Boisbriand</b>	
Mr. Duceppe .....	150
Mr. Manley .....	150
Mr. Duceppe .....	150
Mr. Manley .....	150
Mr. Gauthier .....	150
Mr. Manley .....	150
Mr. Gauthier .....	150
Mr. Manley .....	151
<b>Agriculture</b>	
Ms. McDonough .....	151
Mr. Vanclief .....	151
Ms. McDonough .....	151
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	151
<b>Fisheries</b>	
Mrs. Wayne .....	151
Mr. Dhaliwal .....	151
Mrs. Wayne .....	151
Mr. Dhaliwal .....	152
<b>Agriculture</b>	
Mr. Hilstrom .....	152
Mr. Vanclief .....	152
Mr. Hilstrom .....	152
Mr. Hilstrom .....	152
<b>GM Plant in Boisbriand</b>	
Mr. Brien .....	152
Mr. Manley .....	152
Mr. Brien .....	152
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	152
<b>Agriculture</b>	
Mr. Manning .....	153
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	153
Mr. Manning .....	153
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	153
<b>Air Transportation</b>	
Mr. Guimond .....	153

Mr. Collenette .....	153
Mr. Guimond .....	153
Mr. Collenette .....	153
<b>Government Contracts</b>	
Miss Grey .....	154
Ms. Minna .....	154
Miss Grey .....	154
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	154
<b>Parental Leave</b>	
Mr. Crête .....	154
Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....	154
<b>Agriculture</b>	
Mr. Calder .....	154
Mr. Vanclief .....	154
<b>Government Grants</b>	
Mrs. Ablonczy .....	155
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	155
Mrs. Ablonczy .....	155
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	155
<b>Child Care</b>	
Mrs. Dockrill .....	155
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	155
Ms. Davies .....	155
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	155
<b>Fisheries</b>	
Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest) .....	155
Mr. Dhaliwal .....	155
Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest) .....	156
Mr. Dhaliwal .....	156
<b>Child Care</b>	
Mr. O'Reilly .....	156
Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....	156
<b>Employment</b>	
Mr. Obhrai .....	156
Mr. Pettigrew .....	156
<b>Native peoples</b>	
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) .....	156
Mr. Nault .....	156
Mr. Stoffer .....	156
Mr. Nault .....	157
<b>Fisheries</b>	
Ms. Vautour .....	157
Mr. Dhaliwal .....	157
<b>Presence in Gallery</b>	
The Speaker .....	157
<b>Business of the House</b>	
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford) .....	157
Mr. Boudria .....	157
Mr. Blaikie .....	157
Mr. Boudria .....	157
Mr. Nunziata .....	158
<b>Privilege</b>	
<b>Canadian Security Intelligence Service</b>	
Ms. Meredith .....	158
Ms. Meredith .....	159
Mr. Strahl .....	160
Mr. Abbott .....	161

Mr. Boudria .....	161
Ms. Meredith .....	161
The Speaker .....	161

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

#### Speech from the Throne

##### Resumption of debate on Address in Reply

Mr. McWhinney .....	162
Mrs. Wayne .....	162
Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	163
Mrs. Wayne .....	164
Mr. Canuel .....	164
Mrs. Wayne .....	164
Mr. Borotsik .....	164
Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	166
Mr. Borotsik .....	166
Mr. Laliberte .....	166
Mr. Borotsik .....	166
Mr. Proud .....	167
Mr. Desrochers .....	168
Mr. Proud .....	169
Mr. Borotsik .....	169
Mr. Proud .....	169
Mrs. Chamberlain .....	169
Mr. Herron .....	171
Mrs. Chamberlain .....	171
Mr. Canuel .....	171
Mrs. Chamberlain .....	171
Mr. Borotsik .....	171
Mrs. Chamberlain .....	171
Mr. Cummins .....	171
Mr. Cummins .....	172
Mr. Bryden .....	173

Mr. Cummins .....	173
Mr. Benoit .....	174
Mr. Bryden .....	175
Mr. Benoit .....	175
Mr. Anderson .....	176
Mr. Elley .....	179
Mr. Anderson .....	179
Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	179
Mr. Anderson .....	180
Mr. Blaikie .....	180
Mr. Anderson .....	180
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose) .....	180
Ms. Alarie .....	181
Mr. Harvey .....	182
Ms. Alarie .....	182
Mr. Desrochers .....	182
Mr. Crête .....	184
Mr. Desrochers .....	184
Mr. Herron .....	184
Mr. Desrochers .....	184
Ms. Whelan .....	184
Amendment to the amendment negatived .....	187

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### Business of the House

Mr. Kilger .....	187
Mr. Strahl .....	187
Mr. Bergeron .....	187
Mr. Solomon .....	187
Mr. Harvey .....	187
Mr. Nunziata .....	187
Motion No. 1 agreed to .....	188

**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://wwwparl.gc.ca>**

---

**The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.**

**Additional copies may be obtained from 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 : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9**